



**RESPONSIVE FOREST GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE (RFGI):  
SUPPORTING RESILIENT FOREST LIVELIHOODS THROUGH  
LOCAL REPRESENTATION**

**Social protection in REDD+ initiatives: A Review**

**Rebecca L. Rutt**  
Doctoral Candidate, University of Copenhagen  
*Reru@life.ku.dk*

**4 January 2012**

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	4
Executive Summary .....	5
1. Introduction .....	8
2. Evolution of the REDD+ mechanism in international negotiations .....	10
3. Social and governance aspects of REDD readiness and implementation .....	14
4. Primary multilateral REDD+ processes and associated frameworks.....	16
4.1 Forest Carbon Partnership Facility .....	16
4.1.1 FCPF steps for REDD+ readiness.....	17
4.1.2 FCPF-specific social safeguard efforts and stakeholder inclusion .....	18
4.1.3 Strengths and limitations of the FCPF on social safeguarding and stakeholder inclusion.....	20
4.2 UN-REDD Programme .....	21
4.2.1 UN-REDD steps for REDD+ readiness .....	23
4.2.2 UN-REDD-specific social safeguard efforts and stakeholder inclusion.....	23
4.2.3 Strengths and limitations of UN-REDD social safeguards and stakeholder inclusion .....	26
5. Before REDD+: Instruments to assess REDD+ relevant aspects .....	26
5.1 Framework for assessing and monitoring forest governance (PROFOR and FAO, 2011).....	27
5.2 Governance of Forests Toolkit (version 1): A draft framework of indicators for assessing governance of the forest sector (Brito et al., 2009).....	28
5.3 Roots for good forest outcomes: an analytical framework for governance reforms (World Bank 2009).....	30
5.4 Tenure in REDD: Start-point or afterthought? (Cotula and Mayers 2009) .....	31
6. REDD+ ongoing: Research and advocacy groups calling for social protections .....	32
6.1 Standards, principles, guidelines, frameworks and other tools to incorporate various social protections.....	32
6.1.1 REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES) (CCBA and Care 2010).....	32
6.1.2 Developing social and environmental safeguards for REDD+: A guide for a bottom-up approach (Bonfante, Voivodic & Meneses Filho 2010) .....	34
6.1.3 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent in REDD+: Principles and Approaches for Policy and Project Development (RECOFTC and GIZ 2011).....	35
6.1.4 Gender-differentiated impacts of REDD to be addressed in REDD Social Standards (Gurung and Quesada 2009) .....	36
6.2 Others calling for social protection in REDD+.....	38
7. During and after REDD+: tools to assess compliance and outcomes.....	42
7.1 Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment (SBIA) Manual for REDD+ Projects (Richards and Panfil 2011) .....	43
7.2 Guidance for the provision of information on REDD+ governance (UN-REDD and Chatham House 2011).....	44
7.3 Guide to Learning about the livelihood impacts of REDD+ Projects (Jagger et al. 2010).....	45
8. Discussion and conclusions .....	46
References .....	48
Annex 1: Elements of Free, Prior and Informed Consent.....	51
Annex 2: Table on values of select REDD+ social tools.....	52

## List of Acronyms

AWG-LCA	Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperation Action under the Convention
BACI	Before–After/Control– Intervention
BIA	Biodiversity Impact Assessment
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCBA	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
COMIFAC	Commission des forêts d’Afrique Centrale
COP	Conference of the Parties
ESMF	Environmental and Social Management Framework
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FFI	Fauna & Flora International
FGLG	Forest Governance Learning Group
FLEGT	Forest Law Enforcement, Governance, and Trade
FOCALI	Forest, Climate, and Livelihood research network
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
FPP	Forest Peoples Programme
GCSREDD	Global Comparative Study on REDD+
GFI	Governance of Forests Initiative
GGCA	Global Gender and Climate Alliance
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
ICDP	Integrated conservation and development projects
ICV	Instituto Centro de Vida
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IMAFLORA	Institute for Forest and Agricultural Management and Certification / Instituto de Manejo e Certificação Florestal e Agrícola
IMAZON	Instituto do Homem e Meio Ambiente da Amazonia
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
LAS	Legality Assurance System
LLS	Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy
LULUCF	Land use, land use change and forestry
MRV	Measurement, reporting and verification
NPD	National Programme Document
P&C	Principles and Criteria
PES	Payments for ecosystem services
PGA	Participatory Governance Assessments
RECOFTC	Center for People and Forests
RED	Reducing emissions from deforestation
REDD	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation
REDD+ SES	REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards
R-Package	Readiness Package
R-PIN	Readiness Proposal Idea Note
R-PP	Readiness Preparation Proposal
RFN	Rainforest Foundation Norway
RRI	Rights and Resources Initiative
SBIA	Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment

SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SESA	Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment
SIA	Social impact assessments
UN CEDAW	United Nations Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
UN PFII	United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
VPA	Voluntary Partnership Agreements
WEDO	Women's Environment and Development Organization
WOCAN	Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management
WRI	World Resources Institute

### **Acknowledgements**

This paper benefitted greatly from comments and suggestions provided by Jens Friis Lund, Jesse Ribot and Jesper Tranberg. Any errors contained herein are the responsibility of the author.

## Executive Summary

Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) is an important international approach to incentivizing improved forest management to reduce carbon emissions. Despite the uncertainty of whether REDD+ will be incorporated into a 2012 post-Kyoto Protocol UN agreement, REDD+ initiatives are moving forward as countries rush to prepare for the potential financial incentives. In early 2009, at least 144 REDD initiatives were already underway. These and more recent initiatives reveal the variety of options for designing REDD programmes, including multilateral and bilateral schemes, nongovernmental organisation initiatives, and private-public partnerships.

Debate, criticism, and fear have already flourished about REDD+ and its potential negative impacts on both the environment and people. It has been noted that market-based carbon offset mechanisms may be particularly risky for the poor, who are least likely to have a voice in the design of REDD+. There are also worries with regard to specific applications of REDD+, for example the fear of displacement and impoverishment of forest dependent poor groups in the wake of expansion and stricter enforcement of conservation regulations without consideration for local livelihoods.

In response to these concerns, there has been a proliferation of initiatives to develop social safeguards as well as guidelines, principles, frameworks, and other tools to protect and empower poor, marginalized and indigenous peoples in relation to REDD+. Some have also called for the application of existing standards to REDD+. Indeed there are many REDD+ relevant standards and certification tools in the areas of, for example, forest governance and land based carbon schemes. Ranging from the broad REDD+ social and environmental safeguards and principles laid out at COP 16 in Cancun in 2010, to the more narrowly focused efforts targeting particular vulnerable groups such as women or indigenous people, these efforts in sum represent an evolving focus beyond simply preserving and regenerating forests for carbon storage.

This review seeks to provide an overview of these evolving efforts to develop and promote social safeguards. First, a brief narrative of the process from RED to REDD to REDD+ is provided to understand how different values have entered into the evolution of the understanding of the REDD endeavour. Then, the wider spectrum of tools large and small, generic and specific, are presented, to provide a resource for those interested in what exists now with regard to REDD+ social protection demands. Further, the calls to action with regard to emerging and specific focus areas, beyond the traditional demands, for example, for stakeholder participation are described.

Although the current agreement on REDD+ is considered a success of the 2010 COP 16 Cancun Agreements, the ideas behind the REDD global mechanism were first introduced in the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, albeit with a restricted role, allowing only for afforestation and reforestation projects in Annex 1 countries<sup>1</sup> to generate credits for trading under the Clean Development Mechanism. The concept of avoided deforestation re-emerged at COP 11 in Montreal in 2005, where approaches to stimulate action on “reducing emissions from deforestation” (RED) was on the agenda. In 2007 in Bali, the idea of integrating emission reductions from degradation was introduced, in spite of the challenges of its measurement. Further, social benefits, including how to deal with indigenous people and local communities as stakeholders and their rights in terms of participation, land tenure, distribution of funds etc., were debated. The Bali Road Map of 2007 not only for the first time

---

<sup>1</sup> Annex I Parties include the industrialized countries that were members of the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) in 1992, plus countries with economies in transition (the EIT Parties), including the Russian Federation, the Baltic States, and several Central and Eastern European States. See [http://www.unfccc.int/parties\\_and\\_observers/parties/annex\\_i/items/2774.php](http://www.unfccc.int/parties_and_observers/parties/annex_i/items/2774.php) for a complete list.

stated that REDD can promote co-benefits, but also referred to a range of international agreements and associated instruments in the indicative guidance for REDD+ demonstration activities and thereby pointed to the relevance for REDD of a larger body of international norms, focusing on biodiversity, sustainable forest management and concerns for poverty and rights of indigenous and forest dependent groups.

At COP 14 in Poznan in 2008, REDD was transformed into REDD+ through the inclusion of strategies that go beyond deforestation and forest degradation to include the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in reducing emissions. Albeit often described as an overall failure, COP 15 in Copenhagen in 2009 did give REDD+ a boost, with a decision adopted that supports REDD+. Specifically, the decision requests of Parties to identify drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and REDD+ actions to be taken, following a three phased approach that has since been widely adopted. At COP 16 in Cancun both the Green Climate Fund and, after five years of discussion<sup>2</sup>, a delineation of social and environmental principles and safeguards were unveiled. The scope of REDD+ was finally agreed upon: reducing emissions from deforestation; reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests; and enhancement of forest carbon stocks. Countries were requested to develop national REDD+ strategies and action plans, national/sub-national forest emissions reference levels, a national forest monitoring system for REDD+ activities, and a system for reporting on how safeguards are being managed and observed. Towards the COP 17 in Durban, South Africa in December 2011, a system for reporting on how social safeguards are addressed and respected during REDD+ implementation and how this system will plug into the measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) systems and modalities are being discussed.

The reviewed tools on social aspects of REDD+ projects cover the entire policy process from development over implementation to evaluation, and focus on identifying and mitigating risks, promoting various co-benefits, and securing the inclusion of a broad range of stakeholders in the process.

The tools focusing on the policy development phase are the Forest Carbon Partnership's (FCPF) Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA), the United Nations Collaborative Initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation's (UN-REDD)'s Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool which supports UN-REDD Principles and Criteria (P&C), and the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) and Care's REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (SES), that all draw on a number of more generic forest governance assessment tools that are also reviewed. These mainly focus on the national level of policy making, although CCBA and Care's REDD+ SES also has a specific project level focus. The review indicates that the CCBA and Care's REDD+ SES has a higher level of detail with regard to social safeguards, whereas the UN-REDD tool is more elaborate on and gives more weight to environmental concerns. Further, the review indicates that the FCPF – possibly due to its inherent focus on the national and strategic level – includes fewer of the social and environmental values. Finally, the overview shows that none of these three larger processes of developing social safeguards give much attention to the process of stakeholder identification and independent and participatory process monitoring. With regard to the latter, however, the Participatory Governance Assessment Tool that is under development by the UN-REDD constitutes a notable exception.

---

<sup>2</sup> Although the discussion for REDD specific safeguards was undertaken for about 5 years prior to this decision, at the time when the UNFCCC agreed on the modalities of A/R CDM projects at CoP 9 in Milan (2003), the EU was already fighting for the introduction of a set of social and environmental safeguards to be independently verified by designated operational entities, in the style of a binding international standard and ignoring country-specific social and environmental circumstances of natural resource management (Merger, Dutschke and Verchot, 2011).

The tools with particular focus on process related issues of inclusion and participation in implementation are the joint FCPF & UN-REDD's Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement, the UN-REDD Participatory Governance Assessment Tool, and parts of the CCBA and Care's REDD+ SES. The Principles and Approaches for Policy and Project Development by the Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC) and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ 2011) is an example of an effort to develop elaborate guidance on process, including identification of stakeholders mainly at the project level.

Finally, project-level assessment of social impacts (e.g. poverty and social impact assessments (SIAs) is covered in, among others, the Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment (SBIA) Manual for REDD+ Projects and the guide to learning about the livelihood impacts of REDD+ projects. In addition to these, the review has covered a number of smaller and more specific tools that are useful at various stages of project design, implementation, and review.

The review reveals that the international REDD+ discourse and national processes have progressed toward an increasing focus on social protections for the poor. Accordingly, REDD+ specific tools to protect and empower the most vulnerable are being generated. Their range is diverse; some are exclusively process focused, whereas others centre on substantive standards, principles, criteria, and indicators. Among those mentioned in this document, there is substantial overlap in the issues addressed, although differences exist with regard to the point of departure, the level of detail, and the intended outcomes. The sum of efforts, however, provides a very wide and elaborate coverage of social and environmental issues. The issue at hand is one of assuring alignment between the different efforts based on an agreement on minimum standards across the board. This would also counter the problem identified in previous analyses of the existing social safeguards; that no one standard provides comprehensive coverage of the criteria set out in the Cancun decision safeguards. Alignment of criteria and procedures would not only guarantee a common minimum standard for social and environmental safeguards, it would, in all likelihood, also contribute towards efficiency in REDD+ processes through opportunities for replication of processes.

# 1. Introduction

Despite the uncertainty of whether reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) will be incorporated into a 2012 post-Kyoto Protocol UN agreement, REDD initiatives are moving forward as countries rush to prepare for the potential financial incentives. In early 2009, at least 144 REDD initiatives were already underway (Cotula and Mayers 2009). These initiatives reveal the variety of options for designing REDD programmes. They include multilateral schemes (e.g. the World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility), bilateral schemes (e.g. the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation Climate and Forest Initiative Funding Scheme), nongovernmental organisation initiatives (e.g. Conservation International in Madagascar) and private-public partnerships (e.g. Government of Aceh, Fauna and Flora International, Carbon Conservation with investment from Merrill Lynch and the US states of California, Illinois and Wisconsin) (Springate-Baginski and Wollenberg 2010:2). The Brazilian Development Bank has also independently created a country fund and scheme for payments related to ecosystem services (ibid).

Yet even before COP 13 in Bali, where the REDD mechanism in its present REDD+<sup>3</sup> form was formalized, there had been much debate, criticism, and fear surrounding the use of the instrument and its potential negative impacts on both the environment and people. It has been well noted that market-based carbon offset mechanisms may be particularly risky for the poor, who are least likely to have a voice in the design of REDD (Peskett et al. 2008 cited: Lohmann 2006). The global scale of the REDD+ dialogue, and design risks overlooking local challenges and issues, and there are indications that the linkages of possible benefit flows (or co-benefits) to carbon markets are oversimplified. An example of this is in the use of ‘community’ without disaggregating differences within communities (Peskett et al. 2008). There are also worries about certain applications of REDD+, for example, the fear of displacement and impoverishment of forest dependent poor groups in the wake of expansion and stricter enforcement of conservation regulations without consideration for local livelihoods (Moss and Nussbaum 2011).

In reaction to these concerns, there has been a recent proliferation of initiatives to develop social safeguards as well as guidelines, principles, frameworks, and other tools that intend to protect and empower poor, marginalized, and indigenous peoples in the implementation of REDD projects. Some have also called for the application of existing standards to REDD investments to improve benefits for the poor (e.g. Peskett et al. 2008). There are many REDD+ relevant standards and certification tools in the areas of, for example, forest governance and land based carbon schemes (see Merger, Dutschke and Verchot 2011). Similarly, Moss and Nussbaum (2011) assert the importance of coordinating REDD+ with other efforts to achieve similar social goals, such as the European Union’s Forest Law Enforcement, Governance, and Trade Initiative (FLEGT) (Box 1). Ranging from the broad REDD+ social and environmental safeguards and principles laid out at the COP 16 in Cancun in 2010, to the more narrowly focused efforts targeting particularly vulnerable groups such as women or indigenous people, these efforts in sum represent an evolving focus beyond simply preserving and regenerating forests for carbon storage.

---

<sup>3</sup> The ‘+’ in REDD+ implies that forest conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks are included – see more on the evolution of the + in section 2.



### **Box 1: FLEGT, the VPA Process and REDD+**

FLEGT Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs) are legally binding bilateral agreements between the European Union (EU) and timber exporting countries, which aim to guarantee the legality of wood exported to the EU and to support countries in improving their own forestry regulation and governance. The REDD+ safeguards outlined in the Cancun agreements mention national forest governance structures and participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular, indigenous peoples and local communities, both of which are integral to FLEGT and specifically VPA building processes.

VPAs are designed in step two of the four-step FLEGT implementation process. They include a Legality Assurance System (LAS), which should provide on-the-ground input into monitoring and verification of forest management and degradation. VPAs also contain a detailed plan that sets out clearly defined, time-bound actions for improving forest sector governance and social safeguards, which ‘should seek to minimize adverse impacts on local communities and poor people by taking account of indigenous and local communities’ livelihoods associated with forests, and to pursue broad stakeholder involvement’ (EFI 2007).

The term “safeguards” refers to the need to protect against social and/or environmental damage or harm (Moss and Nussbaum 2011). Safeguards may appear as measures such as policies or procedures that are designed to prevent adverse outcomes of actions or programmes (ibid.). A safeguard system should at the minimum be a risk management tool, though it can also support the generation of co-benefits (Murphy 2011). With regard to REDD+, there is debate as to the adequacy of a “no harm” principle as compared to actively making REDD+ work for the poor. This implies that REDD+ initiatives must make a positive contribution to poverty reduction. Peskett et al. (2008) acknowledges that this is as much a pragmatic issue as a moral one, as the choice could affect the effectiveness of REDD as ‘loading numerous social criteria on to an instrument primarily designed to tackle climate change’ may create a disincentive for investors. However Ribot (2011) asserts that if REDD strives only for neutrality (rather than affirmative action), it will deepen inequalities.

Other social protection related review papers have been created. These resources have been helpful in drafting the present document. For example, the following were drawn upon

- Moss and Nassbaum’s (2011) comparison of three approaches to the development of social and environmental standards and principles by the FCPF, the UN-REDD Programme, and the CCBA with Care International;
- Murphy’s (2011) exploration of the critical issues in the design of an information sharing system for social safeguards and multiple benefits; and
- Merger, Dutschke and Verchot’s (2011) comparison and evaluation of the practical applicability to REDD+ of nine non-REDD specific and one REDD specific forest management, social, environmental, and carbon standards.

This review paper is not prescriptive, but presents the wider spectrum of tools large and small, generic and specific, to provide a resource for those interested, in what exists now with regard to REDD+ social protection demands. It also describes the calls to action with regard to emerging and specific focus areas beyond the traditional demands for stakeholder participation. Specifically, this paper has attempted to catalogue the development over time of REDD+ standards, guidelines, indicators, and other tools and calls to promote social issues. Finally, this paper attempts to produce a brief narrative of how REDD+ evolved from RED to REDD to REDD+. Part of the purpose of putting it into this historic order is to understand how different values have entered into the evolution of the understanding of the RED endeavour and how different groups are asserting their concerns into the process. This implies an overview and brief description of

- the main institutions (donors, governments, intergovernmental agencies, NGOs, universities, research institutions) involved;
- the social/institutional (governance, distribution, equity, wellbeing and justice) indicators, standards and guidelines;
- the stated objectives of the indicators, standards and guidelines;
- the targeted users of the indicators, standards and guidelines, and
- the scales at which the indicators, standards and guidelines operate.

All tools within this review have been assessed, with a brief evaluation of

- the values (i.e. the assumed notions of what is to be valued and to be promoted) that the indicators are measuring, and
- their likely benefits and limitations.

Finally, a table presents the substantive values included within a selection of social tools described herein, namely the CCBA and Care REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards, FCPF’s Strategic Environmental and Social Assessments combined with their Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+, and the UN-REDD Programme’s Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria combined with their Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ (see Annex 2). The criteria include: property rights, access rights, benefit sharing, biodiversity, livelihood, participation, information, human rights, FPIC, grievance, stakeholder representation, stakeholder identification, independent process monitoring, and participatory process monitoring. A more detailed description of these values is included in Annex 2.

## 2. Evolution of the REDD+ mechanism in international negotiations



Although the current agreement on REDD+ is considered a success of the 2010 COP 16 Cancun Agreements (the text of which is an outcome of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperation Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA) and includes a REDD+ framework. The ideas behind the proposed REDD global mechanism were first introduced in the 1997 Kyoto Protocol.<sup>4</sup> Disagreement on the contribution of land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) activities to global carbon emissions, as well as a lack of confidence in their measurement, reporting, and verification, however, led to a restricted role for REDD activities. Only afforestation and reforestation projects in Annex 1 countries were eligible to generate credits for trading under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) (Carbon Planet 2009).

The concept of avoided deforestation re-emerged in 2005, when the newly formed Coalition for Rainforest Nations, via the Governments of Papua New Guinea and Costa Rica, requested that approaches to stimulate action on reducing emissions from deforestation (RED) in developing countries become a formal agenda item at COP 11 in Montreal. Specifically, they proposed to give developing countries access to a potential carbon market through credits generated from RED activities, with the intention that developed nations would provide incentives to developing nations to keep their forests standing (Brunner et al. 2010). Eventually, the value of the carbon would become equal to or greater than profits from logging, monoculture plantations, agriculture, etc.

---

<sup>4</sup> Articles 2 and 3 note policies and measure for the ‘Protection and enhancement of sinks and reservoirs of greenhouse gases, promotion of sustainable forest management practices, afforestation and reforestation’ and that ‘The net changes in greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks resulting from direct human-induced land-use change and forestry activities, limited to afforestation, reforestation and deforestation since 1990...shall be used to meet the commitments under this Article of each Party included in Annex I’, respectively.

(ibid.). Governments agreed to initiate consideration by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), the body tasked with providing Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) with advice on scientific, technological and methodological matters, at its 24<sup>th</sup> session in Bonn in mid 2006.

In 2007, the idea of integrating emission reductions from degradation was introduced by some African countries within the Commission des forêts d'Afrique Centrale (COMIFAC) proposal to the UNFCCC. Central Africa is the third most important tropical forest biome in the world and is threatened more by degradation than by deforestation (Rubio-Alvarado and Wertz-Kanounnikoff 2007; Peskett et al. 2008). Forest degradation had been left out of many early proposals for REDD mainly because of technological challenges of measuring and monitoring, in addition to political opposition by some countries (Peskett et al. 2008).

Following SBSTA deliberation and several workshops, the Bali Action Plan was adopted at COP13 in 2007, of which paragraph 1, b iii states: '*Policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries.*'. In addition to deforestation, degradation was also recognized as a significant contributor to forest carbon emissions. Including degradation in the proposed mechanism not only increased the potential scope of RED, it also was seen to increase the international equity of the mechanism by encouraging participation by a wider range of countries, in particular the many poor African countries in which degradation is the key driver of carbon emissions from forests (Murdiyarsa et al. 2008). Going from RED to REDD, however, may also increase the risks for the poor in the form of oppressive actions against the forest degrading activities they depend upon (e.g. charcoaling and swidden agriculture) (Angelsen 2008 111).

The proposed mechanism for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) was now formalized, but several issues remained contentious. There is still disagreement on finance mechanisms, institutional arrangements, and challenges in measurement, reporting, and verification. Further, social benefits, including how to deal with indigenous people and local communities as stakeholders and their rights in terms of participation, land tenure, distribution of funds etc., was – and continue to be – widely debated. Brown, Seymour and Peskett (2008) note that REDD was negotiated in the context of other international agreements and associated instruments that recognise the importance of social co-benefits<sup>5</sup> in forest management. The Bali Road Map stated for the first time that REDD could promote co-benefits<sup>6</sup>, and also referred to international agreements and associated instruments like the indicative guidance for REDD+ demonstration activities. This guidance states that REDD+ activities 'should be consistent with sustainable forest management, noting, inter alia, the relevant provisions of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and the Convention on Biological Diversity' (UNFCCC 2008). For example, a purpose of the UNFF non-legally binding instrument is 'to enhance the contribution of forests to the achievement of the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals, with respect to poverty eradication and environmental sustainability...' (UN 2008). Article 20 of the Convention on Biological Diversity asserts that 'economic and social development and poverty eradication are the first and overriding

---

<sup>5</sup> The international REDD+ dialogue has been criticized of using terms such as social 'co-benefits' without a description of what the term actually entails (Peskett et al., 2008 cites: Peskett and Iwata, 2007), however criteria for assessing co-benefits may include economic development and poverty reduction, biodiversity, rights and forest governance (see Angelsen, 2008).

<sup>6</sup> There was already some discussion on offset mechanisms providing social and environmental benefits in addition to the offsets themselves. This was embodied in the decision at COP 9 on modalities for implementing CDM afforestation and reforestation (A/R) activities, where the responsibility for ensuring that this was indeed the case was left to the host country (Merger, Dutschke and Verchot, 2011).

priorities of the developing country partners,' and that international support must respect national plans, priorities and programmes (CBD 1992). These kinds of agreements, as well as instruments such as the safeguard policies of multilateral development banks, supply an emerging body of international norms relevant to REDD (Brown, Seymour and Peskett 2008).

At COP 14 in Poznan in 2008, pressure from countries such as India, which wished to see conservation, sustainable forest management and the enhancement of forest carbon stocks given the same level of priority in the negotiations as deforestation and forest degradation, resulted in a comma replacing the semi-colon between the words 'developing countries' and 'the role of conservation' (Carbon Planet 2009). This implied the formalization of REDD+, i.e. strategies that go beyond deforestation and forest degradation to include the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in reducing emissions. The + effectively increased the coverage of REDD to many non-tropical countries that are already engaged in afforestation, such as India and China. Fears quickly arose, however, that increased conservation entailed a risk of evictions and loss of rights for indigenous and forest dependent communities. Similarly, fears were expressed that sustainable management of forests could promote subsidies to commercial logging companies, and that enhancement of stocks might encourage the conversion of land that included forests to industrial plantations, with serious implications for biodiversity and local communities (Butler 2009; Friends of the Earth 2010; Lang 2010).

Meetings in Bonn and Barcelona in 2009 aimed to facilitate the negotiations among Parties on the fulfilment of the Bali Action Plan towards the agreed outcome to be adopted at COP 15 in Copenhagen in 2009. In the same year, a REDD Options Assessment Report prepared by the Meridian Institute advised, among other things, that REDD+ initiatives ought to be undertaken in three successive, though sometimes overlapping phases. Phase one involves a preparatory or readiness period, with a focus on capacity building and stakeholder engagement, while creating a national strategy to address country specific drivers of deforestation. National policies and measures for the implementation of REDD will be built and undertaken in phase two, while the third phase is for the full implementation of REDD activities with performance based payments. Although many REDD+ related issues remained unresolved, from weak provisions for indigenous peoples to the distinction between natural forests and plantation forests and uncertainty regarding financing mechanisms, COP 15 did give REDD+ a boost, with a decision adopted on methodological guidance, which includes REDD+ activities. Specifically, Parties were requested to identify drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, REDD+ actions to be taken, to use the most recent IPCC guidance and guidelines for carbon accounting, to establish national forest monitoring systems, and to engage indigenous people and local communities in monitoring and reporting (FAO 2010a). The phased approach as proposed by the Meridian Institute report is also reflected within the REDD+ text of the Copenhagen Accord (and subsequent Cancun Agreement of the following year), and has been widely appreciated, with many countries and supporting institutions already taking up this approach in ongoing REDD+ preparation processes (Verchot and Petkova 2010).

COP 16 in Cancun in 2010 saw the unveiling of the Green Climate Fund (a financial mechanism of the Convention to support projects and other activities in developing countries including REDD+, to be agreed upon at COP 17 in Durban) and, after five years of discussion,<sup>7</sup> a delineation of principles and safeguards to counteract potential negative social and environmental impacts of REDD+ actions (see Box 2). The scope of REDD+ was finally agreed upon, namely reducing emissions from deforestation; reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of carbon

---

<sup>7</sup> Although the discussion for REDD specific safeguards was undertaken for about 5 years prior to this decision, at the time when the UNFCCC agreed on the modalities of A/R CDM projects at COP 9 in Milan (2003), the EU was already fighting for the introduction of a set of social and environmental safeguards to be independently verified by designated operational entities, in the style of a binding international standard and ignoring country-specific social and environmental circumstances of natural resource management (Merger, Dutschke and Verchot, 2011).

stocks, sustainable management of forests; and enhancement of forest carbon stocks. Countries were requested to develop national REDD+ strategies and action plans, national/sub-national forest emissions reference levels, a national forest monitoring system for REDD+ activities, and a system for reporting on how safeguards are being managed and observed. Carbon accounting rules were still unclear, with debate raised on what is good forest management and how can it be incentivized (FAO 2010b).

**Box 2: Guidance and safeguards for policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to REDD+ in developing countries**

The COP 16 decision encouraged developing country Parties to contribute to mitigation actions in the forest sector by undertaking REDD+ activities, and also encouraged Parties to respect the following guidance or principles:

- Be country-driven and be considered options available to Parties
- Be consistent with the objective of environmental integrity, and take into account the multiple functions of forests and other ecosystems
- Be undertaken in accordance with national development priorities, objectives, circumstances, and capabilities and should respect sovereignty
- Be consistent with Parties' national sustainable development needs and goals
- Be implemented in the context of sustainable development and reducing poverty, while responding to climate change
- Be consistent with the adaptation needs of the country
- Be supported by adequate and predictable financial and technology support, including support for capacity-building
- Be results-based
- Promote sustainable management of forests

When undertaking these activities, the following safeguards should be promoted and supported:

- Actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements
- Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty
- 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 United Nations General Assembly has adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
- The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities, in the actions referred to in paragraphs 70 and 72 of this decision
- Actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that the 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, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits
- Actions to address the risks of reversals
- Actions to reduce displacement of emissions

Source: UNFCCC 2011.

The Cancun Agreement at COP 16 confirmed the scope of REDD+, outlining five mitigation activities as well as principles and safeguards to be respected while undertaking these activities. The

modalities and processes for the REDD+ mechanism will continue to be negotiated under the UNFCCC, and a concrete structure remains elusive. A balancing of interests will be required to develop a mechanism that provides vigorous, valid emissions reductions, while supporting safeguards and promoting multiple benefits and sustainable development (Murphy 2011). Negotiations will address at least two outstanding issues regarding safeguards in the lead-up to the COP 17 to be held in Durban, South Africa in December 2011. The first is a system (the modalities and guidance) for reporting on how safeguards are addressed and respected, while respecting sovereignty, during REDD+ implementation. The second issue is how this system will plug into the measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) systems and modalities. The focus at the latest Bonn UNFCCC discussions in June 2011 was on these topics, as well as how to deal with other unresolved issues such as reference emission levels and the financing of REDD+. Parties identified (but did not agree to) a list of principles for the system(s), including transparency, reliability, adaptability to national circumstances, regularity, predictability, consistency, and comparability (FAO 2011). The draft conclusions adopted by the parties consist of a list of points to be considered as general guidance for submissions.

### **3. Social and governance aspects of REDD readiness and implementation**

Phase one of the three step REDD+ implementation approach, REDD readiness, is about preparing recipient countries for a post-2012 REDD+ payment mechanism funded by multilaterals (the linking of REDD to compliance markets by Phase three depends on whether the UNFCCC process can reach a legally-binding post-2012 climate agreement with binding emissions reductions of Annex 1 countries) and potentially private carbon markets (IUCN 2011a). Initially, readiness focused on preparing an effective and equitable strategy to reduce emissions developed through local stakeholder consultations, institutional, technical, human capacity building, designing MRV and forest carbon accounting systems, and generating baselines and reference scenarios against which to measure deforestation reductions (Varghese 2009). However, broader governance and social issues quickly came to the forefront as vital for successful REDD+ preparation (e.g. Brown and Bird 2008; RRI and RFN 2008).

Although REDD has much potential to deliver benefits both for forest dependent communities and ecosystems, many uncertainties in implementation remain. REDD processes specifically pose significant risks to the poor, such as elite capture of benefits, potential loss of access to land and lack of voice in decision-making (Peskest et al. 2008). This is because of the likely scale of the systems envisaged, the complexities of monitoring and tracking carbon in the landscape, and the strong environmental, private sector and developed country interests to establish REDD mechanisms quickly (ibid.).

The relatively broad safeguards and principles outlined in the Cancun Agreement leave much to be desired with regard to project level REDD readiness and implementation (Lang 2010; Moss and Nussbaum 2011). There is neither a universal mechanism for monitoring safeguard compliance nor certainty on the consequence of noncompliance; rather, governments are requested to develop their own systems to show how safeguards are being ‘...addressed and respected... while respecting sovereignty’ (UNFCCC 2011). According to the text, safeguards should be ‘promoted and supported’ (ibid.). To meet the safeguard, and therefore qualify for REDD funding, a government must say that it is supporting respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples; a meeting organized for this purpose with a handful of indigenous representatives may be sufficient (Lang 2009).

There is also discord with regard to the recognition and protection of indigenous peoples' rights in the latest UNFCCC REDD+ related text (i.e., the AWG/LCA outcome in the Cancun agreements) (Lang 2010). Of primary concern is the lack of inclusion of the principle of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) in the text (e.g. Angelsen 2009:146). The right of FPIC is an important emerging norm of customary international law (Parkinson and Wardell 2010). It is recognised in a number of international instruments and decisions including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), which was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2007. It is also recognised in the OAS Draft American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People and in ILO Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples. Developing country Parties are only requested to ensure the 'full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, inter alia indigenous peoples and local communities' (UNFCCC 2011). Although the UNDRIP is included as a safeguard in the formal text that 'should be promoted and supported,' it is not obligatory for governments to comply with UNDRIPs. Thus while the agreed upon REDD text refers to indigenous peoples rights, it does not ensure protection of those rights (Lang 2010).

During phase one, activities 'should continue to be supported by voluntary contributions that are immediately available, such as those administered through the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), the UN-REDD Programme, and other bilateral arrangements' (Angelsen et al. 2009). Most of those involved in supporting national REDD+ programs aim at the integration of social and environmental considerations into the development and implementation of national programs. Although different in approach, additional safeguards similar to those set out for REDD+ in the Cancun Agreements, including definitions, scope and methodologies for measuring and/or monitoring safeguards, are thus being devised by the various institutions to avoid negative social and environmental impacts and to seek the effective participation of the poor or marginalized (e.g indigenous peoples, forest communities, women). Equitable benefit-sharing, clear and secure land and tenure rights, and the promotion of good governance feature in these safeguards (IUCN 2011a).

The two foremost multilateral REDD programmes, the FCPF and the UN-REDD Programme, are both completing social and environmental safeguards guidance for the planning (REDD Readiness phase) and implementation of national REDD+ programs. Further, a voluntary international standard for REDD+ facilitated by CARE International and the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) has been developed through a broad multi-stakeholder process. These standards could influence how REDD+ safeguards are eventually defined and measured. The importance of safeguards is also being reflected in several recent bilateral agreements (e.g. the Government of Norway's International Forests and Climate Initiative has made their funding to Guyana and Indonesia conditional upon implementation of certain governance requirements aimed at limiting deforestation) (Moss and Nussbaum 2011).

It remains unclear, however, what standards REDD projects will be measured against, given the growing variety of donors and supporting institutions. The World Bank, for example, requires indigenous peoples to be consulted on funded projects that may affect them. Human-rights campaigners would like to see this provision strengthened so that consent is required (Nature 2011). Mandating REDD+ safeguard standards, indicators or methodologies alone will not prevent negative impacts or generate various co-benefits. The challenge then is to identify safeguards that are low cost in both implementation and monitoring as well as agreed upon at multiple levels.

## 4. Primary multilateral REDD+ processes and associated frameworks

The World Bank FCPF and the UN Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD Programme) were launched in 2008, and provide financial support and technical guidance to developing countries seeking to prepare for post-2012 REDD+ opportunities. To gain access to readiness financing, participating countries must submit a proposal outlining a roadmap of activities needed to achieve readiness. Countries applying for FCPF funds must prepare a Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) using a standard template developed by the World Bank with input from stakeholders engaged in the FCPF process. Countries applying to the UN-REDD Programme must submit a National Programme Document (NPD), which has a more flexible structure.

In this section, a brief introduction to the two programmes' history and current level of activity will be given. This is followed by a description of the two programmes' strategies for safeguarding of social and environmental values and engagement of stakeholders. These strategies take the form of principles, criteria and process guidelines and are being increasingly streamlined across the two programmes. They will, however, be described separately with similarities pointed out along the way.

### 4.1 Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

The FCPF, operational since June 2008, is a global partnership focused on assisting tropical and subtropical forest countries to develop policies, legislation, and organizational capacity necessary for REDD+ implementation, and subsequently providing them with performance-based payments for emission reductions. The FCPF framework and processes also aim at preparing countries for other future systems of financial incentives for REDD+ achievements. Using this framework, each participating country develops an understanding of what it means to become ready for REDD+ by developing reference scenarios, adopting a REDD+ strategy, designing monitoring systems and setting up REDD+ national management arrangements, in ways that are supposed to be inclusive of key stakeholders.

The FCPF governance structure includes a 28-member participants committee elected by the REDD country participants, the financial contributors, six observers nominated by forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers, NGOs and international organizations, and the World Bank. The FCPF consists of two separate mechanisms, each with its own trust fund: the Readiness Mechanism and the Carbon Fund. The World Bank acts as trustee for the mechanism funds and delivery partner for the FCPF, providing technical support to the REDD country participants, and conducting due diligence on matters like fiduciary policies and environmental and social safeguards.

The FCPF collaborates with thirty-seven REDD countries in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Asia and the Pacific. Thirteen of these countries have so far submitted R-PPs.<sup>8</sup> The focus to date has been on REDD+ readiness, though it is expected that the Carbon Fund, which will provide payments for verified emission reductions from REDD+ programs in countries that have achieved, or made considerable progress towards, REDD+ readiness, will become operational in the course of 2011 as a public-private partnership.

---

<sup>8</sup> These countries are: Argentina, Costa Rica, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Kenya, Lao PDR, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, the Republic of Congo and Tanzania (as of August 2011).



### 4.1.1 FCPF steps for REDD+ readiness



The FCPF works with two readiness phases: the formulation phase and the readiness preparation phase. The formulation phase starts with the formulation of the Readiness Proposal Idea Note (R-PIN), through which the REDD country expresses its interest in the FCPF. The country does not receive financial or technical support to prepare the R-PIN. If the country is selected for the FCPF, it may then establish a national-level working group that is tasked with preparing a R-PP. The national-level working group should be established on the basis of a comprehensive stakeholder identification process to provide for broad representation (FCPF & UNREDD 2010:7). The R-PP should provide the roadmap for the readiness phase that includes:

- An outline of how REDD+ preparation work will be organized and managed in the country, including procedures for information sharing, consultations with and participation by concerned stakeholder groups
- A description of what capacity building and financial resources are needed and who would fund and undertake them (e.g., domestic agencies, NGOs, foundations, private sector, international donors, etc.)
- An explanation of how the country allocates budget, sets a plan and schedules the identified activities, including funding arrangement such as the support foreseen from the FCPF or UN-REDD

In addition, the R-PP should address the following four elements that were set out as requirements for country Parties in the COP 16 LCA decision par. 71:

- An overview the national situation in terms of drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and proposals for an overall REDD+ strategy for addressing these
- A national forest reference emission level and/or forest reference level, an estimate of historic forest cover change and greenhouse gas emissions and uptake from deforestation and/or forest degradation, potentially including forward-looking projections of emissions
- A robust and transparent national forest monitoring system to measure, report and verify (MRV) the effect of the REDD-plus strategy on GHG emissions and other multiple benefits, and to monitor the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, as well as other variables relevant to the implementation of REDD+
- A system for providing information on how social and environmental safeguards are being addressed, assessment of key social and environmental risks and potential impacts of REDD+ strategy options, and an implementation framework

The R-PP is the final outcome of the REDD+ formulation phase. Then, the country moves to the readiness preparation phase. In this phase, the country receives more substantial funding from the FCPF to implement the activities set out in the R-PP. The intended outcome of this phase is a Readiness Package (R-Package) if a country decides to pursue financing of REDD+ emissions reduction activities on the ground. The specific contents of an R-Package have not yet been defined, but are likely to contain the following elements:

- Results of studies, consultations and actions implemented to date
- Actions still being planned to achieve the state of REDD+ readiness
- Preliminary identification of potential emissions reduction activities
- A summary of Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) activities and outcomes

- A draft Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) (described below) that will provide the framework for managing environmental and social risks and mitigating potential adverse impacts.

#### **4.1.2 FCPF-specific social safeguard efforts and stakeholder inclusion**

During the process of preparing the R-Package, countries must prepare SESAs to address the social and environmental challenges associated with the implementation of REDD+ measures. SESAs combine analytical and participatory approaches in two steps by: (i) identifying and prioritizing key environmental and social issues; and assessing policy, institutional, and capacity gaps to manage these priorities and recommendations; and (ii) preparing an ESMF that will be used to avoid and manage environmental and social risks and to mitigate potential adverse impacts, by applying the relevant World Bank Safeguard policies (see Box 3). Whereas the ESMF will become a stand-alone document, the other components of the SESA will be integrated into the preparation of the R-Package. The SESA approach is integrated into the R-PP template *Working Draft Version 5 (revised): December 22, 2010*,<sup>9</sup> which is expected to be finalized in 2011 after a final round of feedback from stakeholders.

---

<sup>9</sup> Working Draft Version 5 (revised): December 22, 2010 is available on the FCPF homepage under Templates and Guidance: <http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/>.

### Box 3: World Bank safeguard policies and REDD+

The World Bank has a set of ten safeguard policies and an Access to Information policy. These policies provide guidelines for the Bank and borrowing countries in the identification, preparation, and implementation of most Bank-financed programs and projects. The World Bank's safeguard policies are designed to avoid, mitigate, or minimize adverse environmental and social impacts of projects supported by the Bank. In principle, all of the safeguard policies have the potential to apply to readiness preparation.<sup>10</sup> According to Moss and Nussbaum (2011), in the context of REDD+, the World Bank safeguard policies most likely to be triggered are as follows:

1. Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01): The policy aims to ensure the environmental and social soundness and sustainability of investment projects, and support integration of environmental and social aspects of projects into the decision making process.
2. Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10): This policy aims to ensure that the development process fully respects the dignity, human rights, economies, and cultures of Indigenous Peoples. The policy calls for the recipient country to engage in a process of free, prior, and informed consultation, and the Bank provides financing only where free, prior, and informed consultation results in broad community support for the project by the affected Indigenous Peoples. Where under national law or practice the FPIC standard has been adopted, the said standard will also be applied. The Policy includes measures to:
  - a. avoid potentially adverse effects on the indigenous peoples' communities; or
  - b. when avoidance is not feasible, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for such effects.Operations are also designed to ensure that indigenous peoples receive social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate, and gender and inter-generationally inclusive.
3. Involuntary Resettlement (OP 4.12): This policy aims to avoid or minimize involuntary resettlement and, where this is not feasible, to assist displaced persons in improving, or at least restoring, their livelihoods and standards of living in real terms relative to pre-displacement levels, or to levels prevailing prior to the beginning of project implementation, whichever is higher.

The R-PP template defines stakeholders as 'those individuals and groups that live in and/or have a social, cultural or economic interest in forests and adjacent lands, and those that may be affected either negatively or positively by proposed or enacted REDD+ activities.' (FCPF & UNREDD 2010:15). It is further stressed in the R-PP template that forest-dependent indigenous peoples and communities should be given special attention (FCPF and UN-REDD 2010).

Stipulations for stakeholder engagement are laid out in a draft document titled *Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness With a Focus on the Participation of Indigenous Peoples and Other Forest-Dependent Communities*<sup>11</sup> hereafter called the 'Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement' (FCPF and UN-REDD 2011). These guidelines set out principles for participation and consultations as well as practical guidance on how to implement them. As the title indicates, the guidelines have an explicit focus on indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities, and recognize that as these stakeholders are often not engaged in public decision-

<sup>10</sup> The World Bank's safeguard policies are accessible at <http://go.worldbank.org/WTA1ODE7T0>

<sup>11</sup> The text in the Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness With a Focus on the Participation of Indigenous Peoples and Other Forest-Dependent Communities (Draft version May, 2011) is repeated in the *Annexes to the R-PP template* (FCPF & UNREDD 2010a). The final Guidelines is expected to be presented to the UN-REDD Policy Board and annexed to the Joint FCPF/UN-REDD Harmonized Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities by October 2011 (Kantcheva 2011).

making processes, a clear commitment is needed to ensure their inclusion and voice in the process (FCPF and UN-REDD 2011:2). The Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement is a joint publication of the FCPF and UN-REDD. Most of the principles and process guidance set out in it is shared between the two organizations (see Box 4), with a few notable exceptions mentioned further below.

#### **Box 4: Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement guiding principles**

The Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement emphasize the following common guiding principles regarding effective stakeholder engagement (in relation to both national and local level processes) (FCPF and UN-REDD 2011:3-4):

- Transparency and timely access to information
- Representation of all relevant stakeholders, including indigenous and forest-dependent people through their own existing processes (e.g., councils of elders, headmen and tribal leaders), including through representatives chosen by themselves through their own processes
- Consultations should start prior to the design phase, and be applied at every stage of the REDD+ process and allow sufficient time to understand and incorporate concerns and recommendations of local communities
- Consultations should facilitate dialogue and exchange of information, and consensus building reflecting broad community support should emerge from consultation. In the case of indigenous peoples, such consensus should include support from the community as expressed by their legitimate chosen leaders<sup>12</sup>
- Impartial, accessible and fair mechanisms for grievance, conflict resolution and redress must be established and accessible
- Special emphasis should be given to the issues of land tenure, resource use rights and property rights
- There should be records of consultations and a report on the outcome of the consultations that is publicly disclosed in a culturally appropriate form, including in local languages

The World Bank Operational Policy 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples is given special mention in the Guidelines (FCPF and UN-REDD 2011). The OP 4.10 uses the term ‘free, prior, and informed consultation’ as opposed to ‘free, prior, and informed consent’. With respect to this difference in wording (albeit without referring to the World Bank or FCPF) the following statement is made in the report on the tenth session (16-27 May 2011) of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UN PFII 2011:8): ‘the Forum affirms that the right of indigenous peoples to such consent can never be replaced by or undermined through the notion of “consultation”.’ In the Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement, this difference is downplayed; ‘The Policy (OP 4.10) provides safeguards that are consistent with the Cancun decision and enable the Bank to operate in a manner that can be considered to be equivalent to Free, Prior and Informed Consent.’ (FCPF and UN-REDD 2011:3).

### **4.1.3 Strengths and limitations of the FCPF on social safeguarding and stakeholder inclusion**

Recent national level studies on the application of SESAs in the preparation of the REDD+ R-Packages indicate the potential to contribute to strengthening governance and effectiveness of REDD+ (Slunge et al. 2011). Some groups, however, view the SESA as an attempt by the World

<sup>12</sup> “In the case of the UN-REDD Programme, consultations leading to giving or withholding consent should be carried out in accordance with the UN-REDD Programme’s FPIC and Recourse Guidelines.” (FCPF & UN-REDD 2011:4).

Bank to supersede their own existing system of safeguards and associated mechanisms for redress with a weaker model for assessment and mitigation, by arguing that REDD readiness is not a World Bank-funded project but rather financial assistance from a multi-lateral fund for capacity-building (BICUSA 2010). Yet despite differing opinions, most civil society groups agree that as long as the SESA does not inhibit the proper application of the World Bank's safeguard policies to readiness activities, it could be used to help countries effectively manage social and environmental issues (ibid.). Recent reviews also indicate that the current national readiness safeguards from the World Bank may focus much more on risk mitigation and underemphasize increasing opportunities for multiple benefits (Moss and Nussbaum 2011).

With regard to the Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement, most of the aspects generally mentioned in the stakeholder engagement literature seem to be covered, or at least as it has been represented, in a recent review commissioned by FCPF and UN-REDD (Daviet 2011:8). One missing aspect, however, is independent assessments of the stakeholder engagement process performance that can be used to evaluate and adjust approaches (Daviet 2011). In relation to engagement and consultation with rural communities, the principles and guidelines generally advise that traditional decision-making structures, existing networks, and local level institutions are the focal points wherever possible, and that existing processes of decision-making are respected. This 'localism' entails a risk of legitimizing existing local elites and non-democratic decision-making procedures (Ribot 2004).

Finally, recent reviews of the FCPF have highlighted that the Bank's requirement for consultation as opposed to consent, remains an affront to indigenous and other local people and their supporters (BAASTEL and NORDECA 2011; Dooley et al. 2011). A recent report by FERN and the Forest Peoples Programme, *Smoke and Mirrors: A critical assessment of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility* (Dooley et al. 2011), concludes that the safeguards put in place by the World Bank's FCPF remain inadequate. The report examines eight R-PPs submitted to the FCPF and finds that FCPF safeguards are not clear and even do not conform to the World Bank's own safeguards (Dooley et al. 2011). Further, the assessments indicate that in all countries reviewed, 'there is a worrying trend towards REDD-related legal reforms that would enable increased state control over forest resources' and that the lack of respect for FPIC 'may marginalise forest peoples even further' (ibid: 17).

## **4.2 UN-REDD Programme**

The UN-REDD Programme is a United Nations Collaborative initiative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The Programme was launched in September 2008 to assist developing countries prepare and implement national REDD+ strategies. The Programme currently supports REDD+ readiness activities in 35 partner countries across Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin America, of which 13 are receiving support as of August 2011<sup>13</sup> (to-date, the UN-REDD Programme's policy board has approved a total of US\$55.4 million). National programmes in seven of the 13 countries are now in their implementation phase (UN-REDD 2011).

The UN-REDD Programme supports the development of analyses and guidelines on technical aspects of REDD+, such as MRV of carbon emissions and flows, as well as more social aspects, like ensuring that forests continue to provide multiple benefits for livelihoods and the environment, and supporting the engagement of indigenous peoples and civil society at all stages of the design and implementation of REDD+ strategies (UN-REDD 2011). The two principle modalities of the UN-REDD Programme are to: (1) direct support to the design and implementation of national

---

<sup>13</sup> These 13 countries are: Bolivia, Cambodia, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Ecuador, Indonesia, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, the Philippines, Solomon Islands, Tanzania, Viet Nam and Zambia.

programmes; and (2) have complementary global and regional-level activities. A key function of the global and regional-level activities is to develop and test methodologies and approaches, as well as capture and disseminate lessons learned from the national-level processes.

In the UN-REDD programme strategy 2011-15, six major work areas for the programme are outlined along with outcomes, indicators, and means of verification for achievement of the outcomes (see UN-REDD 2011:7-8). The six work areas have been identified on the basis of demands expressed in the NPDs of the pilot countries, and also build on the UNFCCC negotiations. The six work areas and associated outcomes are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: UN-REDD Programme Work Areas, Outcomes and Indicators**

Work area	Outcomes	Indicators
MRV and monitoring	REDD+ countries have systems and capacities to develop and implement MRV and monitoring	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of MRV related focal personnel with increased capacities</li> <li>2. Number of countries with functional MRV systems for REDD in place</li> </ol>
National REDD+ governance	Transparency, inclusiveness and effectiveness in national REDD+ governance increased	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of countries with nationally owned governance indicators, developed through a country-led democratic governance assessment</li> <li>2. Number of countries where governance assessments supported by UN-REDD are incorporated into the National REDD+ Strategy</li> <li>3. Number of national REDD+ strategies that include anti-corruption measures, such as a code of conduct, conflict of interest prohibitions, (...), etc.</li> </ol>
Stakeholder engagement	Indigenous peoples, civil society and other stakeholders participate effectively in national and international REDD+ decision making, strategy development and implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of indigenous peoples/ civil society stakeholders represented in REDD+ decision making, strategy development and implementation of REDD+ at the national and international level</li> <li>2. Number of consultation processes underway for national readiness and REDD+ activities</li> <li>3. Number of countries with systems established to provide effective recourse to stakeholders who are impacted by readiness and REDD+ activities</li> <li>4. Number of countries that seek FPIC of indigenous peoples before implementation of readiness or REDD+ activities that impact their territories, resources, livelihoods or cultural identity</li> <li>5. Number of countries implementing an approach to REDD+ stakeholder engagement that is harmonized across UN-REDD, FCPF and FIP</li> </ol>
Multiple benefits	Multiple benefits of forests are realized and ensured in REDD+ strategies and actions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of countries adopting safeguard standards for ecosystem services and livelihood benefits</li> <li>2. Number of countries adopting multiple benefit decision tool kits</li> <li>3. Number of REDD+ related plans that clearly indicate optimization of multiple benefits as a goal</li> </ol>
Transparent, equitable, and accountable management	National fund management and equitable benefit sharing systems are operational for REDD+ performance based payments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of REDD+ countries with benefit sharing systems designed</li> <li>2. Application of UN-REDD social standards and social safeguard provisions under the UNFCCC draft text</li> <li>3. Improvements in pro-poor, gender inclusive standards</li> </ol>
Sector transformation	Strengthened national and sub-national capacities to develop sustainable REDD+ investment strategies and portfolios	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of national or sub-national development strategies that incorporate REDD+ based investments as a means for transformation of relevant sectors</li> <li>2. Number of investment agreements that are based on realization of forest multiple benefit investment options</li> </ol>

Source: UN-REDD 2011:7-8.

Table 1 illustrates that social and environmental safeguards and considerations for stakeholder engagement and the rights of vulnerable groups play a major role in the UN-REDD Programme, and that there is commitment to evaluate how well the Programme delivers on its stated outcomes. It also illustrates, however, that the chosen indicators focus on policies and measures, whereas actual implementation and outcomes on-the-ground (that are, admittedly, also harder to verify) do not feature very prominently. Further, the aggregate scale at which the indicators operate may render them less meaningful. Indicator #4 under Stakeholder Engagement, for example, states ‘Number of countries that seek FPIC of Indigenous Peoples before implementation of readiness or REDD+ activities that impact their territories, resources, livelihoods or cultural identity.’ It is unclear whether this is fulfilled if FPIC is sought in some, but not all, implementation processes. The Means of Verification (not presented in Table 1 for lack of space, but can be found in UN-REDD (2011:7-8)) focuses on reports, strategies, plans, minutes from meetings and, thus, further underlines the critique that the actual implementation and on-the-ground developments may be missed. There are, however, a few exceptions, such as the means of verification called ‘Survey to gauge stakeholder perceptions’ under Stakeholder Engagement.

#### **4.2.1 UN-REDD steps for REDD+ readiness**

UN-REDD support to readiness activities is conditional upon the development of a national programme document (NPD) by recipient countries. This document should set out the preparatory activities to build the institutional capacity, and policy and legislative frameworks needed to engage in REDD+, including the development of pilot activities on the ground. The NPD must be developed through consultation and engagement with indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities and civil society organisations at all stages, and adhere to the principles and process guidance set out in the Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement (FCPF and UN-REDD 2011).

Before a NPD can be implemented, it must first receive the endorsement of the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat and subsequent approval by the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board. This requires, among other criteria, that countries carry out a national-level validation meeting to achieve stakeholder endorsement of the NPD. The validation meeting must be documented in an annex to the NDP.

The UN-REDD Programme is collaborating closely with the FCPF on a wide range of initiatives including: the guidelines on stakeholder engagement, a common readiness template (R-PP) and review process, joint country missions, back-to-back board meetings, development of safeguards, and joint secretariat support. Since 2010, the UN-REDD Programme has also accepted submissions using the R-PP template (Davis 2010).

#### **4.2.2 UN-REDD-specific social safeguard efforts and stakeholder inclusion**

Guidelines regarding the process of stakeholder engagement in the readiness phase are laid out in the annexes to the joint FCPF and UN-REDD R-PP template (FCPF and UNREDD 2010a) and the Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement (FCPF and UN-REDD 2011) (both described above under FCPF). As mentioned, the principles guiding stakeholder engagement are similar for the two initiatives (the major difference being the distinction of ‘consultation’ rather than ‘consent’ in FPIC mentioned above), and the practical steps for stakeholder engagement outlined in the guidelines are identical.

The section on FPIC builds on the report of the International Workshop on Methodologies regarding free, prior and informed consent and indigenous peoples convened by the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UN PFII) (UN PFII 2005). These have been adapted to the

context of REDD+ through three regional-level workshops and circulations for comments and inputs throughout 2011 and were presented and discussed at the 10th Session of the UN PFII, held 16-27 May 2011 in New York (UN-REDD 2011a; Kantcheva 2011). The UN PFII definitions pertaining to FPIC are directly reproduced in the Guidelines for Stakeholder Engagement (FCPF and UN-REDD 2011) and in appendix X.1 to this report. The guidelines state that, in the context of the UN-REDD Programme, countries that have adopted the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP)<sup>14</sup> will be expected to adhere to the principle of free, prior and informed consent (FCPF and UN-REDD 2011).

In addition to the Guidelines for Stakeholder Engagement, the UN-REDD Programme is developing Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria (P&C) with the aim of promoting social and environmental benefits and reducing risks from REDD+. The P&C will provide the UN-REDD Programme with a framework to ensure that its activities are aligned with UN system requirements, including application of the UNDRIP, Free, Prior and Informed Consent, and UN Development Group Guidelines on Indigenous Peoples, and that they take account of the safeguards agreed upon at the UNFCCC meeting in Cancun in December 2010. Parties agreed to promote and support a specific list of safeguards, and to provide information on how the safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of REDD+ activities. The P&C are intended to support countries in their operationalization of these safeguards, and may also be used in the evaluation of national programmes and strategies by reviewers and other national stakeholders.

The UN-REDD Programme will work with individual countries to test and refine the P&C and tool. The first version of P&C was presented at the UN-REDD Policy Board meeting in March 2011 (UN-REDD 2011b). Based on the inputs received, a second set of draft P&C has been prepared as a basis for testing and further refining (UN-REDD 2011c). An interim report will be submitted to the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board in October 2011, and the P&C is expected to be finalized by the end of 2011.

### **Box 5: UN-REDD draft social and environmental principles and criteria**

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

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

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

---

<sup>14</sup> The UNDRIP was adopted by the General Assembly of the UN on September 13, 2007 in broad consensus by 143 countries (US, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia being the only countries to vote against, whereas 11 countries abstained and 35 were absent).



- 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

Principle 5 – Protect natural forest from degradation or conversion to other land uses, including plantation 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 fuel wood extraction, infrastructure development) a REDD+ priority
- Criterion 15 – Minimise degradation of natural forest by REDD+ activities and make reducing degradation due to other causes (e.g. agriculture, timber and fuel wood extraction, infrastructure development) a REDD+ priority

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
- 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

- 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)
- Criterion 19 – Minimise harmful effects on biodiversity and other ecosystem services of forest and nonforest 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

Source: UN-REDD (2011c).

As can be seen from Box 5, the seven principles give almost equal weight to social (principles 1-4) and environmental (principles 4-7) issues. Principles 1 and 2 (only criteria 4 and 5) are about process, whereas the remaining principles and criteria focus on substantive issues. Criteria 1-5 focus on the governance of REDD+ processes and provide important standards focusing on transparency in handling of funds, accountability, participation, empowerment of women, and the principle of FPIC. Criteria 6-12 focus more on social development and equity stressing respect for local knowledge and culture, equitable benefit sharing, respect for wellbeing, protection of vulnerable groups, and that REDD+ policies should be aligned with other policies, such as poverty reduction strategy papers. There is not a strong focus on ensuring that REDD+ policies contribute to social development and wellbeing over and above outweighing of costs. The remaining criteria focus on preserving biodiversity, avoiding leakage, and protecting natural forests.

The UN-REDD Programme is also preparing Participatory Governance Assessments (PGA) as a policy tool for countries preparing for REDD+ (UN-REDD 2011d). PGA will identify governance challenges and risks and build an evidence base for responses to address them. PGAs can also act as an accountability tool to mobilize public opinion and create demand for accountability in REDD+ processes, in addition to reinforcing government leadership in responding to this demand by facilitating the presentation of progress in governance outcomes (UN-REDD and Chatham House 2011).

These assessments aim to produce disaggregated and non-ranking governance indicators as an alternative to top down approaches to governance assessment. Emphasis is put mainly on the process of indicator development, rather than the indicators themselves, based on what stakeholders value, and on the process of establishing an information management system that reinforces domestic accountability over time (UN-REDD 2011d). Stakeholders include government officials,

civil society, indigenous peoples, local forest community representatives, journalists and academics. The strategy document for the development of the PGA explicitly recognizes the potentially large differences in capacity to engage in the process among these diverse stakeholders and, subsequently, the need to support capacity development of the 'weaker' parties.

To pilot and conduct the PGAs, the UN-REDD Programme is building on UNDP Oslo Governance Centre's approach to conducting democratic governance assessments through their Global Programme on Democratic Governance Assessments. For governments to be able to provide credible information on the national REDD+ process, and especially on how safeguards are addressed and upheld, mutual trust in the process of information preparation and a capacity to both demand and provide this information are vital (UN-REDD and Chatham House 2011). PGAs for REDD+ emphasize the inclusion of various stakeholders from the start to ensure broad-based agreement on governance indicator frameworks developed to monitor how governance issues are being addressed and how REDD+ safeguards are respected. PGAs are intended to contribute to a REDD+ national system to provide information on REDD+ progress (based on agreed country specific indicators). Pilot processes have begun in Indonesia and Nigeria and are expected in Ecuador and Vietnam in 2011. Experiences from these pilots is expected to inform a primer for PGAs for REDD+, a guidance note on the approach, as well as a manual on data collection (UN-REDD 2011d).

#### **4.2.3 Strengths and limitations of UN-REDD social safeguards and stakeholder inclusion**

In relation to stakeholder engagement, the principles and guidance of UN-REDD are almost the same as the FCPF, mentioned above, with the major exception being the UN-REDD programme's clear commitment to FPIC in the sense of consent, not consultation.

With regard to the P&C, the development from the first (UN-REDD 2011b) to the second (UN-REDD 2011c) version of the UN-REDD P&C has implied the introduction of a criterion stating that FPIC should be sought of indigenous peoples and forest dependent communities and a strengthening of the livelihoods aspects with a new criterion on respect for and enhancement of wellbeing, i.e. overall a strengthening of emphasis on livelihoods and the rights of local communities. This seems to respond in part to a critique raised by Global Witness (2011:5) focusing, among other things, on the lack of recognition of the rights of communities in the P&C version 1, as compared to the Cancun Agreement text that the P&C purport to operationalize. A recent review, however, argues that the current national readiness safeguards from the UN-REDD Programme focus on risk mitigation, whereas the prospects of increasing opportunities for multiple benefits is not emphasized (Moss and Nussbaum 2011). That aside, the UN-REDD P&C provide some broad principles on both social and environmental values to be safeguarded in REDD+ processes. The criteria are, however, too generic and cannot be directly assessed.

The PGA is still in development and, hence, it is difficult to assess its potential. The principle of broad-based participatory monitoring of process and outcomes of REDD, however, seems an important component in assuring transparency and, potentially, accountability in the process of domestic REDD policy making and implementation.

### **5. Before REDD+: Instruments to assess REDD+ relevant aspects**

Good governance is a broad and comprehensive term encompassing aspects such as transparency of decision-making, accountability of actors and decision-makers, and stakeholder participation. Many

point to good governance as an essential pre-condition for effective REDD+ implementation (i.e. Brito et al. 2009; IIED 2011a; UN-REDD and Chatham House 2011; World Bank 2009). Governance assessment tools are useful to REDD+ initiatives as a starting point for determining weak points or for deciding what to monitor for REDD+ specific purposes. They are also the most prevalent frameworks available that are useful at the inception of REDD+ processes, and can be complimentary to other UN-REDD and FCPF project development tools (e.g. the FCPF SESA). Three recent instruments that have been brought forward in relation to the REDD+ process are presented below. They all build upon prior efforts to better understand forest governance by, for example, Chatham House, ITTO, and IIED.<sup>15</sup> Also important to understand before REDD+ projects take shape, is the state of resource tenure, or the systems of rights, rules, institutions, and processes regulating resource access and use, which is of primary importance to the distribution of risks, costs, and benefits (Cotula and Mayers 2009). Further, tenure relies on and is conditioned by governance (ibid.). A REDD+ specific report exploring this topic is also included.

## **5.1 Framework for assessing and monitoring forest governance (PROFOR and FAO, 2011)**

Values promoted:	Good governance based on accountability, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, participation and transparency
Stated objectives:	To facilitate description, diagnosis, monitoring, assessment and reporting on the state of governance in a country's forest sector; to provide a frame of reference for organizing governance-relevant information that can be used within and across countries to assess and monitor the governance of forests and forest resources; to assist countries in reflecting on and responding to critical issues in forest governance in ways that can be measured, tracked and improved over time
Scale:	National (and sub-national/project level, if adapted)
Target users:	Government; Investors; Donors; Researchers; NGOs

The *Framework for assessing and monitoring forest governance* builds upon core principles and criteria of good governance,<sup>16</sup> and draws on major forest governance-related processes and initiatives, including the World Bank's Framework for Forest Governance Reform and the World Resources Institute's Governance of Forests Initiative (both described below).

The Framework is not an assessment or monitoring tool in and of itself, but rather an overarching and comprehensive structure intended to facilitate analyses of forest governance and to provide a structure for the use of more context-specific standards and indicators.

<sup>15</sup> See for example: [Illegal Logging and Related Trade: The Global Response and Indicators of Change](#) (Fripp 2006); [Revised ITTO criteria and indicators for the sustainable management of tropical forests including reporting format](#) (ITTO 2005); [The pyramid: A diagnostic and planning tool for good forest governance](#) (Mayers, Bass and Macqueen 2002).

<sup>16</sup> These same principles are also found in the UN-REDD/Chatham House Framework for Monitoring REDD+ Governance, described below; see Box X [Fix all box numbers]

### **Box 6: Pillars and principles of good governance**

The *Framework for assessing and monitoring forest governance* consists of widely accepted pillars and principles of good forest governance, namely:

*Pillars:* (1) Policy, legal, institutional and regulatory frameworks; (2) planning and decision-making processes; and (3) implementation, enforcement and compliance

*Principles:* Accountability, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, participation and transparency

Source: PROFOR and FAO, 2011.

The basic elements of the Framework are its three pillars, 13 components, and a multitude of subcomponents. The subcomponents provide users with a starting menu or entry point for the selection of indicators to measure and assess different aspects of forest governance. The Framework does not, however, specify indicators. Rather, users such as FCPF and UN-REDD may utilize the subcomponents as a structure for contextualizing existing indicators, or to develop new indicators. Desirable generic characteristics of indicators and how to formulate and score them are provided in annexes to the report.

**Strengths and limitations:** The Framework is intentionally generic, which provides for wide applicability, but also implies little substantive guidance in relation to practical use. For example, under Pillar 1, component 1.5, the subcomponent reads ‘Existence and adequacy of safeguards against social and environmental harm from forest-related policies and activities.’ The definition of what constitutes social and environmental harm, is left undefined, and implies a dependency on context-specific tools and standards, i.e. to evaluate what safeguards are adequate.

Further, it is explicitly stated in the document that this framework builds upon ‘other major forest governance-related processes and initiatives.’ It is, however, rather difficult to discern much difference (i.e. progress) in relation to previous documents apart from a revising and scaling down of the previous governance parameters (specifically, those found in the World Bank’s 2009 Analytical Framework for Forest Governance Reform with its ‘building blocks’ of just ‘forest governance’, to the new ‘pillars and principles’ of ‘good forest governance’). In 2009, upon presenting its analytical framework, the World Bank stated an intention to move away from such a broad, comprehensive and conceptual framework towards the development of a more ‘simple and actionable governance diagnostic tool.’<sup>17</sup> The current framework, however, does not appear to achieve much in this regard, but is rather a diminution and refurbishment of a previous product.

### **5.2 Governance of Forests Toolkit (version 1): A draft framework of indicators for assessing governance of the forest sector (Brito et al., 2009)**

Values promoted:	Good governance based on transparency, participation, accountability, coordination and capacity; importance of process over outcomes
Stated objectives:	To bring widely accepted principles of good governance to bear on the challenges of sustaining forests in developing countries; to define, assess and measure forest governance
Scale:	National; Sub-national; Case study level (of specific policies, regulatory

<sup>17</sup> See: <http://www.profor.info/profor/knowledge/defining-forest-governance-indicators>

	processes, or projects)
Target users:	Civil society

In 2009, the Governance of Forests Initiative (GFI), a collaboration between World Resources Institute (WRI), the Instituto do Homem e Meio Ambiente da Amazonia (IMAZON), and the Instituto Centro de Vida (ICV), produced a Toolkit (draft - Version 1) consisting of a conceptual framework for defining good forest governance and a wide-ranging set of indicators for measuring and assessing forest governance. The GFI Toolkit provides a common definition and conceptual framework for understanding the meaning of good governance of forests across different country contexts, as well as a set of measurable, reportable and verifiable indicators of good forest governance. The indicators assist civil society organizations to independently, systematically, and comprehensively diagnose the integrity of institutions and processes that govern forests in their countries, as a basis to advocate for reform (Brito et al. 2009).

The GFI Framework consists of universally accepted key principles: transparency, participation, accountability, coordination and capacity (similar to those listed in the Framework for assessing and monitoring forest governance, see PROFOR and FAO 2011), and components: actors, rules, and practice, that can be used to define good governance of forests. A matrix provides an organizational structure for 94 governance indicators that assess the quality of aspects of governance relating to four major issues in the forest sector, namely forest tenure, management, revenues and incentives, and land use planning (see Box 7).

**Box 7: GFI Framework Indicators: Asking ‘how’ rather than ‘what’**

The 94 GFI indicators aim to provide an objective but qualitative assessment of the processes and arrangements that determine how (not what) forest management decisions are made, based on the presumption that better decision-making processes are a necessary (and sufficient) condition for improvements in outcomes. For example, indicators addressing management of forest finances considers the transparency of processes for prioritizing spending, rather than the particular programs funded. The relevance of examining processes is linked to actual concrete changes in outcomes in the forest sector. Each indicator is framed as a diagnostic question that is further broken down into elements of quality that describe the various attributes that would describe good governance.

For example, Forest Management Indicator 2, under the ‘Actors’ component: *Independence of forest management agencies*, is framed as: ‘To what extent do staffing policies of forest management agencies effectively promote independence and prevent corruption?’ Elements of Quality for Indicator 2 are:

- *Clear and transparent hiring process* • *Conflict of interest rules* • *Transparency of salaries*
- *Code of behavior for staff* • *Transparent procedures for tender*

Indicators and elements are linked to the principles of good governance. The example above is associated with the principles of ‘transparency’ and ‘accountability’.

Source: Brito et al. 2009.

Strengths and limitations: This toolkit provides useful, accessible formats along a case study design with detailed elements to verify criteria of good forest governance. The level of detail specified in the toolkit may prove challenging in its implementation, in particular, in relation to quick start type initiatives. This document, however, complements the PROFOR and FAO (2011) document in that

it provides examples of particular (albeit generic) and operationally defined (empirically measurable) indicators of good governance.

### **5.3 Roots for good forest outcomes: an analytical framework for governance reforms (World Bank 2009)**

Values promoted:	Good governance based on transparency, accountability, and public participation, stability of forest institutions and conflict management, quality of forest administration, coherence of forest legislation and rule of law, and economic efficiency, equity, and incentives.
Stated objectives:	To provide a framework for analyzing forest governance and improving countries' capacity to understand critical governance issues; to identify reform opportunities and track in-country developments in forest governance over Time
Scale:	National
Target users:	Government

After an extensive literature review of existing relevant indicators, this 2009 World Bank document presents a comprehensive model of forest governance. Five building blocks of forest governance were consolidated from the existing literature with an aim to capture all dimensions of forest governance: (1) transparency, accountability, and public participation; (2) stability of forest institutions and conflict management; (3) quality of forest administration; (4) coherence of forest legislation and rule of law; and (5) economic efficiency, equity, and incentives. Each building block includes specific principal components and subcomponents (also called indicative subcomponents, see Box 8) that can form the basis for development of indicators. These indicators can then be adapted to country-specific circumstances and rated by experts, thus enabling benchmarking and identification of strengths and weaknesses.

#### **Box 8: Subcomponents in the analytical framework for governance reforms**

Provided in detail in Annex 2 to the report, the list of indicative subcomponents is 'large and generic', and is stated to be a 'work in progress'. For each, evaluative questions are to be formulated to assist in the development of country specific 'actionable' indicators. An example of a component and subcomponent under Building Block 1 is:

Component: *Accountability of forest officials*

Indicative subcomponents:

- *Feedback to stakeholders about forest resources and their management*
- *Presence of autonomous organization for monitoring activities*
- *Influence and interest of civil society organizations on forest issues*

Source: World Bank 2009.

**Strengths and limitations:** The exhaustive review of other publications provided in this document is useful in and of itself. Further, the analytical framework provided here provides more detail than that of PROFOR and FAO (2011) reviewed above. Still, users are left with a significant degree of dependency on more operational tools to conduct diagnostic assessments. Further, the tool remains an analytical framework, in the sense that it is a tool to diagnose forest governance weaknesses and

pinpoint appropriate reforms. It does not, however, provide any guidance on how to reform forest governance.

#### **5.4 Tenure in REDD: Start-point or afterthought? (Cotula and Mayers 2009)**

Values promoted:	Secure resource tenure; pro poor/ marginalized groups
Stated objectives:	To identify a typology of tenure regimes (in rainforest countries) and some of the challenges they present for REDD; the nature of tenure and usage rights regimes within key rainforest countries; and the issues revealed by exploration of these regimes that will need to be engaged with if REDD and related strategies are to have sustainable impact.
Scale:	National
Target users:	Government; Others

This report emphasizes that the consideration of tenure must be the starting point, not an after thought, for REDD+ projects. In a review of seven rainforest countries - countries likely to be major REDD players, including Brazil, Democratic Republic of Congo, Indonesia and Papua New Guinea- this report discusses among other topics, the role of governance, the nature of land and carbon rights, the trend of declining (but not entirely) centralized state power and unmet promises to local bodies, and the gap between policy and practice. Great diversity amongst countries is revealed, and it is concluded that improvement in tenure issues alone will not suffice to successfully generate social benefits of REDD+. General recommendations are provided, as are a list of key indicators applicable to the included countries (see Box 9).

#### **Box 9: Key indicators of security of local resource rights for REDD and related mechanisms and general recommendations for REDD+ project development**

Based upon the contexts of the seven rainforest countries, a list of key indicators are responded to both in terms of what is on paper, based on policy and law, and in practice, entailing the subjective opinions of the authors coming from experience, literature, and discussions with knowledgeable individuals. The results are intended to be indicative, and to provide a start-point for discussion.

Key indicators of security of local resource rights for REDD:

- Are private (individual or collective) land and/or tree ownership allowed?
- Are local (incl. customary) use rights in place and recognised?
- Are indigenous peoples' rights protected?
- Are carbon rights defined and addressed?
- Is there a local voice in land use change decisions?
- Are there benefit sharing and revenue-allocation arrangements?
- Is there support for local resource rights – through institutional responsibilities and capabilities?

This report also includes general recommendations during the development of REDD schemes, namely:

- Shape REDD schemes to contribute to improved forest governance, not vice versa.
- Strengthen local resource rights, including customary rights.
- Ensure carbon rights are effectively established in national regulations.
- Build on practical mechanisms for cross-sectoral engagement.
- Develop effective arrangements to channel benefits to the local level.

- Connect national policy to key international thinking and requirements.
- Support learning groups for REDD and related approaches.

Source: Cotula and Mayers 2009.

**Strengths and limitations:** Not exactly a practical, applicable tool, this report nevertheless delves into the interrelated and complex issues surrounding secure tenure with a pro-marginalised persons perspective, and effectively argues why secure tenure is also an essential precondition for equitable REDD+ outcomes. Gender is left out, but indigenous peoples are mentioned. Far more detailed land tenure indicators have been developed,<sup>18</sup> but this is one of the few that methodologically (if loosely) apply the REDD+ lens.

## 6. REDD+ ongoing: Research and advocacy groups calling for social protections

Many research institutes, academics, and multi and bi-lateral initiatives are calling specifically for increased social protections for present and forthcoming REDD+ initiatives. Some are building REDD+ specific standards, principles, guidelines, frameworks and other tools to aid the integration of social aspects such as free, prior and informed consent or gender issues. Other ongoing efforts present opportunities and ideas to strengthen social aspects of REDD+ processes, such as building an evidence base, or looking to past research to learn how REDD+ can strengthen local democracy. Some are being used (or should be used) as complements to other parallel processes, such as the UN-REDD Programme and the FCPF.

Analysis shows that no one standard provides comprehensive coverage of the criteria set out in the Cancun decision safeguards (Murphy 2011; Merger, Dutschke and Verchot 2011). Indeed, the approaches and focus areas vary, but the common threads are greater control, value, and opportunities for those most impacted by both climate change and REDD+ processes, the rural poor. The efforts may not be directly involved in REDD+ project implementation. In recognition of the existing weak points and potential threats of REDD+, however, they draw upon applicable lessons learned and recent research to increase the chances of effective and equitable REDD+ outcomes. Some of the leading efforts are presented in brief below.

### 6.1 Standards, principles, guidelines, frameworks and other tools to incorporate various social protections

#### 6.1.1 REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES) (CCBA and Care 2010)

Values promoted:	Pro-poor/ marginalized groups; Rights including FPIC; Full and effective participation
Stated objectives:	To support design and implementation of government-led REDD+ programs that respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and generate significant social and environmental benefits
Scale:	National; Sub-national
Target users:	Government; NGOs; Donors; Other stakeholders

<sup>18</sup> See for example, [IFAD's land tenure indicators](#).



The REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES) is an initiative facilitated by the CCBA and CARE International.<sup>19</sup> The REDD+ SES is for government-led REDD+ programmes involving policies and measures at a regional or national level under any fund or market-based approach. These voluntary standards are developed with an aim to support REDD+ design and implementation that respect the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, and have been designed to go beyond laying out minimum safeguards, and to identify and elaborate social and environmental benefits (CCBA and CARE International 2011).

The REDD+ SES standards consist of principles, criteria and indicators that define the issues of concern and the required levels of social and environmental performance (CCBA and CARE International 2010). Principles are the intent level of a standard that clarify the scope and present desired outcomes. These fundamental statements are not designed to be verified. Criteria at the content level, however, set out the conditions that need to be met in order to deliver a principle. Criteria can be directly verified, but commonly they are further broken down into indicators, which are achievable, verifiable parameters to indicate whether a criterion has been met. The principles are presented in Box 10. An example of a criterion and a subsequent indicator is: ‘The REDD+ program requires the free, prior and informed consent of Indigenous Peoples and local communities for any activities affecting their rights to lands, territories and resources’ (Criterion 1.3, under Principle 1), with indicators including: free, prior and informed consent is obtained from indigenous peoples, in accordance with their customs, norms and traditions, for activities that may affect their rights, particularly their rights to own and control traditionally owned lands, territories and resources (Indicator 1.3.4).

CCBA and CARE International (2011) set out guidelines to the interpretation and use of the framework, e.g. that the principles and criteria are generic, whereas the indicators should be adapted to the national context.

#### **Box 10: REDD+ SES Principles**

1. Rights to lands, territories, and resources are recognized and respected by the REDD+ program.
2. The benefits of the REDD+ program are shared equitably among all relevant rights holders and stakeholders.
3. The REDD+ program improves long-term livelihood security and well-being of Indigenous Peoples and local communities with special attention to the most vulnerable people.
4. The REDD+ program contributes to broader sustainable development, respect, and protection of human rights and good governance objectives.
5. The REDD+ program maintains and enhances biodiversity and ecosystem services.
6. All relevant rights holders and stakeholders participate fully and effectively.
7. All rights holders and stakeholders have timely access to appropriate and accurate information to enable informed decision making and good governance of the REDD+ program.
8. The REDD+ program complies with applicable local and national laws and international treaties, conventions, and other instruments.

Source: CCBA and CARE International 2010.

<sup>19</sup> The CCBA also has a design standard for individual forestry and land-use projects including REDD+, the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (CCB Standards), intended to secure positive co-benefits for conservation projects in the voluntary carbon market. See <http://www.climate-standards.org/standards/thestandards.html>

Box 10 shows that the REDD+ SES principles cover both social and environmental (principle 5 on biodiversity) issues, as does the UN-REDD P&C (see section 4.2.2). Where the UN-REDD P&C have an equal number of social and environmental principles, the REDD+ SES principles focus more on the social sphere. The REDD+ SES principles focus on both substantial (principles 1-5 + 8) and process (principles 6-7) issues, as do the UN-REDD P&C. One difference is that the UN-REDD P&C included principles on the management of funds that are not in the REDD+ SES principles. Overall, however, the UN-REDD P&C and REDD+ SES principles are similar; the latter provide more detail.

The REDD+ SES process principles focus on participation and access to information about decision-making. On participation, the detailed criteria and indicators focus on stakeholder identification, participation, grievance redress, and representation. On information access, the criteria and indicators focus on timely and sufficient information for participation in decision-making. The substantial principles focus on promoting a wide range of values: (customary) rights; legality issues; livelihoods, equity and development and; biodiversity and ecosystem values.

The REDD+ SES is mentioned as a useful reference in the R-PP template version 5 December 22, 2010 under Component 4b focusing on the development of a national MRV system for the monitoring of multiple benefits, other social and environmental impacts, and governance (in addition to MRV of GHG emissions and removals performed in Component 4a) (FCPF and UN-REDD 2010:54).

**Strengths and limitations:** There are many positive complementarities between REDD+ SES and the various emerging REDD+ initiatives including both the formal UN process and the initiatives supporting early action, such as the FCPF and UN-REDD, as well as for national efforts. REDD+ SES provide a comprehensive framework to assist countries to design, implement, and assess the social and environmental aspects of their REDD+ program, supporting and complementing the requirements of mandatory safeguards (Moss and Nausbaum 2011; Proforest 2010). Furthermore, FCPF focuses at the strategic level (SESA) and the REDD+ SES – that has been developed to a more detailed and directly applicable level – may provide more specific guidance as to the specific issues to be covered by the SESA, as well as provide detailed criteria and indicators that can be used to design, implement, and monitor REDD+ at the sub-national (e.g. project) level.

### 6.1.2 Developing social and environmental safeguards for REDD+: A guide for a bottom-up approach (Bonfante, Voivodic & Meneses Filho 2010)

Values promoted:	Pro-poor/ marginalized groups; Rights including FPIC; Participation
Stated objectives:	To provide a platform for duplicating the process in other countries where the subject REDD+ may also involve risks and challenges
Scale:	National
Target users:	Civil society

As an alternative to top down approaches, the Institute for Forest and Agricultural Management and Certification (IMAFLOA) prepared a guide to describe their own process for developing REDD+ socio and environmental safeguards in Brazil that is based on broad participation, including environmental organizations; representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities; smallholders; research institutions; and the private sector. Eight principles and 27 criteria were presented by civil society to Brazilian government authorities as a contribution to the establishment of public policies addressing REDD+, climate change, and within a broader scenario, alternative land uses in forest areas. The principles consist of legal compliance, rights recognition and guarantee (which includes complete respect of the UNDRIP), benefits sharing, economic

sustainability and poverty alleviation, environmental conservation, participation, monitoring, transparency, and governance (Bonfante, Voivodic and Meneses Filho 2010).

More interesting than the principles perhaps, is the lessons learned and detailed description of the experience of generating the agreed upon safeguards. The first step involves planning and the recruitment of interested stakeholders, in order to jump-start a multi-stakeholder process. This is followed by a description of main activities involved in carrying out a process for developing REDD+ socio and environmental safeguards, including how to hold meetings and process comments received. Practical on-the-ground tips and personalized experiences in the Brazilian context are peppered throughout. Finally, this guide presents how the REDD+ social and environmental safeguards document is being used in the country.

**Strengths and limitations:** The safeguards presented here may not be universally applicable. Yet it is the process model that is important and that makes a contribution to the body of REDD+ specific knowledge, especially for other countries and civil society who wish to take charge of the generation of country specific safeguards that are accepted by a wide range of local stakeholders – perhaps the most crucial aspect for successful safeguard implementation and monitoring.

### 6.1.3 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent in REDD+: Principles and Approaches for Policy and Project Development (RECOFTC and GIZ 2011)

Values promoted:	Pro-poor/ marginalized groups; Rights particularly to FPIC; Participation
Stated objectives:	To help contribute to agreement on mechanisms that are effective and responsive to the needs of all stakeholders
Scale:	National; Project
Target users:	Independent facilitators; indigenous and local community leaders; local government staff; project staff; private sector investors; NGOs

Given the fast pace of REDD+ readiness and even project design activities, there is a high risk that such a learning by doing approach may result in adverse impacts on the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities (RECOFTC and GIZ 2011). In recognition of this, and the fact that rights alone are not sufficient to protect local people against external pressures exerted in ways that may misinform or mislead, the Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC) and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) recently published *Free, Prior, and Informed Consent in REDD+: Principles and Approaches for Policy and Project Development* (RECOFTC and GIZ 2011).

The three levels of agreement that are crucial for obtaining FPIC in the context of REDD+ are (RECOFTC and GIZ 2011)

- consent to discuss the idea for a REDD+ project that will affect community forests,
- consent to participate in developing a detailed plan for a project, and
- consent to the implementation of the project.

Achieving each level of consent requires increasingly intense negotiations. Specific points in a REDD+ project or program cycle where consent may be required, are discussed, and a useful indicative steps map is presented. The document also provides detailed information on twelve elements of a generic process to respect the right of FPIC (as FPIC is locally and culturally specific, guidelines can not be universally applicable) (see Box 11).

### Box 11: Twelve elements for REDD+ projects to include FPIC

The RECOFTC and GIZ publication provides detailed guidelines, including a sub-section on what ‘*Indigenous peoples and local communities need to know*,’ to achieve each of the following 12 elements to properly equip REDD+ processes to effectively prepare for rights-holder engagement, implement a consent process, and maintain consent.

Preparing for rights holder engagement:

1. Mapping rights, rights holders and land use
2. Identifying appropriate decision-making institutions
3. Identifying national support structures for rights advocacy
4. Developing a process for seeking and obtaining consent
5. Developing the content for consent agreements
6. Agreeing on a communication plan
7. Developing a capacity-building strategy

Implementing a process for respecting the right to FPIC:

8. Integrating the right to FPIC with REDD+ project design
9. Ensuring alternative information and independent advice

Monitoring and recourse: maintaining consent

10. Monitoring what is agreed in implementation
11. Developing a grievance process
12. Verifying consent

Source: RECOFTC and GIZ, 2011.

**Strengths and limitations:** This document has a limited scope as it focuses on process only, i.e. there is no categorization of the varieties of activities to which consent might or must be sought. The limited scope, however, also represents a strength, in that it offers detailed and experience-grounded recommendations on process design.

#### 6.1.4 Gender-differentiated impacts of REDD to be addressed in REDD Social Standards (Gurung and Quesada 2009)

Values promoted:	Pro marginalized people (women); Rights of women to natural resources; Respect for UN Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (UN CEDAW)
Stated objectives:	To identify and assess the gender differentiated impacts of REDD and key gender-related issues that must be addressed in development of REDD social standards
Scale:	National; Project
Target users:	Government; Civil society

Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN) and the Global Gender and Climate Alliance (GGCA) are two organizations at the forefront in identifying and addressing the gender dimension of REDD+. <sup>20</sup> In 2009, WOCAN with GGCA prepared a report to contribute to the REDD+ SES voluntary social standards. The aim of the paper

<sup>20</sup> Others include GenderCC ([www.gendercc.net](http://www.gendercc.net)) and IUCN ([www.genderandenvironment.org](http://www.genderandenvironment.org)).

was to identify and assess the gender differentiated impacts of REDD and key gender-related issues that must be addressed in development of REDD social standards. The report recommends that standards for national and sub-national level REDD programs and policies include a gender-based approach adhering to specific principles (see Box 12).

**Box 12: WOCAN Principles for gender equitableness and effectiveness in REDD processes and agreements**

As outlined in the 2009 report, WOCAN's principles include the following:

- Implementation of REDD must not lead to obstruction of women's access to forests to meet their subsistence needs for fuelwood, fodder and non-timber forest products (do no harm).
- Actions should be taken to ensure women have clear ownership rights to forest carbon and forest-land.
- Promote equal access of women to land ownership and other resources necessary for effective socio-economic participation in forest management and climate mitigation strategies (e.g., land, capital, technical assistance, technology, tools, equipment, markets and time).
- Parties willing to participate in REDD must ensure compliance with international and national commitments on gender equality and equity, including the Convention to Eliminate Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and women's rights to natural resources.
- REDD must contribute to transparent, inclusive, and accountable forest governance and to bringing about changes in forestry institutions to enable them to be accountable and responsive to poor women's needs.
- Responses to global climate changes should have broad goals that aim to reduce climatic change, protect natural resources, improve social well-being, and promote equality.

Source: Gurung and Quesada 2009.

A focus on gender in REDD financing, capacity building, and monitoring and evaluation are also emphasized. For example, 'Compliance with these standards should be required for countries participating in REDD mechanisms', with 'verification by an independent body that includes gender expertise', are asserted. The authors purport that a systematic process to promote gender mainstreaming in the stages of design, implementation, review, monitoring, and evaluation across all relevant aspects of REDD (including property rights, participation in decision making, equitable sharing of benefits, etc.) will best support adherence to these principles.

Finally, they provide a general framework for gender mainstreaming:

1. Generating political commitment, based on both the effectiveness of including a gender perspective, and a rights based approach for women's access to natural resources
2. Developing technical expertise for gender
3. Developing mechanisms for accountability
4. Addressing organizational cultures to ensure against institutional gender blindness

**Strengths and limitations:** The WOCAN principles are purely focused on substantive issues. Gender differentiated impacts have been included within the framework for indicators of the REDD+ SES (e.g. under Principle 3) and therefore the relevance of this document has probably been proven. While the principles and the framework are just a starting point, the authors do advise that follow up actions are needed. For example, both national and specific indicators should be developed with regard to gender equality and women's empowerment/rights and to measure women's access to, and control of forest resources, respectively.

Many more efforts are also focusing on gender and REDD+ (see Box 13).

### **Box 13: Additional gender and climate change resources**

Formed in 2007, the GGCA<sup>21</sup> now includes over 25 UN agencies and international civil society organizations such as the UNDP, IUCN, UNEP, and the Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO). The Alliance is spearheading gender and climate change advocacy and has generated resources such as the *Training Manual on Gender and Climate Change* (IUCN, UNDP and GGCA 2009) which aims to build up trainers to help increase the capacity of policy and decision makers so that efforts to mitigate and adapt to climate change are gender-sensitive. Individual members are also providing resources, like the UNDP, which has published the adaptation focused *Gender, climate change and community-based adaptation: A guidebook for designing and implementing gender-sensitive community-based adaptation programmes and projects* (UNDP 2010), and a *Resource Guide on Gender and Climate Change* (UNDP 2009) which presents principal, conceptual, and methodological advances on gender relations in the context of climate change. Among other activities, IUCN has created a number of factsheets on gender and climate change.<sup>22</sup>

Beyond the GGCA, other gender focused REDD+ initiatives are also underway, such as information sharing from the GenderCC<sup>23</sup> platform, a global network of gender activists and experts working for gender and climate justice. A recent report for USAID aimed to identify good practices, lessons learned, and key entry points for increasing women's participation in, and benefits from, REDD+ activities (see Gurung et al. 2011).

Women focused climate change actions are also being driven at the project level, such as gender sensitive REDD+ projects led by CARE International,<sup>24</sup> as well as by grassroots initiatives. Possibly the best known example of women's empowerment linked to addressing climate change and REDD is the work of the Green Belt Movement in Kenya, founded by Nobel Peace Laureate Wangari Maathai.<sup>25</sup>

## **6.2 Others calling for social protection in REDD+**

In addition to the various tools being developed, other ongoing efforts present opportunities and policy and implementation ideas to strengthen social aspects of REDD+ processes, such as promoting pro-poor agendas and reinforcing local democracy, while drawing from lessons learned in other forestry and development arenas like community forestry (e.g. Agrawal and Angelsen 2009). For example, researchers from the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) have produced a massive body of research publications on REDD, focusing on all aspects, from the technical to the social, including *Moving Ahead with REDD: issues, options and implications* (Angelsen 2008) and *Realising REDD+: National strategy and policy options* (Angelsen et al. 2009). *Moving Ahead with REDD* brings together a range of experts to present a broad overview of REDD issues, provide the options, and assess the implications according to three aspects: effectiveness, efficiency, and equity - henceforth labelled as the '3E' criteria. *Realising REDD+*, an early output of CIFOR's current Global Comparative Study on REDD, examines what REDD+ at the national level might look like and presents a menu of options, and discusses their worth in terms

<sup>21</sup> See <http://www.gender-climate.org/>

<sup>22</sup> E.g. see <http://www.gender-climate.org/pdfs/FactsheetClimateChange.pdf> and <http://www.gender-climate.org/pdfs/FactsheetAdaptation.pdf>

<sup>23</sup> See [www.gendercc.net](http://www.gendercc.net)

<sup>24</sup> See <http://www.careclimatechange.org/carbon-finance/redd>

<sup>25</sup> See [greenbeltmovement.org/w.php?id=98](http://greenbeltmovement.org/w.php?id=98)

of their 3E outcomes, plus the generation of co-benefits (e.g. biodiversity and other environmental services, poverty reduction and sustainable livelihoods, governance and rights, and climate change adaptation) – labelled the 3E+ criteria.

CIFOR has not produced generic standards or indicators for social aspects to be considered by the REDD process. CIFOR is, however, building an evidence base on REDD+ through a Global Comparative Study (GCS-REDD). The study focuses on REDD+ project sites in at least six countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia over the four year period 2009-2012, and is examining REDD+ at both national and project levels. At the national level, the study aims to analyse how national processes that formulate REDD policies reflect different interests at all levels. At the project level, the study will look at effects of the REDD intervention on meeting the 3E+ criteria for REDD+:

- Effectiveness: Can the mechanism bring significant emission reductions?
- Efficiency: Are these reductions achieved at the minimum cost?
- Equity: Are benefits and costs distributed fairly among and within countries?
- +: Are co-benefits achieved?

The indicators of achievement of co-benefits used by the GCS-REDD study are grouped under and across the following: well-being (e.g. village development and perceptions of wellbeing), effectiveness (e.g. perceptions on costs versus achieved emissions reductions), governance (e.g. tenure arrangements and security of tenure), and conservation (e.g. perceptions of improvements in soil). The study seeks to link these to the outcome of the REDD project intervention. It will also have less of a focus on procedural and process aspects of the governance of the REDD projects under study (Sunderlin et al. 2010:36,151-152).

Knowledge generated will assist first-generation REDD+ practitioners to improve their performance in attaining 3E+ outcomes, provide guidance to design second generation (post-2012), and will serve as one reference point for evaluating the success of national REDD+ policies and practices (Sunderlin et al. 2010). The main product of the project level assessment to date was a 'Guide to Learning about the livelihood impacts of REDD+ Projects' (Jagger et al. 2010), presented further below (See: During and after REDD+: tools to assess compliance and outcomes).

CIFOR is not alone in calling for an equity focus for REDD+ projects. IUCN is currently working on the promotion of pro-poor REDD options as core principles during the preparation of REDD national strategies in five tropical countries. Particular emphasis is given to the equitable participation and consultation of indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups such as women in national REDD planning. Pilots that are part of the project in each country focus on the participatory assessment of: forest governance; multi-stakeholder processes and participation; tree and carbon rights and tenure; drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; impacts on rural people's livelihoods in forest areas; equitable distribution and systems for benefit sharing; and safeguards for social and environmental impacts (IUCN 2011b).

IUCN is now in the process of defining and testing the pro-poor principles and creating an overarching pro-poor strategy, and has recently put forth the elements of a pro-poor REDD+ approach, namely (Adeleke 2011):

1. Understanding the nature and scope of livelihoods of people and dependency on forests
2. Participation of vulnerable groups
3. Improved clarity of rights, benefits and responsibilities of vulnerable groups
4. Equitable sharing of benefits and responsibilities
5. Investments in resilience of vulnerable livelihoods
6. Environmental safeguards
7. Linking local and national processes to address needs of the poor

8. Customary norms and values
9. Transparency

The ongoing Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy (LLS), which provides tools for participatory monitoring and learning, has also recently provided guidance on how to adapt their Forests-Poverty Toolkit specifically for REDD+ purposes (IUCN 2011c). The Forests-Poverty Toolkit is a rural assessment tool that uses locally identified poverty indicators and participatory exercises to collect data and differentiate forest dependence, and can help to determine how REDD+ can contribute to reductions in poverty and increases in livelihood resilience (ibid.)

The International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) has produced a substantial amount of pro poor, governance and tenure focused REDD+ related materials such as policy briefs.<sup>26</sup> Their Forest Governance Learning Group (FGLG), an alliance with nine countries, emphasizes the importance of governance for REDD+ success, as exemplified in their recent publication, 'Just forest governance – for REDD, for sanity,' with examples from the Group's alliance countries (IIED 2011a). The FGLG has also generated much country specific REDD+ relevant materials.

The Forest, Climate, and Livelihood research network (FOCALI), a Swedish research network, released a 2009 report with an analysis of four key documents in relation to REDD and poverty. The analysis also identified seven key issues: (1) tenure rights and REDD, (2) climate-beneficial forest-based livelihoods, (3) participation in forest policy, (4) experiences from REDD demonstration activities and PES, (5) impacts of deforestation on the poor, (6) demography and deforestation, and (7) protected areas and the poor.

Following a literature review, the FOCALI report identified that the main gap in knowledge was how to 'roll out the REDD agenda' on a large scale, particularly in resource poor landscapes and in the face of predatory high level interests. At the time of their report, REDD demonstration activities were deemed as yet too small to yield valuable lessons learned.

However, the report provides the following tentative policy recommendations (Biddulph et al. 2009):

- Support the recommendations of the REDD Options Assessments Report (Angelsen, et al. 2009) of supporting participation of indigenous peoples and local communities and strengthening their role in national implementation, to safeguard the interests of the poor in global negotiations.
- Encourage and/or directly fund large-scale (national or regional level), rapid REDD pilots in resource-cursed contexts, and ensure poverty monitoring is prioritised within these.
- Support and encourage coordination of global research efforts in relation to REDD including the incorporation of high quality poverty monitoring.

The next phase of FOCALI's work involves case studies of REDD preparations and links to poverty, in order to evaluate local and national level experiences.

The Norwegian Government has commissioned and funded a significant share of the foremost climate change research and recent project initiatives, many of which include a focus on social aspects. For example, an influential 2009 Norwegian Government report proposed principles to enhance the effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities (Angelsen et al. 2009), specifically the

- definition of rights to lands, territories, and resources, including ecosystem services;

---

<sup>26</sup> See for example [Carbon righteousness: How to lever pro-poor benefits from REDD+](#) (IIED, 2011).



- representation in REDD decision making, both internationally and nationally, including access to dispute resolution mechanisms; and
- integration of REDD into long-term development processes.

International nongovernmental organizations are also taking an active role in responding the identified gap in social protections for REDD+ implementation. The Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) supports forest people's rights. Land tenure and acknowledging community rights to forest resources are promoted as a means to enhance the equity and efficiency of REDD+ processes (Griffiths 2008). The influential Forest Peoples Programme report, *Seeing REDD: Forests, Climate Change Mitigation and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (Griffiths 2008), provided a rights-based account which charts shortcomings in REDD processes thus far, and made a case for FPIC as the foundation of REDD engagements with the poor. Among other activities, the FPP has also broadly criticized REDD+ supporting bodies such as the FCPF for its lack of recognition of the right of forest people to consent to participation in REDD+ (see Dooley et al. 2008, 2011).

The Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI) also works to ensure that poverty-focused rights and tenure issues are prominent in global discussions on forest-based responses to climate change, to shape ways forward for policy, and structures for adaptation and mitigation. The RRI with partners have organized a series of dialogues to foster critical reflection and learning on forest governance, the rights of forest communities and indigenous peoples, and forest tenure in the context of global action to combat climate change, including REDD. RRI has also put out some REDD+ specific literature. For example, RRI with Rainforest Foundation Norway (RFN) (2008) created a framework for ensuring effective climate change mitigation and adaptation in forest areas while ensuring human rights and development. The framework was captured in a policy brief, which aimed to provide government and inter-governmental organization negotiators with a tool to demonstrate that their actions do not undermine national social and economic development. The framework purports that effective investment in climate change mitigation and adaptation in forest areas requires four mutually reinforcing and self-correcting policy foundations (RRI and RFN 2008):

1. Strengthen rights and governance — establish an equitable legal and regulatory framework for land and resources
2. Prioritize incentives for communities — establish accountable funding mechanisms to ensure that incentives go to the right people
3. Monitor more than carbon — establish monitoring systems that monitor more than carbon and which are transparent and easily accessible to the public
4. Establish national and international mechanisms to ensure independent advice and auditing

Methods to pursue the four policy foundations are suggested, for example, that transparency in actions to equitably share benefits and comply with FPIC standards is important for policy foundation number 3.

Others are focusing on the long-term opportunities of REDD+ for improving local democracy and forest management. Brown, Seymour and Peskett (2008) note that there is a case for using REDD-related financial resources to support local government reform processes and social capital development, not only to help channel financial flows to the actual forest managers, but also to improve broader forest governance. They refer to previous research by Larson and Ribot (2006) when describing how, via local government reform, REDD may have the potential to improve timber revenue capture and management, and to help local communities manage the local component of those revenues and deploy them for community benefit (ibid).

The level at which rules are made and benefits distributed will be crucial to the overall success of REDD+ (Larson and Ribot 2009). Ribot (2011) notes that despite the many demands for

participation and rights recognition, calls for local democratic decision-making on core matters remain deficient. To actually benefit forest dependent poor, he suggests that REDD must be held to account by standards for (1) democratic representation of local populations in all REDD decisions (meaning the discretionary power to make significant and meaningful choices), and (2) access to benefits (meaning local control over access to markets and forest resources) (ibid). Ribot (2011) then suggests that CIFOR's 3Es+ criteria be expanded to include a 4th and 5th 'E', namely enfranchisement and emancipation.

Finally, new research from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies and CIFOR offers a list of principles to guide REDD+ subnational implementation based upon a review of best practices generated by integrated conservation and development projects (ICDPs). The authors assert that the inherently localized nature of REDD+ in practice stands to benefit from the lessons learned of past ICDPs. The relevance of each of the 15 best practices to REDD was determined; the first four will almost certainly be achieved during the transition from ICDPs to REDD, whereas the following eleven will require greater diligence if they are to be achieved by REDD projects (Blom Sunderland and Murdiyarso 2011). The best practices/principles are (ibid.):

1. Have measurable and clearly defined goals
2. Project duration should reflect the time commitment needed to achieve goals
3. Markets must be available for participants' products and services
4. Mechanism should be in place for monitoring and evaluation
5. National policies should support project activities
6. Locally-based conservation should be applied where threats and solutions are local
7. Recognize and acknowledge tradeoffs between conservation and development
8. Develop an understanding of community heterogeneity and complexity
9. Develop an understanding of community livelihood needs
10. Design projects to be adaptive and flexible
11. Involve the community in all phases of the project
12. Collaborate with other projects
13. Engage in activities that you know, collaborate with for activities that you do not
14. Enforcement is always needed
15. Provide clear and sustainable community benefits

## **7. During and after REDD+: tools to assess compliance and outcomes**

As REDD+ projects will be performance based, mechanisms for monitoring, reporting and verifying emission reductions are a pre-requisite (Wertz-Kanounnikoff et al. 2008). Social and other non-carbon co-benefits, however, are more challenging to measure.

The policies, mechanisms, and institutions to ensure that social safeguards are effectively addressed are only in the beginning stages of development. Work is needed to determine the purpose of the information system, the type of system that will be established, its modalities, and how the safeguards system will link to the REDD+ MRV system (Murphy 2011).

Although this is currently being examined by SBSTA, other preliminary efforts are underway, for example, by the UN-REDD and Chatham House (2011). Research is also progressing with regard to determining the social and livelihood impacts from initial REDD+ activities, for example, by CIFOR (Jagger et al. 2011). These kinds of tools will be important for the monitoring, reporting, and improving of future REDD+ projects. Three REDD+ specific efforts in this regard are described below.

## 7.1 Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment (SBIA) Manual for REDD+ Projects (Richards and Panfil 2011)

Values promoted:	Moral imperative (to at least avoid negative impacts); upwards and downwards accountability; ensure local and wider political acceptability/ social sustainability; commercial rationale; benefits for local people and environment; increased understanding and participation of local stakeholders
Stated objectives:	To help monitor the ways in which projects affect biodiversity and the livelihoods of people living in and around a project site; To help project proponents implement cost-effective social and biodiversity impact assessments to meet the CCB or other standards
Scale:	Project
Target users:	Project designers and implementers

Operating from a belief that sub-national activities will continue to have an important role in REDD+, the CCBA, Forest Trends, Fauna & Flora International (FFI) and the Rainforest Alliance have produced a revised manual on how to conduct a cost-effective and credible social and biodiversity impact assessment. This revised version (2) includes new guidance on assessing the biodiversity impacts of REDD+ projects. Departing from the question, are land-based carbon projects good for local people, biodiversity, and ecosystem services? The manual is designed in a way that particularly helps projects meet the requirements of the Climate, Community & Biodiversity (CCB) Standards (which requires that projects generate net-positive impacts for local communities and for biodiversity), but should be useful also for other multiple-benefit standards. The methodologies and approaches set out in the manual are applicable to not only land-based carbon projects, but to a range of payments for ecosystem services (PES) situations.

The manual is divided into three Parts: Part 1) Core Guidance for Project Proponents, Part 2) Social Impact Assessment (SIA) Toolbox for REDD+ Projects (Social Toolbox for short) and Part 3) Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) Toolbox for REDD+ Projects (Biodiversity Toolbox for short). Part 1 provides an overview of challenges and issues for SBIA and then sets out a suggested process or framework for impact assessment. Parts 2 and 3, the Toolboxes describe specific methods or tools and provide examples that can help project proponents select the most appropriate measurement methods (Richards and Panfil 2011). For example, the Social Toolbox introduces a range of SIA methods, however users must then refer to the original methods material source.

### **Box 14: Seven proposed stages for conducting cost-effective SBIA**

- SBIA 1: Original Conditions Study and Stakeholder Identification
- SBIA 2: “Without-Project” Social and Biodiversity Projections
- SBIA 3: Project Design and Theory of Change
- SBIA 4: Negative Impact, Risks and Mitigation Measures
- SBIA 5: Identification of Indicators
- SBIA 6: Developing the Monitoring Plan
- SBIA 7: Data Collection, Analysis and Reporting

Source: Richards and Panfil 2011

**Strengths and limitations:** Self-proclaimed as user friendly, this manual is indeed ‘written in a style that... is easy to understand by individuals who are not specialized in impact assessment or

monitoring and evaluation.’ At first glance it may seem to provide an almost overwhelming array of detail, however it is surely one of the most practical, useful tools to date of this nature. Version 1 of this document, which also aimed to provide guidance on how to implement the CCB Standards and provide evidence of net positive social impacts attributable to the project at validation, was very focused on up-front assessments (through Theory of Change approaches) of the potential impacts of carbon projects on local people. A remaining deficit in this version 2 is that it does not yet tackle how to assess national-level policy implementation, which will be a crucial aspect of the future REDD+ process.

## 7.2 Guidance for the provision of information on REDD+ governance (UN-REDD and Chatham House 2011)

Values promoted:	Good governance based on accountability, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, participation and transparency
Stated objectives:	To provide guidance on main elements to consider when establishing a national information system for the provision of information on dimensions of governance that are important for successful REDD+ implementation, including REDD+ safeguards
Scale:	National
Target users:	Government

A new (draft) document by UN-REDD and Chatham House offers a framework for the provision of information on key governance issues for implementing REDD+, including REDD+ safeguards. It aims to provide guidance on main elements to consider when establishing a national information system. The guidance considers what information to provide, how to generate this information, and who should be involved. It is intended for use by national governments, which are primarily responsible for ensuring that REDD+ activities are effectively implemented, and safeguards respected, as well as for other stakeholders.

In beginning to consider what information to provide, the framework presents the same generally accepted pillars and principles of good forest governance as found in, for example, the framework for assessing and monitoring forest governance (PROFOR and FAO 2011). Nineteen generic but essential elements of each Pillar are then provided (and to show further relevance, are linked up to the safeguards contained in the Cancun Agreements), although these are understood to be not necessarily universal to all countries. An example of an element is (under Pillar one): *Incorporation of international commitments/obligations relevant to REDD+, such as UNFCCC, United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), in national legislation.*

Country-specific indicators are expected to be developed to collect data on each element, though how to do so is not included within this document. The UN-REDD Programme’s Participatory Governance Assessments for REDD+ (PGAs, described previously) is cited as a document useful to developing indicators in a participatory and country-specific manner.

The Cancun REDD+ agreement began a process whereby the UNFCCC SBSTA is tasked with developing guidance for systems to provide information on how safeguards are addressed and respected. This will be discussed further at the next climate conference in Durban in December 2011. Meanwhile, this guidance draws on experiences in the natural resources sector to ‘inform a system for the provision of information on REDD+ governance,’ and presents a long list of lessons learned in brief, such as, for example, *Lessons for indicator-based data collection* and *Lessons for selecting appropriate tools*. To design a national information system for REDD+ governance, this

document then considers how the lessons can be applied by suggesting possible tools and activities. REDD+ relevant guidelines, methodologies, and assessment and monitoring tools are listed in an Annex.

**Strengths and limitations:** This guidance document can assist countries in preparing to establish safeguard monitoring and reporting systems. It is important however, to note that the emphasis of this framework is more on the ‘how’, i.e. process outcomes, rather than substantive outcomes. The suggested ‘What information to provide: elements’ offers very few concrete, measurable criteria. Countries must show what they do, not the results of the implementation of the social safeguards (such as measurably reduced poverty), which is undoubtedly more achievable at the national level. It is another tool that remains purposefully generic and ‘suggestive’, with the justification that ‘methodologies need to be adapted to suit national circumstances’.

### 7.3 Guide to Learning about the livelihood impacts of REDD+ Projects (Jagger et al. 2010)

Values promoted:	Pro-poor
Stated objectives:	To understand the livelihood impacts of first-generation REDD+ projects
Scale:	National; Project
Target users:	Multi/ bilateral agencies; Donors; National and regional government; NGOs; Civil society; Researchers

This guide from CIFOR represents the main product of the ongoing project level assessment of the Global Comparative Study on REDD+ to date. It provides an overview of methods to gather evidence about how REDD+ interventions affect social welfare in forest regions. It also includes a series of technical worksheets and an annotated bibliography of toolkits and methods.

Noting that no one method will be appropriate for evaluating all REDD+ projects given their complexity and diversity, the focus of this guide is rather on how to build a strong research design based upon existing frameworks (Jagger et al. 2010). The authors argue that causal mapping using a mixed-methods approach is best. Rigorous impact evaluation methods quantify impacts, followed by a theory of change for interpretation. Several design options are discussed and the concept of the ‘counterfactual’ is stressed, that is, to assess a project’s causal impacts or additionality; what would have happened without the project must be established (Jagger et al, 2010). This is similar to the business-as-usual baseline in REDD+.

This guide focuses on research design for impact evaluation, primarily because other important steps such as the development and measurement of indicators are thoroughly described in other resources; the guide provides a comprehensive list in Annex B. Methods and examples from CIFOR’s GCSREDD are highlighted as examples of the implementation of one of the ‘most robust research designs’ presented in this guide: Before–After/Control– Intervention (BACI) (Jagger et al. 2010).

**Strengths and limitations:** Although the focus is solely on livelihoods and ex post project impact assessment, this guide does offer a thorough description of these kinds of evaluation methodologies and links them to specific needs of current and future REDD+ project implementers. It also includes useful Annexes with a broad variety of relevant non- and REDD+ specific resources. It has been criticized for over-emphasizing quantitative methodologies that may risk missing out on opportunities for project assessment in, for example, a situation in which a project is assessed in early stages or when no baseline or controls are collected – in which case qualitative methodologies that can better capture intangible issues such as trust, equity, and conflict at the community level are useful (Sepehri 2011).

## 8. Discussion and conclusions

Undoubtedly, the international REDD+ discourse and national processes have progressed toward an increasing focus on social aspects, in particular social safeguards targeting poor and forest dependent communities and measures to secure their inclusion in decision-making processes. Accordingly, REDD+ specific tools to protect and empower the most vulnerable are being generated. Their range is diverse; some are exclusively process focused, whereas others centre on substantive standards, principles, criteria and indicators. Among those mentioned in this document, there are substantial overlaps in the issues addressed, but also large differences with regard to the point of departure, the level of detail, and the intended outcomes.

The reviewed tools on social aspects of REDD+ projects cover the entire policy process from development over implementation to evaluation, and focus on identifying and mitigating risks, promoting various co-benefits, and securing the inclusion of a broad range of stakeholders in the process.

The tools focusing on the policy development phase are the FCPF's SESA, UN-REDD's risk identification and mitigation tool, and CCBA and Care's REDD+ SES, that all draw on the generic forest governance assessment tools reviewed in section 5. These mainly focus on the national level of policy-making, although CCBA and Care's REDD+ SES also has a specific project level focus. Annex 2 presents an attempt at a schematic overview of the values that these three tools seek to safeguard. Importantly, this overview is highly interpretative, and others may come to different conclusions. That said, it indicates that the CCBA and Care's REDD+ SES, with its high level of detail and strong focus on social issues, is the most comprehensive in terms of values covered. Further, CCBA and Care's REDD+ SES has a more explicit focus on issues of access rights – i.e. the ability to obtain benefits from resources - and stakeholder representation. These issues are of importance, not least, to safeguard the interests of poor and forest dependent groups. Further, the overview shows that the FCPF – possibly due to its inherent focus on the national and strategic level – includes fewer of the social and environmental values. What the overview does not show – but what has been mentioned earlier on – is that the UN-REDD – in its social and environmental principles and criteria – is more elaborate on, and gives more weight to environmental concerns than does the CCBA and Care's REDD+ SES. Finally, the overview shows that none of these three larger processes of developing social safeguards give much attention to the process of stakeholder identification and independent and participatory process monitoring. With regard to the latter, however, the UN-REDD constitutes an exception with its process towards developing a Participatory Governance Assessment Tool.

The tools with particular focus on process issues of inclusion and participation in the implementation are the joint FCPF & UN-REDD's Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement, the UN-REDD Participatory Governance Assessment Tool, and parts of the CCBA and Care's REDD+ SES. The Principles and Approaches for Policy and Project Development by RECOFTC and GIZ (2011) is an example of an effort to develop rather elaborate guidance on process, including identification of stakeholders, albeit mainly relevant at the project level.

Finally, project-level assessment of social impacts (e.g. poverty and social impact assessments) is covered in, among other, the Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment (SBIA) Manual for REDD+ Projects and the Guide to Learning about the livelihood impacts of REDD+ Projects. In addition to these, the review has covered a number of smaller and more specific tools are useful at various stages of project design, implementation and review.

Outstanding challenges, however, have been identified for all efforts to address social aspects of REDD+. Considering post-project social impact assessments, Peskett et al. (2008), draws attention to the shortcomings of these methods, from the limited role that lessons learned actually play in final policy decisions to the reluctance of the poor to expose illegal behaviour. Sepehri (2011) describes the current lack of REDD+ specific qualitative methods that can better capture the more intangible issues at the community level.

Other recent reviews of social standards in REDD point to a need to further emphasize opportunities for co-benefits, the general lack of national legal frameworks to enable and ensure compliance, and the importance of incorporating lawful recourse and grievance mechanisms (Moss and Nussbaum 2011). One could argue, with a basis in the current review, that issues regarding co-benefits and recourse and grievance mechanisms are covered in some of the tools and frameworks currently offered and that the issue at hand is more one of assuring alignment between the different efforts based on an agreement on minimum standards across the board. This would also counter the problem identified in previous analyses of the existing social safeguards; that no one standard provides comprehensive coverage of the criteria set out in the Cancun decision safeguards (Murphy, 2011; Merger, Dutschke and Verchot 2011). Alignment of criteria and procedures would not only guarantee a common minimum standard for social and environmental safeguards, it would, in all likelihood, also contribute towards efficiency in REDD+ processes through opportunities for replication of processes.

Mandating the use of standards and specific tools or methods cannot be expected to automatically bring about true pro-poor REDD+ behaviours (Peskett et al. 2008). Ribot (2011) notes that existing standards are insufficient, and that participation and alms alone do not constitute democracy or enfranchisement. He asserts that positive change will demand 'a radical rethinking, indeed dismantling, of forestry regulation and management in addition to establishing and strengthening substantive rights and representation of forest based people.' One could argue that the current body of tools and frameworks tends to operate within the boundaries of the existing policy-level discourse with development and forestry that focuses on the strengthening of people's rights to forests etc. Albeit ever present, this discourse seems generally to have left the privileges of powerful actors untouched as is testified by a large body of literature on how people fare in decentralized, community-based, participatory and integrated conservation and development projects and so on. The current REDD+ debate, however, has at least to this author, brought some promising new developments to the scene, such as the participatory governance assessment tool, that may, by bringing in a broad range of stakeholders at the national policy level, with due emphasis on process and inclusion, create more accountability and attention to the needs and rights of the poor and forest dependent in the development and implementation of REDD+. Time will tell whether this promise will hold true.

## References

1. Adeleke, W. 2011. [Building Pro Poor REDD National Strategies: Poor Experience from Ghana](#). IUCN presentation at the REDD Expectations and Experience, September 14, 2011.
2. Agrawal, A. & Angelsen, A. 2009. [Using community forest management to achieve REDD+ goals](#). Realising REDD+, A. Angelsen, ed. Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor, Indonesia.
3. Angelsen, A. (ed.) 2008. [Moving ahead with REDD: Issues, options and implications](#). CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.
4. Angelsen, A. with Brockhaus, M., Kanninen, M., Sills, E., Sunderlin, W. D. and Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S. (eds) 2009. [Realising REDD+: National strategy and policy options](#). CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.
5. Angelsen, A., S. Brown, C. Loisel, L. Peskett, C. Streck and D. Zarin. 2009. [Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation \(REDD\): An Options Assessment Report](#). Prepared by Meridian Institute for the Government of Norway. Meridian Institute, Dillon, CO, USA.
6. BAASTEL & NORDECO. 2011. [First Program Evaluation for the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility \(FCPF\)](#). Le Groupe-conseil baastel Itée (BAASTEL) and Nordic Agency for Development and Ecology (NORDECO).
7. Evaluation Report BICUSA. 2010. [SESA, Safeguards and the FCPF: A Guide for Civil Society](#). Bank Information Center. Washington D.C.
8. Biddulph, R., Westholm, L., Mattsson, E., Pettersson, J., Strömberg, J. 2009. [Making REDD work for the poor](#). Inception Report. Forest, Climate and Livelihood research network (Focali), Gothenburg, Sweden.
9. Blom, B., Sunderland, T. & Murdiyarso, D. 2011. [Getting REDD to work locally: lessons learned from integrated conservation and development projects](#). *Environmental Science & Policy* 13 (2010) 164–172.
10. Bonfante, T. M., Voivodic, M., & Meneses Filho, L. 2010. [Developing social and environmental safeguards for REDD+: A guide for a bottom-up approach](#). Institute for Forest and Agricultural Management and Certification (Imaflora), Piracicaba, Brazil.
11. Brito, B., Micol, L., Davis, C., Nakhooda, S., Daviet, F., & Thuault, A. 2009. [The governance of forests toolkit \(version 1\): A draft framework of indicators for assessing governance of the forest sector](#). World Resources Institute, Imazon (Brazil) and the Instituto Centro de Vida (Brazil).
12. Brown, D., & Bird, B., 2008. [The REDD road to Copenhagen: Readiness for what?](#) Opinion 118. Overseas Development Institute, London, U.K.
13. Brown, D., Seymour, F., & Peskett, L. 2008. How do we achieve REDD co-benefits and avoid doing harm? In *Moving Ahead with REDD*, A. Angelsen, ed. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.
14. Brunner, R. Ali, F., Calvo Ambel, C., Aquino, P., Bautista, K., Bendandi, B., Karpati, A., Lai, K., Barbour McKellar, J., Roos, M., Rudder, N., Soergel, E., & Valencia, N. 2010. [Back to its Roots: REDD+ via the Copenhagen Accord](#). Electronically published December 8, 2010. *Reconsidering Development*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Winter 2010).
15. Butler, R. 2009. [How to save the Amazon rainforest](#). Mongabay.com
16. CBD. 1992. [Convention on Biological Diversity](#). United Nations, New York, NY.
17. CCBA and CARE International 2010. [REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards. Version 1. June 2010](#). Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) and CARE International.
18. CCBA and CARE International 2011. [Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards at country level. Version 3](#) February 2011. Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) and CARE International.
19. Davis, C. 2010. [Governance in REDD+: Taking stock of governance issues raised in readiness proposals submitted to the FCPF and the UN-REDD Programme](#). Monitoring Governance Safeguards in REDD+ Expert Workshop. 24th – 25th May 2010, Chatham House, London, U.K. Background Paper Two. Accessed on August 31, 2011.
20. Dooley, K., Griffiths, T., Martone, F. & Ozinga, S. 2011. [Smoke and mirrors: A critical assessment of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility](#). FERN and Forest Peoples Programme.
21. Daviet, F. (with inputs from M. Mabel and E. Halverson). 2011. A Draft Framework for Sharing Approaches for Better Multi-Stakeholder Participation Practices. FCPF & UN-REDD. June 1, 2011.
22. EFI. 2007. [Voluntary Partnership Agreements](#). FLEGT Briefing Notes (06). European Forest Institute, Joensuu, Finland.
23. European Community and the Republic of Ghana. 2010. [Voluntary partnership agreement between the European community and the republic of Ghana on forest law enforcement, governance and trade in timber products into the community](#).
24. FAO. 2010a. CLIM FO Newsletter. May 2010. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.
25. FAO. 2010b. CLIM FO Newsletter. December 2010. FAO, Rome, Italy.
26. FAO. 2011. [CLIM FO Newsletter. June 2011](#). FAO, Rome, Italy.
27. Friends of the Earth. 2010. [Convention on Biological Diversity COP-10: How the world must protect biodiversity](#). Media briefing. London, U.K.
28. FCPF & UNREDD. 2010. [Readiness Preparation Proposal \(R-PP\) Template. Working Draft Version 5 \(revised\)](#). December 22, 2010. Accessed online on August 31, 2011.
29. FCPF & UNREDD. 2010a. [Readiness Preparation Proposal \(R-PP\) Template. Draft Version 5. Working Draft ANNEXES](#): December 22, 2010. Accessed online on August 31, 2011.
30. FCPF & UN-REDD. 2011. Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness. With a Focus on the Participation of Indigenous Peoples and Other Forest-Dependent Communities. DRAFT – May 18, 2011. Available online: [http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com\\_docman&task=cat\\_view&gid=1120&Itemid=53](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=1120&Itemid=53). Accessed on September 5, 2011.
31. FCPF. 2011. [Introduction](#). Accessed online on 24 August 2011. Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF).



32. **Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Fund.** 2010. *Incorporating Environmental and Social Considerations into the Process of Getting Ready for REDD plus*. Revised DRAFT – March 7, 2010 New York, 16-27 May 2005.
33. **Fripp, E.** 2006. *Illegal Logging and Related Trade: The Global Response and Indicators of Change*. London: Chatham House, London, U.K.
34. **Griffiths, T.** 2008. *Seeing REDD: Forests, Climate Change Mitigation and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Update for Poznań (UNFCCC COP 14). Forest Peoples Programme, Moreton-in-Marsh, England.
35. **Gurung, J.D. with Quesada, A.** 2009. *Gender -Differentiated Impacts of REDD to be addressed in REDD Social Standards. A report prepared for an initiative to develop voluntary Social and Environmental standards for REDD*. Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN), Bangkok, Thailand.
36. **Gurung, J, Giri, K., Billah Setyowati, A., & Lebow, E.** 2011. *Getting REDD+ right for women: An analysis of the barriers and opportunities for women's participation in the REDD+ sector in Asia*. USAID.
37. **IIED.** 2011a. *Just forest governance - for REDD, for sanity*. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), London, U.K.
38. **ITTO.** 2005. *Revised ITTO criteria and indicators for the sustainable management of tropical forests including reporting format*. ITTO Policy Development Series No. 15.
39. **IUCN** 2011a. *REDD-plus explained*. International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Gland, Switzerland
40. **IUCN.** 2011b. *IUCN's Pro-poor REDD project*. Webpage accessed on 28 August 2011. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland
41. **IUCN.** 2011c. *Understanding forest dependency for REDD+: Adapting the Forests-Poverty Toolkit to new purposes*. Briefing paper. IUCN), Gland, Switzerland
42. **IUCN, UNDP & GGCA.** 2009. *The GGCA Training Manual*. International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and others as part of the Global Gender and Climate Alliance (GGCA).
43. **Kantcheva, N.** 2011. *Designing the Consultation Process to Develop Guidelines for Implementing FPIC and Providing Recourse*. Presentation delivered to the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. Tuesday, 24 May 2011. New York, NY. Accessed online on September 5, 2011.
44. **Lang, C.** 2010. *The Cancun agreement on REDD: Four questions and four answers*. Redd-monitor.org
45. **Larson, A.M. & Ribot, J.C.** 2009. *Lessons from forestry decentralisation*. Realising REDD+, A. Angelsen, ed. Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor, Indonesia.
46. **Lawson, S. & MacFaul, L.** 2010. *Illegal Logging and Related Trade Indicators of the Global Response*. Chatham House, London, U.K.
47. **Mayers, J., Bass, S., and Macqueen, D.** 2002. *The pyramid: A diagnostic and planning tool for good forest governance*. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), London, U.K.
48. **Merckx, V.** 2011. *FLEGT and REDD linkages*. Presentation at the 17th Illegal Logging Stakeholder Update – 28 January 2011. Chatham House, London, U.K.
49. **Merger, E. Dutschke M. & Verchot, L.** 2011. *Options for REDD+ Voluntary Certification to Ensure Net GHG Benefits, Poverty Alleviation, Sustainable Management of Forests and Biodiversity Conservation*. *Forests* 2011, 2, 550-577.
50. **Murdiyarmo, D., Skutsch, M., Guariguata, M., Kanninen M., Luttrell, C., Verweij, P., & Stella, O.** 2008. *Measuring and monitoring forest degradation for REDD. Implications of country circumstances*. Info Brief (16), November 2008. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.
51. **Murphy, D.** 2011. *Safeguards and Multiple Benefits in a REDD+ Mechanism*. International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), Manitoba, Canada.
52. **Moss, N. & Nussbaum, R.** 2011. *A Review of Three REDD+ Safeguard Initiatives*. UN-REDD Programme and the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility.
53. **Nature.** 2011. *Seeing REDD. Plans to conserve the world's tropical forests must respect the rights of indigenous peoples*. *Nature* 472, 390 (28 April 2011).
54. **Parkinson & Wardell,** 2010. *Legal frameworks to support REDD pro-poor outcomes*. Sustainable development law on climate change legal working paper series (09). International Development Law Organization (IDLO), Rome, Italy, and the Centre for International Sustainable development Law (CISDL), Montreal, Canada.
55. **Peskett, L., Huberman, D., Bowen-Jones, E., Edwards, G. & Brown, J.** 2008. *Making REDD work for the Poor*. A Poverty Environment Partnership (PEP) Report. Overseas Development Institute (ODI), London, U.K.
56. **PROFOR & FAO.** 2011. *Framework for assessing and monitoring forest governance*. FAO, Rome.
57. **PROFOREST.** 2010. *REDD+ SE Standards: Briefing on complementarities with other REDD+ social and environmental safeguards mechanisms*. Proforest Ltd.
58. **Ribot, J. C.** 2004. *Waiting for Democracy – The Politics of Choice in Natural Resource Decentralization*. WRI Report. World Resources Institute. Washington D.C. USA. 140 pp.
59. **Ribot, J.C.** 2011. *Seeing REDD for Local Democracy: A Call for Democracy Standards*. *Common Voices*, Vol. 3, January 2011, pp. 14-16.
60. **Richards, M. & Panfil, S.** 2011 *Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment (SBIA) Manual for REDD+ Projects*. Forest Trends, Climate Community Biodiversity Alliance, Fauna and Flora International, and Rainforest Alliance, Washington, DC.
61. **RRI.** 2008. *Seeing people through the trees: scaling up efforts to advance rights and address poverty, conflict and climate change*. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington, DC.
62. **RRI and RFN.** 2008. *Foundations for effectiveness: a framework for ensuring effective climate change mitigation and adaptation in forest areas without undermining human rights and development*. Policy Brief. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington, DC and Rainforest Foundation Norway, Oslo, Norway.
63. **Sepehri, M.** 2011. *(Forthcoming). The Challenges of assessing social dimensions of REDD-plus: Examples from a Cambodian context*. Draft, September 2011. Forthcoming as a chapter in conference proceeding from "Re-framing Sustainability? Climate Change and North-South Dynamics", Helsinki 10-11 February 2011. Available from author: mase@life.ku.dk

64. **Slunge, D., Ekbom, A., Loayza, F., Guthiga, P., & Nyangena, W.** 2011. [Can Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment of REDD+ Improve Forest Governance?](#), Working Papers in Economics nr 493. Department of Economics, University of Gothenburg, Sweden.
65. **Springate-Baginski, O. and Wollenberg, E.** (eds.) 2010 REDD, forest governance and rural livelihoods: the emerging agenda. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.
66. **Sunderlin, W.D., Larson, A.M., Duchelle, A., Sills, E.O., Luttrell, C., Jagger, P., Pattanayak, S. Cronkleton, P. and Ekaputri, A.D.** 2010. Technical guidelines for research on REDD+ project sites. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.
67. **UN.** 2008. [Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the report of the Second Committee. Non-legally binding instrument on all types of forests.](#)
68. **UNDP.** 2009. [Resource Guide on Gender and Climate Change.](#) New York, NY, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
69. **UNDP.** 2010. [Gender, climate change and community-based adaptation: A guidebook for designing and implementing gender-sensitive community-based adaptation programmes and projects.](#) UNDP, NYC, NY.
70. **UNEP.** 2010. [CBD Nairobi Workshop on REDD-plus and Biodiversity \(September 2010\), and relevant UNFCCC and CBD COP decisions, in particular decision 1/CP.16 of UNFCCC and X/33 of CBD.](#) UNEP/CBD/WS/CB/REDD/APAC/1/2, 18 March 2011. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya.
71. **UNFCCC.** 2008. [Report of the Conference of the Parties on its thirteenth session, held in Bali from 3 to 15 December 2007.](#) FCCC/CP/2007/6/Add.1, 14 March 2008. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Bonn, Germany.
72. **UNFCCC.** 2011. [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. UNFCCC, Bonn, Germany.
73. **UN PFII** 2005. [Report of the International Workshop on Methodologies regarding Free, Prior and Informed Consent and Indigenous Peoples.](#) Fourth session. Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, NYC, NY.
74. **UN PFII** 2011. [Report on the tenth session \(16-27 May 2011\).](#) United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. NYC, NY.
75. **UN-REDD.** 2011. [The UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-15.](#) Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries.
76. **UN-REDD.** 2011a. [UN-REDD Newsletter Issue 19.](#) June 2011.
77. **UN-REDD** 2011b. [UN-REDD Programme Social & Environmental Principles and Criteria, version 1.](#) UNREDD/PB6/2011/IV/1.
78. **UN-REDD** 2011c. [UN-REDD Programme Social & Environmental Principles and Criteria. Draft for consultation – June 30, 2011.](#)
79. **UN-REDD.** 2011e. [Participatory Governance Assessments for REDD+. Planning document: 2011 – 2015.](#) Accessed online on 25 August 2011.
80. **UN-REDD & Chatham House.** 2011. [Guidance for the provision of information on REDD+ governance \(Draft\).](#) Chatham House, London, U.K.
81. **Varghese, P.** 2009. [An Overview of REDD, REDD plus and REDD readiness.](#) Presentation at the International Conference on Community Rights, Forests and Climate Change, August, 2009, New Delhi. The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI), New Delhi, India.
82. **Verchot, L.V., & Petkova, E.** 2010. [The state of REDD negotiations. Consensus points, options for moving forward and research needs to support the process.](#) A background document for the UN-REDD sponsored support to regional groups. An update following COP15 in Copenhagen. CIFOR, Bogor.
83. **Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S., Verchot, L.V., Kanninen, M., Murdiyarsa, D.** 2008. How can we monitor, report and verify carbon emissions from forests? In: Angelsen, A. (Ed.), *Moving Ahead with REDD*. CIFOR, Bogor, pp. 87–98.
84. **Wageningen University.** 2010. [Social safeguards in the Ghana-EU Voluntary Partnership Agreement \(VPA\) Triggering improved forest governance or an afterthought?](#) Policy brief. Wageningen, Netherlands.
85. **World Bank.** 2005. [Operational Policy 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples.](#) Accessed online on September 5, 2011. Washington D.C.

## ***Annex 1: Elements of Free, Prior and Informed Consent***

- Free implies no coercion, intimidation or manipulation
- Prior implies consent has been sought sufficiently in advance of any authorization or commencement of activities and respect time requirements of indigenous consultation/consensus processes
- Informed implies that information is provided that covers (at least) the following aspects:
  - The nature, size, pace, reversibility and scope of any proposed project or activity
  - The reason/s or purpose of the project and/or activity
  - The duration of the above
  - The locality of areas that will be affected
  - A preliminary assessment of the likely economic, social, cultural and environmental impact, including potential risks and fair and equitable benefit sharing in a context that respects the precautionary principle
  - Personnel likely to be involved in the execution of the proposed project (including indigenous peoples, private sector staff, research institutions, government employees and others)
  - Procedures that the project may entail
- Consent

Consultation and participation are crucial components of a consent process. Consultation should be undertaken in good faith. The parties should establish a dialogue allowing them to find appropriate solutions in an atmosphere of mutual respect in good faith, and full and equitable participation. Consultation requires time and an effective system for communicating among interest holders. Indigenous Peoples should be able to participate through their own freely chosen representatives and customary or other institutions. The inclusion of a gender perspective and the participation of indigenous women are essential, as well as participation of children and youth as appropriate. This process may include the option of withholding consent. Consent to any agreement should be interpreted as Indigenous Peoples have reasonably understood it.

Source: FCPF and UN-REDD 2011:10.

## Annex 2: Table on values of select REDD+ social tools

In the table below, property rights implies a focus on respecting statutory and customary rights to land and resources. ‘Access rights’ implies a specific focus on respecting access and use rights. Benefit sharing implies a focus on ensuring that the benefits of REDD+ are shared equitably. Biodiversity implies a focus on preserving biodiversity and ecosystem services. Livelihood implies a focus on supporting well-being and securing livelihoods when implementing REDD+, i.e. a much more broad focus than benefit sharing. Participation implies a focus on ensuring participation (going beyond consultations) of weak stakeholders, i.e. rural communities and indigenous groups. Information implies a focus on ensuring that information about REDD+ policies and projects is

<i>Substantive value</i>	<b>CCBA and Care</b> REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards	<b>FCPF</b> Strategic Environmental and Social Assessments + Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+	<b>UN-REDD Programme</b> Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria + Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ + Participatory Governance Assessments for REDD+
Property rights	X	X	X <sup>27</sup>
Access rights	X	No	No
Benefit sharing	X	No <sup>28</sup>	X
Biodiversity	X	(X) <sup>29</sup>	X <sup>30</sup>
Livelihood	X <sup>31</sup>	No	X <sup>32</sup>
Participation	X	X	X
Information	X	X	X
Human rights	X	X	X <sup>33</sup>
Free, Prior, and Informed Consent	X	(X) <sup>34</sup>	X
Grievance	X	X	X
Stakeholder	X <sup>35</sup>	No <sup>as UN-REDD</sup>	No <sup>36</sup>

<sup>27</sup> FCPF & UN-REDD 2011, page 4 (g)

<sup>28</sup> The FCPF part of the FCPF & UN-REDD (2011) focuses mainly on mitigation of harm, whereas sharing of benefits (and compensation beyond status quo) do not feature.

<sup>29</sup> May be included in one or more of the underlying safeguard policies: Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01), Natural Habitats (OP 4.04), Forests (OP 4.36), Pest Management (OP 4.09), Dam Safety (OP 4.37) Physical Cultural Resources (OP 4.11), Involuntary Resettlement (OP 4.12), Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10), International Waterways (OP 7.50), and Disputed Areas (OP 7.60)

<sup>30</sup> Criteria 14 through 20.

<sup>31</sup> Criterion 3.1 states that REDD+ should generate additional positive impacts on livelihood security.

<sup>32</sup> Criterion 9 states that economic, social and political well-being should be respected *and* enhanced.

<sup>33</sup> Explicitly mentioned in 30 ‘Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement’ (FCPF & UN-REDD 2011) that activities that affect indigenous people should follow a human rights based approach (pages 2-3).

<sup>34</sup> The FCPF argues that their approach to engaging with indigenous people ‘... can be considered to be equivalent to Free, Prior and Informed Consent’ (FCPF & UN-REDD 2011, page 3)

representation			
Stakeholder identification	No <sup>37</sup>	No	No
Independent process monitoring	No	No	No
Participatory process monitoring	No	No	X <sup>38</sup>
Policy coherence	X <sup>39</sup>	No	X

---

<sup>35</sup> Criterion 6.3 specifically mentions that those who represent stakeholders must be accountable to them.

<sup>36</sup> Rather, the 'Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement' (FCPF & UN-REDD 2011) focus on representation of indigenous groups through 'recognition of existing processes, organizations and institutions, e.g., councils of elders, headmen and tribal leaders; Indigenous Peoples should have the right to participate through representatives chosen by themselves in accordance with their own procedures and decision-making institutions.', i.e. there are no mechanisms to validate whether these 'existing processes' actually cater for accountability and representativeness.

<sup>37</sup> Under criterion 1.1. a 'participatory process' to identify right holders is mentioned, but no guidance.

<sup>38</sup> UN-REDD (2011d) on Participatory Governance Assessments outlines a strategy for participatory monitoring of process and outcomes in relation to governance issues in REDD at the national level involving various State and civil society stakeholders.

<sup>39</sup> Criteria 4.1 and 4.5

made available to all relevant stakeholders in good time for them to react and be meaningfully involved. Stakeholder representation implies a focus on ensuring accountability of the representatives towards those they are supposed to represent. Participatory process monitoring implies a focus on supporting the monitoring of REDD+ impacts by local people. Policy coherence implies a focus on assuring consistency with existing national policies.