

## Second Expert Workshop on Monitoring Governance for REDD+

18-19 November, 2010  
FAO Headquarters, Rome

### Report Annexes

**Annex 1 – Core governance parameters for monitoring REDD+ governance (What to monitor)**

**Annex 2 – Operational considerations (How to monitor)**

**Annex 3 - Indicative national system (Who should monitor)**

**Annex 4 – Working group reports**

#### Annex 1 - Core governance parameters for monitoring REDD+ governance (What to monitor)

Core governance parameters for REDD+	Key considerations in Scope	Of particular relevance to “supporting and promoting” (current safeguards text <sup>1</sup> )
Clear and coherent policy, legal, institutional and regulatory frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest and land use policies, laws and regulations</li> <li>• Legal framework to support and protect land tenure/carbon ownership and use rights</li> <li>• Consistency of REDD+ policies with broader development policies</li> <li>• Clarity of mandates across different levels of government</li> <li>• Incorporation of international commitments into national legislation</li> </ul>	a) Consistency with national forest programmes, international conventions and agreements c) respect for rights of indigenous peoples and local communities e) consistency with conservation of natural forests, biodiversity etc f) address risk of reversals g) address risk of displacement
Effective implementation, enforcement and compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooperative enforcement of laws and regulations relevant for REDD+</li> <li>• Effectiveness and integrity of judicial system</li> <li>• Implementation of, and compliance with, relevant international</li> </ul>	b)...effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation... f) address risk of reversals g) address risk of displacement

<sup>1</sup> At the time of the workshop this text was in draft form, but it is now agreed that REDD+ activities will be undertaken, in accordance with these safeguards that will be promoted and supported.

	commitments/obligations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anti-corruption measures</li> </ul>	
Transparent and accountable decision-making and institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder participation in REDD+ design and implementation, with special emphasis on vulnerable groups</li> <li>• Transparency and accountability of agencies responsible for implementation and enforcement</li> <li>• Conflict resolution and grievance mechanism</li> <li>• Transparency and accountability (including reconciliation) of REDD+ payments and revenues</li> <li>• Participatory and transparent monitoring, reporting, verification and MRV, including accessibility of information</li> <li>• Level of knowledge appropriation among different stakeholders</li> </ul>	b) transparent...national forest governance structures d) full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders

## Annex 2 – Operational considerations (How to monitor)

Pillar	Operational considerations
Transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify and publish relevant laws and policies, including tenure and land/forest use rights</li> <li>• Clarify and publish institutional roles and responsibilities</li> <li>• Include field-based element of monitoring to reconcile policy and practice</li> <li>• Report publicly and in a timely manner</li> <li>• Establish benchmarks against which to demonstrate progress/change</li> <li>• Establish robust financial accounting for REDD+ financial flows, with full reconciliation and stakeholder oversight</li> <li>• Timely access to, and active dissemination of, information</li> </ul>
Appropriate accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish institutions to facilitate multi-stakeholder participation</li> <li>• Collect data/opinions from broad-based sources as well as expert opinion</li> <li>• Develop capacity both within and outside REDD+ institutions to facilitate accountability, with particular attention given to enabling the vulnerable groups highlighted above</li> <li>• Develop appropriate peer review mechanisms</li> <li>• Establish conflict-resolution/complaints mechanisms at national and international levels</li> <li>• Establish independent and consistent financing for monitors</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adapt or develop ethical codes of conduct</li> </ul>
Effectiveness (including cost-effectiveness)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid waste through fraud or corruption with effective auditing</li> <li>• Enforcement monitoring should be 'intelligence-led'</li> <li>• Systematic information gathering should build on existing data sets wherever possible</li> <li>• Data gathering should be based on complementary national and international concepts and needs</li> <li>• Incorporate feedback loops, including on the level of knowledge by different stakeholder groups</li> </ul>

### Annex 3 - Indicative national system (Who to monitor)

Characteristics	Institution and reporting information flows		
<p>Partnership/hosted by REDD lead Ministry with representatives of all relevant policy and implementing agencies plus domestic and international stakeholders.</p> <p>Functions: decision-making and reporting/publication. Also possibly national-level 'Ombudsman'.</p>	<p>↑↑↑↑</p> <p><i>Reporting to International level</i></p> <p>NATIONAL IMPLEMENTING COMMITTEE</p>		
<p>Multi-stakeholder, chaired by relevant implementing Ministries.</p> <p>Functions: receiving and peer reviewing input data from monitors, detailed deliberations, recommendations to NI Committee.</p>	<p>↑↑↑↑ ↑↑↑↑ ↑↑↑↑ ↑↑↑↑</p> <p>WORKING GROUPS</p> <p>Social impacts</p> <p>Environmental impacts</p> <p>Policy design and implementation</p> <p>Law enforcement and judicial issues</p> <p>Financial transparency</p>		
<b>Monitoring Mechanisms</b> (Characteristics described below)	↑↑↑↑	↑↑↑↑	↑↑↑↑
	Regular independent implementation and enforcement monitoring (civil	Periodic policy, implementation and impact assessment.	Reconciliation and audit of REDD+ financial flows, benefit sharing and

	society).  ⇒ ⇒ ⇒	Undertaken by relevant research institution and/or Government agency. Based on existing data sets wherever possible.	distribution (EITI-like model). ⇐ ⇐ ⇐
--	------------------------------	--	--

## Annex 4 – Working group reports

### Report WG 1

#### Participants:

Andrew Wardell	CIFOR
Asbjorn Lovbraek	NORAD
Lao Sethaphal	Government of Cambodia
Felician Kilahama	Government of Tanzania
Emmy Hafild	KemiTraan, Indonesia
Daniela Carrion	Government of Ecuador
Davyth Stewart	Global Witness
Lawrence Ang	Ateneo School of Government
Nguyen Quang Tan	RECOFTC, Vietnam
Filippo Del Gatto	Madera Verde/Green Wood, Ecuador
Estelle Fach	UNDP
Francesca Feliciani	FAO
Robles	

**Facilitator:** Estelle Fach

**Rapporteur:** Francesca Feliciani Robles

#### What does the guidance framework need to achieve?

- The guidance framework should improve good governance of the forest and related land use sectors, bringing effective changes at national level;
- It should be the framework for cross-sectoral and cross-boundary country implementation of harmonized governance monitoring systems;
- It should contribute to achieve institutional reforms to reduce the risks of non compliance with the monitoring and verification standards;
- It should strengthen sub-national participation in decision making processes, involving all relevant actors;
- It should help monitor change in performance;
- It is a voluntary guidance that can be expanded (not restrictive);
- It should be embedded within larger monitoring contexts;
- It should help institution building for governance.

### **How should the guidance framework be used? And by Whom?**

- It is a guidance framework that will facilitate the use of existing monitoring tools;
- It should be used by all national and sub-national stakeholders; including policy-makers, civil society and all institutions (the many) that must be involved in monitoring governance (impossible for one ministry);
- It should take into account the different multilevel governments/institutions (e.g. the complex institutional scenario of Indonesia);
- The guidance framework should be used by existing domestic and international multi-stakeholder committees; and all implementing agencies that must be involved in monitoring governance;
- Prioritizing the existing political will to use the guidance framework is key to achieving a successful level of implementation;
- The guidance framework should be voluntary and flexible, reaching an easy level of interpretation by all national and sub-national stakeholders.

### **What should the scope and content of the guidance framework include?**

- The guidance framework is linked to governance only, its focus should not include the social dimension. The title of BGP3, “Monitoring governance and social issues for REDD+: Operational Considerations”, is misleading;
- Governance assessment and institutional capacity building should be part of the REDDness process;
- It should contain the minimum standards and indicators for guidance, that will be considered as the basis for governance assessment (e.g. Indonesia institutional architecture is quite complex, so it is important to identify first the institutions in charge of the process and their responsibilities);
- The guidance framework should be linked to already existing voluntary guidelines;
- It should define the level of compliance, ownership and how it is going to evolve, taking into account the REDD+ financial commitments;
- It should provide “a menu of options” related to good governance and monitoring practices, distinguishing between core issues and secondary scopes;
- It should take into account the existing frameworks for national REDD+ implementation processes (strategies, programmes);
- It should develop capacity building, taking into account the different levels of monitoring scopes;
- It should specify the future requirements for its implementation;
- It should promote changes and reforms on forest governance.

### **What should the guidance framework look like in terms of style?**

- The guidance framework should be a work in progress, short, simple and flexible;
- It should not be linked to the UNFCCC terminology;
- It should not be a ranking or index or check list tool.

### **What is needed to further elaborate the proposed parameters?**

- The criteria defining the payment mechanisms should be specified;
- It should include monitoring of financial flows;

- The category of actors that could be involved in the process should be clarified;
- The process should be more participatory and open;
- Flexible indicators/criteria should be harmonized, in order to facilitate implementation at country level;
- The monitoring frameworks linked to REDD+ financial mechanisms should be well defined;
- The strategic objectives need to be better defined in the document;
- The guidance framework has to be more operational, the document is too normative;
- The review process needs to be more inclusive;
- Specify that “National context” in the title implies whoever operates within a national context;
- Some terms are unclear and need to be elaborated:
  - Include field based
  - Develop appropriate peer review
  - Intelligence-led
  - Independent financing by monitors
  - Establish benchmarks
  - Access to information (availability)

### **Recommendations:**

- Change the structure of the three major aspects guiding the drafting process. Several inconsistencies have been pointed out such as the overlap between concepts that are linked with the three aspects (What, How, Who).
- Governance must take into consideration the correlation with REDD+ compliance criteria (e.g. who is accountable for non performance?).
- The national context should be the starting point in drafting the guidance framework.
- The standards established by the REDD+ programme must be harmonized. The initiatives from the private sector should be taken into account in defining the UN REDD+ criteria.
- If we talk of monitoring of governance for REDD+, we should monitor the performances established for its compliance.
- The success or failure of REDD+ should be measured on the basis of the capacity of the country to fulfill the six monitoring principles: there are 6 principles of good governance (Participation, Transparency, Fairness /Equity, Accountability, Efficiency, Effectiveness). There are 6 principles of good governance, why lump into 3?
- Need to take stock of all reference documents related to governance in the peer review process.
- Give more emphasis to the sub-national level.
- Reflect on the need to encourage the convergence of parallel fora led by the private sector, in the UN-REDD multilateral meetings.

## Report WG 2

### Participants:

Rosalind	Reeve	Chatham House
Emelyne	Cheney	FAO
Valerie	Merckx	EFI
Ivar	Jorgensen	Norwegian Embassy in Tanzania
Truong	Tat Do	Government of Vietnam
André	Kondjo Shoko	Government of DRC
Carlos	Munoz Pina	Government of Mexico
Moeko	Saito-Jensen	University of Copenhagen
Nils	Hermann Ranum	Rainforest Foundation Norway
Antti	Erkkila	University of Eastern Finland

**Facilitator:** Valerie Merckx

**Rapporteur:** Emelyne Cheney

### What does the guidance framework need to achieve?

- The guidance framework should guide in-country processes.
- It should develop trust between REDD+ partners, including between donors and recipients.
- It should not be a ranking tool.

### How should the guidance framework be used? And by Whom?

- The guidance framework should be used by a broad audience, including national governments as well as all other stakeholders involved in REDD+.
- It should be relevant for actors at sub-national levels of government.

### What should the scope and content of the guidance framework include?

- The guidance framework should focus exclusively on governance, but it should also be stated in the introduction that it is located within a wider monitoring framework (including social and environmental safeguards).
- The three “core governance parameters for REDD+” provide a suitable structure for the framework.

### What should the guidance framework look like in terms of style?

- The guidance framework should be a short document of 10-15 pages, available in English, French and Spanish, and translated in the languages of the pilot countries.
- It should be accessible and practical.
- It should be complemented by a web-based resource.

### **What is needed to further elaborate the proposed parameters?**

- Incorporation of international obligations into national legislation should be included in the first parameter, “Clear and coherent policy, legal, institutional and regulatory framework”.
- The level of knowledge appropriation among different stakeholders should be added in the key considerations attached to “Transparent and accountable decision-making and institutions”.
- In the “How” table, under Transparency, “Timely access to information” should become “Timely access to, and active dissemination of, information”; under Appropriate Accountability, “Adapt or develop ethical code of conducts”; Cost-effectiveness should become “Effectiveness (including cost-effectiveness)”, and operational considerations for this pillar should include “Incorporate feedback loops, including of the level of knowledge by different stakeholder groups”.

### **Recommendations:**

- The guidance should stress the need to use existing institutions as much as possible.
- It should list institutional functions, rather than institutions, to be included in national systems, so that countries can adapt the guidance to their own institutional context.
- It should make mention of a diagnosis/periodic assessment of institutional structures to support the creation/adaptation of national systems.
- The indicative national system should include mechanisms for dispute resolution and benefit sharing.



## Report WG 3

### Participants:

Anna Chilese-Masinja	Government of Zambia
Crystal Davis	WRI
Padraig Foley	European Commission
Phil Franks	CARE International
Peter Holmgren	FAO
Agus Justianto	Government of Indonesia
Eva Muller	FAO
Inger Naess	Government of Norway
Maurice Odhiambo Makolo	Institute for Law and Environmental Governance
Lisen Runsten	FAO
David Young	Global Witness

**Facilitator:** David Young

**Rapporteur:** Lisen Runsten

### What does the guidance framework need to achieve?

- Inform people on how to set up a governance monitoring system and achieve a high standard of monitoring and reporting on governance.
- Safeguards need to be clarified - what are countries committing themselves to?
- Show that paying attention to governance will build trust, both for governments and investors, and show that REDD+ is possible to implement.
- The guidance should not assume that national decision-making processes are coherent and coordinated. It should be seen as an *aid* for governments, not another hoop to jump through like the boxes in the R-PP, FIP templates etc.
- Achieving benefits not only for a selected elite.
- Better management of resources.
- De-jargonise the terminology of governance and REDD+: an achievement would be to facilitate the dialogue at the country level, and the dialogue on operational tools.
- Redress the balance between R-PP and NPD content on carbon monitoring (where there is often a lot of detail) and governance monitoring (where there is often very little detail).

### How should the guidance framework be used? And by whom?

- Rather than a tool for country led governance assessments, it is an *approach* to be used in the assessments – but not the template. Not a methodology or recommendation of methodologies, but rather a guidance on how to think about methodologies and processes.
- Main recipients: governments – broadly defined, including all relevant bodies (the guidance is for governments, but the assessment should be done by an independent agency)
- Users: investors (and negotiators)
- The audience could also be civil society and local communities/indigenous people. Since the guidance includes a multi-stakeholder approach, all actors involved should be able to

understand the process (see question 4, different formats for different audiences). The process should recommend involvement of different stakeholders from the outset.

- Defining governments: countries are linked and engaged in partnerships. Therefore they are also interested in the governance of neighbouring country resources where there are vested interests across borders. If borders are not clear, decisions cannot be made, and processes will fail. The guidance should consider these transboundary relationships.
- **The guidance can give relevant government institutions a tool to push for certain governance principles in a political sphere and give leverage against internal tensions.**
- Implicitly as a 'best practice' guide, by recommending an approach, but best practices implies a methodology, which is not the case here. Therefore it is not an appropriate term.
- Monitoring frameworks in other sectors: the functions of the monitoring of governance could extend to different sectors, which should be taken into account.
- What content on **cost** is realistic to expect the writer to be able to come up with? Estimates in monetary terms are not fruitful, but for example human resources needed and requirements for monitoring and reporting. Identify existing institutions that can help with data sources (e.g. Attorney General, National Statistics Office). Include that the aspects of REDD+ in DG performance audits will bring some costs.

#### **What should the scope and content of the guidance framework include?**

- Objective: Facilitate dialogue at country level.
- No more than 10 pages.
- There is a difference between governance and forest governance. **The scope will have to be governance for REDD+ and should explain how this is different from forest governance** (see examples below). Also relate it broader to good governance. The document should not include indicators for forest governance which is done complementarily in e.g. the WB-FAO initiative – there should be cross-referencing and the two documents should be written in coordination, so the drafting of one informs the drafting of the other...
- Should not ask countries to do anything that will not be part of the final system in the country. Therefore it needs to be sensitive to how the negotiations develop. The objective of the guidance is to guide the process of establishing a good monitoring and reporting mechanism for governance.
- International payment mechanisms and agriculture are examples of REDD+ governance issues that are often not seen as of forest governance concern.
- Actors that are influenced by forest governance are also influenced by other "fields" of governance, indigenous people not the least. E.g. governance of land (tenure). Thus governance of REDD+ is appropriate, as concluded above. Can be a branding issue for REDD+ also. Keep doors open.
- The language of governments – what governance issues concern whom? There may be mismatches or discrepancies.
- Sectors are changing and integrating, we need to keep our scope open for this, not losing sight of the overall objectives.
- Need to remember that forest (and REDD+) governance spans all levels. Corruption and mismanagement are often talked about on high levels, but these problems also occur on local levels. One can make a point about the importance of governance at different levels, but the guide can probably not be designed to be scalable to inform all levels.

- A local level issue (e.g. community forestry) can in fact be a national level concern because it is so widespread, and is therefore in fact a structural matter.
- **Will the guide include livelihood aspects/social safeguards or standards? Or do we choose a pure governance path?** Corporate CSR increasingly sees ‘ESG reporting’ – environmental, social, and governance – as the norm. Social standards have been gradually added in the CH-UN-REDD process. At the level of the three pillars, it is not explicit what to include. The paper “Forest governance indicator development: Early lessons and proposed indicators for country assessments”, prepared for FAO by Doris Capistrano, covers more than what the framework will include in the end. **Should the scope of the UN-REDD-CH initiative be extended from three pillars to four, including social equity?** There was a previous discussion whether institutions should be a fourth pillar. But it was decided that it is implicit in the other three. The issues can be mentioned and the need to develop guidance on those issues as well emphasized, but not necessarily included in this guide. Need to define boundaries. The CCBA is much broader, and this guide should help participants consider the governance section in it.
- Issues of equity and the allocation of benefits need to be a part of the process. There is a whole range of social impacts that then should also be considered. Equity is an issue in its own right. **Agreement:** So far our assumed theory of change is that improved governance will help deliver social and environmental (as well as financial) benefits, so it would be useful to spell this out. The process began with the insight that the monitoring of governance in REDD+ was the least clear of REDD+ monitoring aspects. As the discussion moves into the operational sphere, the scope of issues has been broadened. If you address the theory of change, or the question of ‘governance for what?’, you will identify environmental and social benefits, as well as equity/livelihoods/poverty reduction, as outcomes. However, there are pros and cons for including/not including social and environmental impacts. Risk of not satisfying the audience, and risk of confusion.
- Remember to keep carbon and mitigation still in the equation.

#### **What should the guidance framework look like in terms of style?**

- Different formats for different audiences
- The language can and should be straight forward for a broad impact, and translated in different languages.
- A website allows a concise, accessible introduction and then the opportunity to go to greater detail for those who actually develop a governance monitoring system, and is adaptable as REDD+ evolves. Different printed briefings could then be produced at different stages.

#### **What is needed to further elaborate the proposed parameters?**

- Introduce the ‘WHO’ (i.e. the table in Section 5 of background paper 3) first, but as functions, not institutions. Keep the three ‘monitoring mechanisms’ functions. Allow for decentralization & replication especially in large countries such as Indonesia and Brazil.
- The HOW is still missing, and guidance on the process. A stepwise structure of the guide would be helpful – which advice is relevant when? What kinds of institutions and what kinds of processes?

How do you map the considerations to operational processes? The connection between the 'what', 'how' and 'who' is missing. Linkage between 'how' and 'who' could be addressed through mapping the 'who' onto the earlier BGP tables on the 3 key parameters and the 15 operational considerations. This would form the main substance of the guide.

Other comments on 'who' in the table in Section 5 of background paper 3:

- Feedback mechanisms lacking in the 'who' diagram: how could downwards accountability or corrective actions be included? – need more arrows??
- The five working groups are not necessary to monitor only governance, especially if the guidance will not cover social and environmental impacts (but they might still be recommended as important functions for monitoring in their respective arenas)
- The separation between technical and political tiers is important. The function of the NIC would probably be overtaken by existing technical institutions/resources. Therefore the institutional recommendations should perhaps be limited to functions that need to be filled and not imply that new institutions should be formed.
- FLEGT has learned from having two partner governments at the top of the structure. Reflected in a Joint Implementation Committee (JIC). This is key to the governance of an international agreement, but for REDD+ it's more complicated by it being multilateral.
- Functions could be carried out by sub-national committees as well, so perhaps avoid implying which national level functions should be carried out on.