

REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards

Expert workshop on approaches to monitoring and assessing REDD+ safeguards performance

4th- 5th June 2013, Oxford, UK

FINAL REPORT

30 June 2013



Please contact Joanna Durbin jdurbin@climate-standards.org with any comments or to request copies of presentations and supporting documents

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Objectives & outputs of the workshop	3
3. Participants' involvement in REDD+ safeguards and related initiatives.....	4
4. Introduction to country approach to REDD+ safeguards and SIS.....	5
5. Introduction to REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards & challenges for monitoring and assessing safeguards performance	5
6. Discussion & other perspectives on REDD+ safeguards information systems	6
7. Introduction to workshop methodology	7
8. Experience using REDD+ SES to feed into the development of State safeguards information system in Acre, Brazil	8
9. Approaches of CCB and FSC to collecting and assessing information for certification	8
10. Approach for monitoring and assessment by WRI Governance of Forests Initiative	8
11. The FLEGT approach to collection and assessment of information	9
12. Studies of social and governance performance approaches to REDD+ safeguards	9
13. Approach used for supervision/monitoring of safeguards implementation by international financial institutions (eg. Wold Bank)	9
14. Experience using REDD+ SES to feed into the development of a national safeguards information system in Ecuador	10
15. Discussion on characterization of different approaches	10
16. Group work: reviewing the framework	12
17. Group work: brainstorming different approaches appropriate for REDD+ SIS at national/sub-national levels	16
18. Development of initial recommendations for practitioners and policy makers.....	21
19. Next steps from this workshop	23

1. Introduction

The agreement on REDD+ from UNFCCC COP16 included a request to country parties *to develop a system for providing information on how the safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of the [REDD+] activities*. A number of countries are now elaborating a national approach to safeguards and developing REDD+ safeguards information systems (SIS). Following established practice in forest management and governance assessment, many of these countries are using the principle/criteria/indicators hierarchy with indicators of essentially three types: policy (policy content), process (how a process has been planned, implemented and institutionalised), and outcome (the actual social and environmental impacts of REDD+ activities).

Having defined indicators, a number of countries are now moving to the challenge of defining and then implementing a monitoring, assessment, review and reporting process. As is common with project monitoring and evaluation (M&E), there is a risk of information overload while at the same time discovering during the analysis that some key information needed for the assessment is missing – in other words a real risk of ending up with a poorly designed, overly complex and expensive SIS that may fail to meet its objectives, and even undermine efforts to establish effective REDD+ safeguards.

This workshop brought together experts from different communities of practice together with experts in REDD+ safeguards to discuss the relevance of different approaches to SIS.

This workshop was convened by the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES) Initiative. REDD+ SES is currently supporting 10 countries to develop a country-led, multi-stakeholder approach to SIS, and therefore has a keen interest in this issue and is well-placed to facilitate an expert dialogue. The recommendations generated from this workshop will directly help countries using REDD+ SES and will also support a broader effort to develop and strengthen SIS, and thus the effectiveness of REDD+ safeguards.

2. Objectives & outputs of the workshop

Objectives

1. To bring together experts with experience of different approaches to collecting and assessing safeguards information to discuss the relevance of these different approaches to REDD+ Safeguard Information Systems (SIS).
2. To develop recommendations on safeguards monitoring and assessment to help countries using REDD+ SES and also to support a broader effort to develop and strengthen SIS, and thus the effectiveness of REDD+ safeguards.

Expected Outputs

1. A framework enabling better understanding of similarities, differences, strengths, weaknesses of the different approaches i.e. for characterizing the different approaches
2. A set of approaches (broadly defined) that can be used for SIS
3. Initial recommendations that could form the basis for developing guidance for REDD+ SES practitioners and others developing SIS

3. Participants' involvement in REDD+ safeguards and related initiatives

The workshop brought together a small group of 16 people. Participants had a range of background and experience relevant for collecting and assessing REDD+ safeguards information, including from related initiatives. See Annex 2 for a full list.

Cordula Epple: UNEP-WCMC. Has worked with UN-REDD Programme on SIS, e.g. supporting Ecuador in identification of indicators for monitoring of social and environmental benefits from REDD+.

Steve Swan: SNV. Has worked on multiple benefits for REDD+, focusing on national safeguards in Vietnam for replication in Laos. Is interested in exploring the validity of a participatory approach to monitoring. Developing field test in Vietnam in the next 3 years. Looking at how to adjust the existing forest system to accommodate a participatory approach of safeguards monitoring.

Gernot Brodning: Has worked with FCPF on benefit sharing and social and environmental impacts assessment. Interested in quality control systems for implementation of safeguards.

Connie McDermott: Has worked on a case study of development of SIS and safeguards system in Mexico, looking at projects with ejidos nested with a national and international system.

Jeff Heyward: Rainforest Alliance – experience with forestry audits with FSC and also carbon project audits with CCB Standards and VCS. Working with governance to support the development of the R-PP s or REDD strategies, in particular with safeguards components (Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico).

Michael Richards: Forest Trends. Developed a manual on Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment (SBIA) of REDD+ projects. Also worked on livelihoods impacts assessment for FLEGT programmes combining SBIA and social impact assessment of the WB.

Priscilla Santos: Worked for Imazon, part of Governance of Forests Initiative (GFI). Also involved in developing recommendations for Brazilian government for REDD+ SIS.

Crystal Davis: WRI. Leads the GFI and has experience from Indonesia and Brazil.

Mary Hobley: Independent consultant. Has worked on the poverty effects of forestry. Also works on FLEGT and EU voluntary partnership agreements (VPA), particularly on livelihoods impacts assessment pilots in Indonesia, Vietnam and Ghana.

Mary Menton: Global Canopy programme. Has worked on global comparative analysis of REDD+ in Peru. Community MRV.

Pam Jagger: CIFOR and University of North Carolina. Has worked on global comparative study of REDD+, and on monitoring REDD+ safeguards at national level.

Pav Ramani: Proforest. Has worked on sustainable palm oil.

Dawn Robinson: Proforest. Has worked on FSC and on several commodity round tables and also provides technical support to the REDD+ SES secretariat.

Phil Franks: CARE and REDD+ SES Secretariat. Has worked on social impacts of conservation projects and community forestry.

Joanna Durbin: CCBA and REDD+ SES Secretariat. Has worked on participatory monitoring of biodiversity with local communities in Madagascar.

Aurelie Lhumeau: CCBA and REDD+ SES Secretariat. Has worked on REDD+ SES indicator and monitoring plan development in Ecuador.

4. Introduction to country approach to REDD+ safeguards and Safeguards Information Systems (SIS)

Presentation by Joanna Durbin

Overview of different initiatives and tools relevant to REDD+ safeguards: FCPF SESA & ESMF, UN-REDD SEPC, BeRT and PGA and REDD+ SES. Presentation of elements and steps for development of a country approach to safeguards.

Questions and comments

1. What is the role of CBD in relation to REDD+ safeguards? CBD has provided advice on REDD+ biodiversity safeguards but there is no compliance mechanism. The decision related to safeguards agreed on in Hyderabad is only advice for countries to follow.
2. Vietnam is building a national biodiversity system to report on how meeting the Aichi targets. Ideally this platform should be linked/feed into REDD+ SIS.

5. Introduction to REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards & challenges for monitoring and assessing safeguards performance

Presentation by Phil Franks

Overview presentation on REDD+ SES, LISA REDD and challenges for assessing and monitoring safeguards performance.

Rationale for workshop:

- Countries are moving from defining SIS content to collecting and using safeguards information
- Countries using REDD+ SES as part of their approach to developing an SIS are interpreting existing REDD+ SES guidance in different ways
 - Based on project/program M&E approach
 - Based on standards auditing approach
- Risks of classic pitfalls of M&E
 - Lack of focus/precision
 - Stakeholder alienation and/or participatory paralysis
 - Unsustainable cost
- SIS: crucial role to play in REDD+ but there are different approaches and inherent trade-offs

6. Discussion & other perspectives on REDD+ safeguards information systems

'REDD+ SIS – UNREDD support to countries' presentation by Cordula Epple

Questions and comments

- Evaluation of ecosystem services work, does it include any social aspects? Aim is to assess the amount and variety of benefits a country can get from implementing REDD+. By definition, all changes in ecosystem services have a social effect (as ecosystem services provide some form of benefit to people), so there is a need for integration when considering social and environmental benefits.
- In Ecuador, the development of a safeguards information system for REDD+ includes consideration of multiple benefits.
- SEPC is a guiding framework. New countries developing UN-REDD National Programmes are encouraged to use them. For countries who already have a UN-REDD National Programme approved, consideration of the SEPC is not a requirement but can be useful in developing a national approach to safeguards; for instance, Ecuador decided to include them in the process of identifying relevant topics and indicators for REDD+ SIS.

Steve Swan explanation of SIS development in Vietnam

- Policies, laws, regulations (PLR) gap analysis has been done and collecting comments. Advocating for a country safeguards system that brings up the social, environmental and governance performance for high performance for development aid (not only REDD).
- Option 1: Small adjustments needed to close the main gaps identified:
 - Law on environmental protection that regulates environmental impact assessment
 - Carbon regulation under national PES scheme
 - Grassroots democracyUse country safeguards system to report on Cancun safeguards.
- Option 2: Create a SIS specific for REDD+
- Option 1 more cost effective and responding better to development aid but Option 2 could be developed as a temporary solution towards a country safeguards system, in particular because lots of funding for REDD+.

Questions and comments

- Options 1 and 2 are not mutually exclusive. Need an information platform.
- Information system on biomass, social, biodiversity and governance 'national forest and statistics inventory' programme could be a SIS.
- PLRs could be at country level, not only for REDD+ while SIS may only be REDD relevant.
- Will go down to the household level.
- SIS a complement to improve the PLRs?
- Methodologies used: Cancun safeguards too broad, need interpretation criteria. In Vietnam, use interpretation criteria from various methodologies (FCPF, REDD+ SES, SEPC). Not possible to use existing framework because only relevant for REDD+ while the team was looking at existing PLRs which are broader.
- Seem to have a parallel with land tenure reform discussion.

- Articulate with SBSTA. Focus on how to incentivize the non-carbon benefits. Further guidance on the timing of the submission – link to bi-annual reporting instead of national communication? Need more guidance than in the Durban agreement.
- FCPF: working on substantial equivalence of WB safeguards to Cancun safeguards. Consider how WB revision process can feed into the REDD safeguards and SIS. Learn from early experience of SESA/ESMF.

7. Introduction to workshop methodology

Focus on the assessment phase of the REDD+ SES process and the monitoring and reporting steps that could be used to develop a SIS

1. Review existing approaches to assessing social, environmental and/or governance performance with regards to:
 - Users and their objectives
 - Monitoring, assessment, review and reporting (MARR processing descriptors)
 - Participation, transparency, precision, accuracy, capturing variation, cost (general attributes)
2. Review this ‘characterization framework’
3. Develop assessment (MARR) approaches that could be used for SIS and REDD+ SES in particular

Key questions

Monitoring	Is there a process to further specify what information should be collected? Where and how is the information collected <i>and by whom</i> ? How is the information aggregated and analyzed, <i>and by whom</i> ?
Assessment	How is the monitoring information interpreted to assess performance <i>and by whom</i> ? To what extent performance is assessed against a minimum standards and <i>who judges</i> ?
Review	How are assessment findings reviewed/verified to ensure accuracy <i>and by whom</i> ?
Reporting	What information is finally put in the public domain?

Identified approaches

- Program/project M&E approach e.g
 - a. Performance assessment based on REDD+ SES
 - b. Forest governance and socio-economic monitoring and assessment e.g. GFI
- Program/project audit approach
 - a. Validating and verifying performance vs standards e.g. CCB and FSC
- National reporting approach
 - a. Monitoring country level implementation of international agreements e.g. FLEGT
- Monitoring of safeguards implementation by international financial institutions e.g. World Bank

8. Experience using REDD+ SES to feed into the development of State safeguards information system in Acre, Brazil

Presentation by Joanna Durbin based on feedback from Imaflora

Questions & comments

- Who collects the non-project information? Within the ISA Carbon programme of the SISA Programme, there will be private projects and Government programmes that will be implementing and thus will have to report how they meet the SISA requirements. The self assessment will be carried out by the IMC.
- It seems that Acre is relying on secondary information but who will check that the information is actually accurate in the field? IMC thought they would have a spot check team but the issue is whether they have the time and resources to do it. Advised by Imaflora to rely on third party audit. There is an ombudsman who will receive complaints.
- What if there are gaps and inconsistency of information? Acre is now identifying what are the key elements for which they will need consultancies to collect information.
- Is there an attempt to include IPs in CEVA? IPs have recently shown more interest in participating in CEVA so will see how the representation will evolve in CEVA.

9. Approaches of CCB and FSC to collecting and assessing information for certification

Presentation by Jeff Hayward, Rainforest Alliance

Questions & comments

- Most of information held by certified entity. PDD made public but there is a wealth of project information that is not necessarily public but that is shared with the project auditors. Making information available takes time.
- To what extent the auditor is also collecting data for the assessment as it is more than reviewing the forest manager self assessment? A: this is annual surveillance to make sure that the forest manager is still in compliance with the standards. There is not a lot of measurement. The forest management is not the only one that collect data but the auditor is actually make interviews, collect some data.
- For the certification, the accuracy of the assessment depends on the competence of the certification body and the training of the auditor. It is important to have auditors who are trusted by forest managers.

10. Approach for monitoring and assessment by WRI Governance of Forests Initiative

Presentation by Crystal Davis

Questions & comments

- So much qualitative data: where do you put it? Who has access to it? After the phase of testing the indicators, the partners are now collecting only targeted data.
- Problem diagnosis is key to identify what actions are you going to take. How does this affect the indicators? When you know what your problem is then you can pick the indicators but

when you don't, it is more difficult but sometimes using some indicators that may not seem relevant in the first place may help to diagnose the cause of the problem. E.g. the revenues in Brazil and how the funds were set up.

- Feedback from Brazil:
 - a. Depending on who you talk to, the diagnosis changes.
 - b. Flexibility on how to use the assessment: advocacy (Indonesia) vs recommendations to government (Brazil).
 - c. Importance of summary assessment information. Importance of layers of detail.
- May need to accept that these assessments are subjective processes. The nature of the process that involves some judgment. Need to draw conclusions on objective data, for credibility.
- Good to have a scoping investigation before going to the issues.
- There is a difference between collection of information done by civil society groups with an advocacy agenda vs. government assessment that tries to get a 'good mark'. The review process is important to ensure accuracy or fair assessment. For GFI, review process chosen by countries (multi-stakeholder committee, peer review etc).
- Important to have satisfaction/acceptance of stakeholders of the assessment.
- GFI: diagnostic assessment/snapshot to understand big issues to be addressed and not necessarily monitoring over time.

11. The FLEGT approach to collection and assessment of information

Presentation by Mary Hobley, independent consultant and Michael Richards, Forest Trends

Questions & comments

- Will most of the indicators only measure the impacts on the livelihoods? Collective voices should be also monitored so some governance issues are addressed.
- What is the difference between LIA and SESA? SESA is an approach borrows from PSIA and SEA, but there is no clear methodology or indicators, only ToRs.

12. Studies of social and governance performance approaches to REDD+ safeguards

Presentation by Pam Jagger, CIFOR

Questions & comments

- The 'after' is defined as where something has happened that it was not business as usual.
- Due to the persistence of Frances Seymour that the National Forest Monitoring FAO (?) dataset included data on forest derived income.
- Created a typology of REDD+ projects (conservation and development, in-kind type of benefits etc).

13. Approach used for supervision/monitoring of safeguards implementation by international financial institutions (eg. World Bank)

Presentation by Gernot Brodnig, FCPF

Questions & comments

- Does the country that is receiving the grant need to provide reports on how they are doing on the different safeguards instruments? With WB supervision, is the ranking for assessment of safeguards implementation per parameter or more general for policy? Does it go through public/WB review? For the supervision reports, it is up to the task team to define the level for the assessment ranking. Generally, the ranking is per policy but if there are some specific issues, then there is some further narrative. It is up to the country to undertake consultations or involve multi-stakeholders as part of their monitoring and reporting process. Once the report is submitted the review is a WB internal process with safeguards specialists and lawyers.
- What is the WB experience with piloting country safeguards systems? The approach taken is incremental: do we build on existing policies or do we create our own system. The WB tries to encourage country to have IP policy, resettlement policy etc. And then started to look at existing policies and tweak what was necessary. Safeguards review will revisit these questions.
- Bank project can create a parallel safeguards system. What do you think about the ESMF being a prototype for SIS? It has potential. If ESMF is limited to filling WB safeguards, it is a waste given the time and effort because it ends when the FCPF grant ends for readiness.

14. Experience using REDD+ SES to feed into the development of a national safeguards information system in Ecuador

Presentation by Saraswati Rodriguez, Ecuador UN-REDD Programme

Questions & comments

- There will be REDD+ projects implemented by private parties. Who will collect the information for areas under government programme? The Ministerial Agreement sets out that Ecuador will implement a national programme for REDD+. There will be one safeguards system with different inputs: projects and national programme.
- SIS accuracy: who will be part of the technical committee that will review information accuracy? National experts that work on REDD+ and conservation, in particular with monitoring experience. Technical committee and REDD+ Roundtable that represents different stakeholders.
- Need to develop specific indicators: how close will these be to REDD+ SES? SIS indicators will be based on REDD+SES indicators, integrating other international safeguards mechanisms.
- You mentioned 3 levels of monitoring: government, projects, communities – are they end users or is there a plan to vertically integrate this information? Information will be organized by level but all information will be gathered in the national system for the country to report to the UNFCCC.

15. Discussion on characterization of different approaches

During the presentations of different approaches the workshop facilitators captured the key points related to Monitoring, Assessment, Review and Reporting. In plenary, the participants reviewed

what had been captured from the presentations and were asked to identify if there is anything missing in relation to the different options.

Monitoring

Is there a process to further specify what data is collected?

- Outcome indicators needing attribution to REDD+
- Non indicator based methodology for REDD+ SIS e.g. most significant change methodology
- Define the country objectives of the safeguards e.g. which ecosystems services
- Define the users of safeguards information
- Population representative dataset i.e. existing data that can be used/sampling
- Process for selection and prioritization of indicators
- Remote sensing
- Define boundaries of REDD+ and need for attributions
- Information need
 - a. Average
 - b. Variability
 - c. Impact/involvement of vulnerable groups
- Different approaches and set of guidance needed for each type of indicator: policy, process, outcome. Need to define tiers and phases for each type of indicator.
- Different guidance for project and program level monitoring

Who?

- Who maintains the data?
- Integrate community level monitoring
- Government monitoring unit

How is information aggregated?

- Self assessment
- Auditor for project certification

Who aggregates?

- PDD writers

Assessment

- Implications of low vs high performance to make decisions on how to interpret performance
- Show level of performance but no ranking in order for countries can transmit how they are doing
- Who: joint government and civil society

Review

- How: public comment period

16. Group work: reviewing the framework

Participants were asked to form three groups around the three key elements of monitoring and assessment for establishing a SIS:

1. Data collection and management
2. Data aggregation, analysis and assessment
3. Review, verification and reporting

Each group was tasked to:

- Cluster and organize the information drawn from the presentations of Day 1 in order to define a set of options that are not mutual exclusive.
- Identify any differences between options for outcome information, process information and policy information.

Plenary report back from group work

Group 1: Data collection for ongoing monitoring

What info to collect/ where and how to collect it?

	Primary data	Secondary data
<i>Policy indicators</i> Eg: equitable benefit sharing		Presence/absence of policy Quality of policy
<i>Process indicators</i> Eg: full & effective participation	Satisfaction surveys Presence of CSOs Grievance redress mechanism: existence +use Participatory governance monitoring tool	Public comments Media/newspapers Reports/minutes from CSOs Social media International+national governance survey (eg transparency international)
<i>Outcome indicators</i> Eg: livelihoods	Participatory Rural Appraisal methods (focus groups) New household surveys Theory of change, important for attribution	Use of LISA REDD methods Surveys by SMS Demographic/health surveys Poverty mapping Other household surveys Census data Remote sensing Strategic Environmental Assessment/Livelihood Impact Assessment Commodity certification Existing projects

Who? 6 categories of stakeholders. This is country-specific and depends on indicators

- Government
- Civil society: NGOs and academia/research organisations
- Local communities
- Project proponents
- Consultants/auditors

Who keeps the data?

- In existing institutional structures, likely to be government at different levels.
- Need for high level inter-ministerial framework for information sharing with a mandate which includes information management.
- Multi-stakeholder platform for post-analysis and pre-reporting

Guidance:

- Need to make the difference clear between ‘intermediary outcomes’ and ‘long term impacts’
- Select best secondary data
- Develop decision support/decision-making tree tool for the different functions that give options to the countries. See tools developed for reference levels
- Decision support tool to include REDD phase or short term/long term objectives i.e. indicators that can be monitored in Phase 1 - Readiness and which will be also be relevant in Phase 2 - Implementation or Phase 3 – Results based payments of REDD+ (e.g. outcomes).

Group 2: Assessment

Monitoring, assessment, reporting and review - 2 scenarios were developed:

1. Scenario 1
 - a. Monitoring and evaluation program collects information, interpret and reports
 - b. Assessment of the quality or the M&E programme and its results
 - c. Other consultation/review (e.g. multi-stakeholder)
2. Scenario 2 – monitoring is a function of collecting and gathering data and assessment is interpreting the data and reviewing its accuracy
 - a. Data gathering/aggregation
 - b. Assessment of disparate information to determine, interpret, analyse
 - c. Review: quality, performance by entities managing REDD+ programme use for adaptive management

For scenario 1 (note that the group did not do further work on scenario 2)

1. Monitoring Monitoring and evaluation program collects information, interpret and reports	Options			
Who?	Government: one ministry	Government: multiple ministries coordinating	Government with other organization	Outsource to another organization
How to interpret/assess indicators?	Check list	Scoring	Narrative/qualitative	
2. Assessment Assessment of the quality or the M&E programme and its results	Options			
Who?	Internal audit in the same ministry	Different government unit	Independent 'auditor' a) Peer review by different government agency b) Expert review panel with government, civil, society etc c) Independent third party	
What?	Only report/results	Only M&E process	Both	
For 1. and 2.	Options			
What criteria followed?	Country defined criteria	International norm for safeguards reporting		
3. Review Other consultation/review (e.g. multi-stakeholder)	Options			
	government own adaptive management review of its program	Multi-stakeholder consultation process	If no independent evaluation then could add this here	

Group 3: Reviewing/reporting

Review					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who reviews/verifies? How findings reviewed/verified ? 	<p>Government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency responsible for REDD Ministry responsible for REDD Interministerial Government evaluation body President's/PM's office 	<p>Multi-stakeholder Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal process and established body Ad hoc review <p>Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshops – possibly with separate stakeholder groups Public hearings Public comments via web Social media 	<p>Technical experts</p> <p>Appointed by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donor agency Government Civil society Multi-stakeholder committee UNFCCC <p>Could be permanent review body</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Watchdog 	<p>Feedback Grievance Redress Mechanism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greivances/complaints Public comments Throughout design and implementation Ombudsmen 	<p>Frequency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review more frequently at start Periodic more detailed review Stakeholder request or other trigger for more detailed review
Reporting					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What information made public? 	<p>Assessment report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary Full results Process for collecting and assessing 	<p>Review report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations Process for review Inputs (eg comments) Response to inputs/comments 	<p>Action Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives/priorities Implementation plan 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How disseminated? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website Summary actively disseminated in local language 				

Discussion in plenary after report back

- Need for clarification on the boundaries between monitoring, assessment, review/verification and reporting and steps:

Workshop participants proposed the following typology of steps for three main functions

Steps	
Preliminary step: Definition of theory of change, identification of indicators etc	
1. Data collection	Monitoring & Assessment
2. Data compilation, aggregation	
3. Data analysis & interpretation	
4. Reporting on results of monitoring and assessment (draft assessment report)	
5. Review/verification	Review & Reporting
6. Report on review and revised assessment	
7. Action planning and implementation	Action planning

Approaches to explore for SIS:

- Review social impact assessments, LISA-REDD that makes distinction between impact Assessment (ex-ante) and impact evaluation (synchronous throughout implementation)
- National Forests Monitoring & Assessment (FAO): makes no difference between monitoring and assessment
- Need for a coordinated and specific M&E programme for REDD+ instead of disjointed responsibilities across different actors

17. Group work: brainstorming different approaches that could be explored for REDD+ SIS at national/sub-national levels

Participants were asked to break into three groups to work on SIS approaches for three different situations or 'case studies'

1. A country whose main objective for SIS is to show the highest performance on safeguards to external actors to attract finance (eg. Deliver a programme which is attractive to California markets), or to get recognition for international leadership.
2. A country whose main objective for SIS is to build confidence and support among national and local stakeholders and improve the design and implementation of their REDD+ program.
3. A country whose main objective for SIS is to meet the UNFCCC requirements.

In all 3 case studies the REDD+ programme includes:

- Both government programmes *and* private projects (ie. Nested projects), and
- Different jurisdictional levels ie. State/provincial programmes *and* national/federal programmes.

Scenarios: For each case study consider 2 alternative scenarios:

- a) Firstly you have plenty of funds. You have US\$250,000/ year or more for safeguards, plus you can use several FT equivalent people from a govt dept
- b) Then imagine you have very limited resources eg. 1 full time equivalent employee, and a very limited operational budget, eg. US\$50,000/year

Tasks

Describe – in terms of the options previously identified - the approach to Monitoring/data collection, Assessment, and Review & Reporting that would be appropriate for this scenario.

Score each scenario in terms of each of 5 variables (High, Medium, Low):

- Degree of transparency
- Level of stakeholder participation
- Accuracy
- Capturing variation

Note that none of the group work on case studies or scenarios was intended to develop a recommended process or to provide any judgment on how well the described process would respond to the UNFCCC requirements. The aim of the exercise was an initial exploration of different options for developing an SIS, and of the effect of different choices on performance against the criteria of transparency, accuracy etc.

Group 1 – SES aims to show high performance to external actors

Key attributes of an SIS that aims to show high performance for external actors

- Expert review
- Robust methodology
- Transparent international standards
- Topics of international priority eg biodiversity
- Effective grievance mechanism
- Less emphasis on stakeholder contribution
- Avoid complaints

High budget scenario

Monitoring & assessment

- Monitoring unit in the Ministry
- International researcher organization/universities
- Building capacity locally
- International experts input to design system and methods
- Project management
- Communities: best cases vs. check

What?

- Project level data up to international/certified standards
- CIFOR type research/surveys: what attributions?

- Statewide and nationwide data
- Primary and secondary data
- Financial management and anti-corruption
- Incentives (international, pressures) to prioritize

How?

Indicator assessment: adaptation

- a. Policy/binary/absence-presence/ detailed research (focused)
- b. Site sampling/state/municipality level data still structured
- c. Census. Big data, RS of forest cover, social media, crowd sourcing

Review & report

- Who?
 - a. Multistakeholder review process: committee/validation workshop/ wider consultation process/ role for REDD+ SES group?
 - b. Open to public comment
 - c. Review by international organizations/international advisory board
 - d. Independent verification/audit (Rainforest Alliance & co)
 - e. PR firm
- What?
 - a. Full report in English and national language
 - b. Full report public
 - c. Transparency in line with external requirements/pressures
 - d. Grievance mechanism
 - e. Address issues that are flagged
- How?
 - a. Systematic regular calendar of reports, workshops etc.
 - b. Website, multilingual, interactive maps. Flashy reports, videos of multistakeholders

Low budget scenario

Constraints/ priorities with less money

- More responsibilities given to projects to collect data
- Registry with conditions including monitoring
- Seek fully funded research groups/ODA to cover data collection costs
- Reduce the role of international experts using them only at the start and no longer change system over time
- Reduce primary data, no control sites calibration
- Proxy data instead of direct testing
- Maintain use of census data etc but simplify analysis
- Ensure clarity of tools and methods/ToR with a manual from the experts that is easy to apply and use online mentoring from experts
- Domestic verifiers/auditors instead of international
- Multistakeholder committee stays but minimize workshops (basic, every 2 or 3 a year, fewer people from local)
- Cut out international advisory board but keep online process

- Local PR firm
- The 'what' stays the same. Online but cut back the scale. Maintain comprehensive set of indicators addressing all the key issues. Less frequent assessment (3 to 5 years).

	More \$\$\$	Less \$
Capturing variation	***	*
Cost	***	**
Stakeholder participation	**	*
Transparency	***	***
Accuracy	***	**

Group 2 – SIS aims to build support among national and local stakeholders and improve implementation

Steps	More \$\$\$	Less \$
Definition of theory of change and prioritization of indicators	Multi-stakeholder process supported by PSIA/research	Prioritise indicators of relevance/importance to key stakeholders
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish REDD+ M&E unit attached to high level Ministry (possibly NSO) or semi-independent body (gov/NGOs. Uni) - use best secondary data sources and primary data (participatory monitoring) - Data compilation: REDD+ M&E unit - Analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Embed M&E expert in REDD Task Force or government expert/CSO team. - only secondary data, review process and stakeholder workshops to fill gaps for interpretation - piggyback on existing dataset - analysis by experts - national stakeholders workshops
Review and report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - interpretation in multiple stakeholder workshops or WG - feedback cycle iterative - Presentation of findings in national workshops of representative stakeholders and public consultation process - revised report 	Same

	- official approval - full report into public domain	
Action planning	- Plan to address/mitigate/prevent short falls, gaps, potential negative impacts developed by REDD+ task force relevant to ministries. - Periodic revision	Same

	More \$\$\$	Less \$
Capturing variation	***	*
Stakeholder participation	***	**
Transparency	***	***
Accuracy	***	**

Discussion:

- Time variable not taken into account – need consider time taken in particular for data collection and consultations.

Group 3 – SIS aims to meet UNFCCC requirements

	Less \$	More \$\$\$ –Domestic constituency as a second audience
Data collection	Only secondary data Focus on policy indicators primarily, secondarily process indicators and potentially intermediaries outcomes indicators	Same and add: Primary data collection with purposive sampling or representative sampling if there are already projects that can provide data
Compilation	Single full time government officer Or outsourced to non state actor such as NGOs or university	ODA to compensate other civil servants that are responsible for existing repository of data to submit data Dedicated SIS website
Analysis	Short narrative on each Cancun safeguards and easily accessible data online	

Report results		Workshops at subnational levels and provide capacity building
Review	Public review period online Multi-stakeholder forum on a regular basis in the capital city – no travel support	
Report review		Grievance mechanisms
Action plan	No action plan but official government response to comments	

	More \$\$\$	Less \$
Capturing variation	*	*1/2
Stakeholder participation	*	*1/2
Transparency	*	*1/2
Accuracy	*	*1/2

18. Development of initial recommendations for practitioners and policy makers using REDD+ SES or otherwise involved in developing SIS

Participants were asked to write ideas for recommendations for people in REDD+ countries responsible for developing SIS on cards. These were then clustered as follows:

Objectives & Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear objectives and indicators to identify the data needed before you start the monitoring process. This reduces the quantity of data and increases the usefulness of data. • Focus on a few core indicators • Clarify theory of change to define key indicators and prioritize for national/local stakeholders • Use a tiered approach to identify and prioritise indicators for different phases of REDD+: policy, process and outcome indicators coupled to results financing • Investing funds in design and baseline can reduce later effort and funding • Ex-ante assessment is essential to identify part of SIS objectives, indicators and attributes • SESA is the ex-ante part of SIS • Need comprehensive coverage of all safeguards issues for international recognition • Clear definition of safeguards issues and objectives is crucial for choosing relevant monitoring approaches • Separate outcome (impact) monitoring from process and governance (which are steps towards impacts)
Data sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using best existing data sources • Pay attention to attribution and causality – may necessitate additional data (funds)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Triangulate data for key indicators (use different data and methods) • Use project level and national data sources to complement each other • Pay attention to issues of attribution • Identify and analyze existing data before designing new data collection • Take advantage of existing data sources • Registration process to require/clarify monitoring information from projects/process • Invest in data management and storage
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Think about how much funding will be available for ongoing operations when designing SIS • Ensure expectations for SIS match the level of human and financial resources available
Assessment and review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate iterative process of assessing the system methods and data • Prioritize multi-stakeholder buy-in for M&E, review. • Review of SIS performance should <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include multi-stakeholder consultative process 2. Include independent external quality evaluation 3. Include the government SIS programs review process • Important to be clear what will be done with review findings • Review, monitoring and assessment process as well as results • Capacity building needed for effective stakeholder review and comments
Grievance mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback grievance redress mechanism to trigger more detailed review
Terminology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly define what is meant by monitoring, assessment and review • Monitoring and assessment involved the design of data collection and compilation as well as interpreting meaning and analyzing results to report on performance and progress
Institutional arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build SIS on existing processes and institutions • Dedicated REDD M&E unit and/or integrate functions across institutions • Integrated approach (cross-sector agreement)
Action plan/adaptive management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iterative process: assess/adapt/monitor • SIS should include action planning • Iterative process vital - adaptive management • Include action planning and monitor implementation
Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review monitoring and assessment process as well as results • Important to be clear what will be done with review findings
Cross-cutting issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need clear transparent process for assessment/scoring • Think about transparency at every stage • Refer to LISA REDD report for methodology guidance on outcome indicators and monitoring • Ensure that SIS is integrated with other REDD+ activities • Communities and local peoples can and should be allies throughout the process

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well thought out consultative processes will increase validity and buy-in but takes time. Bottom-up is good. • Build transparency and ownership via multi-stakeholder process
Enabling conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level support important to ensure effective use and sharing of information across government agencies • Incentivize safeguards

Suggestions for the form of potential guidance for practitioners and policy makers on development of SIS

Participants were asked what kind of guidance, in what form, could be most useful for people in REDD+ countries developing SIS. The following suggestions were made in plenary discussion.

- Provide guidance on mapping of institutions/agencies in government that are involved in SIS.
- Identify costs of SIS development and implementation for a range of countries – compare with costs of MRV of carbon, national forest inventories. Identify the costs for an example/model country.
- Define an operational framework for participatory processes: identifying institutions and functions.
- Develop decision support tools that break down different options, identifying pro and cons and trade-offs.
- Manage expectations between UNFCCC reporting and in country implementation.
- Terminology: try to be as clear and simple as possible to ensure understanding/level down the technical language for the country teams that work with SIS.

19. Next steps from this workshop

Following this workshop the REDD+ SES Secretariat will:

- Share a workshop report that records discussion and group work by end of June
- Share preliminary output from this workshop with country teams using REDD+ SES and get their feedback at REDD+ SES Exchange and Learning workshop, Bogor Indonesia 1-3 July
- Develop guidance/recommendations on development of SIS by November 2013, sharing drafts with this group and others for feedback in preceding months.

Annex 1 – Agenda

Day 1: Tuesday June 4th

Timetable	Topic
9a.m.	Coffee on arrival
9.15	Welcome, Objectives, logistics.
9.25	Participant Introductions
<i>Scene Setting and Methodology</i>	
10.00	Introduction to country approach to REDD+ safeguards and SIS
10.15	Introduction to REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards & challenges for assessing and monitoring safeguards performance.
10.35	Discussion & other perspectives on REDD+ safeguards information systems
11.15	COFFEE BREAK
11.30	Introduction to workshop methodology
<i>Learning from different approaches to monitoring and assessing.</i>	
11.40	Overview of Approaches
11.40	Joanna Durbin: the experience using REDD+ SES to feed into the development of a national safeguards information system in Acre, Brazil.
1200	Jeff Hayward: the Approaches of CCB and FSC to collecting and assessing information for certification.
1220	Crystal Davies: the approach used for monitoring and assessment by the WRI-GFI
1240	Mary Hobley/Michael Richards: the FLEGT approach to collection and assessment of information
1300	LUNCH
1400	Pam Jagger (CIFOR): studies of social and governance performance approaches to REDD+ safeguards
1420	Gernot Brodnig: approach used for supervision/ monitoring of safeguards implementation by international financial institutions (eg. World Bank)
1440	Saraswati Rodriguez: the experience using REDD+ SES to feed into the development of a national safeguards information system in Ecuador
1510	Discussion
1540	COFFEE BREAK
1555	Group work: Reviewing the framework
1700	Plenary presentation and discussion
1745	Close

Day 2: Wednesday June 5th

Timetable	Topic
0900	Re-cap on previous day Explanation of agenda day 2
0915	Group work: Reviewing the framework Plenary discussion
10.45	COFFEE BREAK
11.00	Group work: Brainstorming different approaches appropriate for REDD+ SIS at national/sub-national levels
13.00	LUNCH
14.00	Plenary feedback from group work Discussion
15.00	Development of initial recommendations for practitioners and policy makers
15.45	COFFEE BREAK
16.00	Development of initial recommendations for practitioners and policy makers, <i>Continued</i>
17.00	Next steps
17.30	Close

Annex 2- Participants list

1	Steve Swan	SNV	Vietnam
2	Priscilla Santos	IMAZON	Brazil
3	Crystal Davies	WRI	USA
4	Mary Hobley	Consultant	UK
5	Michael Richards	Forest Trends	UK
6	Cordula Epple	UNEP-WCMC/UN-REDD	UK
7	Pam Jagger	CIFOR/University North Carolina	USA
8	Jeff Hayward	Rainforest Alliance	USA
9	Gernot Brodnig	World Bank/FCPF	USA
10	Connie McDermott	Oxford University	UK
11	Mary Menton	CIFOR/Global Canopy Program	UK
12	Joanna Durbin	CCBA	
13	Aurelie Lhumeau	CCBA	
14	Phil Franks	CARE	
15	Dawn Robinson	Proforest	
16	Pavithra Ramani	Proforest	