UN-REDD
PROGRAMME

Social Principles Risk-Assessment Tool

Principle 1:
Good governance:The program complies with standards of good governance*.

Principle 2:
Stakeholder livelihoods: The program assesses potential adverse impacts on stakeholders long-term livelihoods and mitigates effects where appropriate.**

Principle 3:
Policy coherence: The program coheres with and complements sustainable development strategies and priorities, forestry plans and other relevant policies and treaties.

* Governance is defined as the complex mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their rights and obligations and mediate their differences
**Includes economic, cultural, social, physical, natural and political well-being.

Version: October 2010
United Nations Development Programme

Principle 1 – Good governance:Theprogrammecomplies with standards of good governance.	
Criterion 1 – Integrity of Fiduciary and Fund Management Systems	The programme has assessed and addressed corruption and fiduciary risks
Criterion 2 – Transparency and Accountability	programme administration and REDD+ readiness activities are carried out in an accountable and transparent manner.
Criterion 3 – Stakeholder participation	a) All relevant stakeholders are identified and enabled to participate in a meaningful and effective manner; b) Special attention is given to most vulnerable groups and the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples.
Principle 2 – Stakeholder livelihoods: Theprogramme assesses potential adverse impacts on stakeholders long-term livelihoods and mitigates effects where appropriate.	
Criterion 4 – Avoidance of involuntary resettlement	Theprogrammeis not involved and not complicit in involuntary resettlement.
Criterion 5 – Traditional Knowledge	Theprogrammeis not involved and not complicit in alteration, damage or removal of any critical cultural heritage or the erosion of traditional knowledge..
Criterion 6 – Social and political well-being	Social and political implications are assessed and adverse impacts on social and political structures mitigated. Benefits are shared equitably.
Principle 3 – Policy coherence: The programmecoheres with and complements sustainable development strategies and priorities, forestry plans and other relevant policies and treaties.	
Criterion 7 – Low-Emission, Climate Resilience Development Coherence	The programme coheres with relevant strategies and policies at all levels of government.

Update whenever framework paper is revised!

Overview and instructions

Tool overview: This is a risk-assessment tool. With the help of indicator questions that can be answered "yes" or "no", users are guided through assessing the programme for potential risks. Identified risks are categorized as follows:

Policy Risks:	Risks identified at the policy level present potential strategic risks to the programme. Risk mitigation actions should be taken at the policy or strategic level to ensure enabling conditions for the programme formulation and implementation.
Programmatic Risks:	Risks identified at the programme level present potential risks to programme design. Risk mitigation actions should be taken to allow for necessary structural improvement(s) to be made in the programme.
Operational Risks:	Risks identified at the operational level present potential risks to the operation of the programme. Risk mitigation actions should be taken to put in place appropriate operational procedures and mechanisms.

For reasons of simplified presentation, the tool includes a yes/no decision tree for each criterion and leads through a series of risk identification questions. However, rather than 'stopping' when a risk is identified, the assessment should be continued and identified risk mitigation actions should be collected into a report based on Risk Mitigation Action Plan guidelines *(currently being developed).*

Dark/light shading: The tool is designed to complement the REDD+ readiness process: Dark-shaded risk identification questions are general questions that can be answered at low or no costs because they do not require the consulting of further sources. They are intended to be addressed in early stages of the readiness process. Light-shaded risk identification questions can be addressed during implementation of UN-REDD national programmes or in later phases of readiness since they may require further consultation of sources or additional documentation. In particular, suggested risk mitigation strategies can only be assessed in later phases of readiness.

Iterative application: Rather than a rigid one-time assessment, the tool should be applied to a different extent and iteratively throughout readiness design, implementation and monitoring. Ideally, policy risks identified early in the process will be addressed so as to facilitate the mitigation of related program and operational risks. As such, all identified risks should be interpreted as an opportunity to make the programme more effective and sustainable and does not imply that the programme cannot be designed in a rigorous, low-risk manner.

Additional guidance: There is no "one tool fits all" approach since programmes may include a large range of activities. It will therefore be necessary to add further social due diligence considerations! Also, where risk areas are identified that cannot be sufficiently mitigated, the tool should be used in conjunction with other standards and best guidance for addressing these particular risk areas.

Most importantly: The tool isdesigned to provide a standardized structure for thinking through and assessing a complex and multi-dimensional problem and enable consistent decision-making. It is not a standardized decision-making tool and does not replace good judgment!

Criterion 1 – Integrity of fiduciary and fund management systems
The programme has assessed and addressed corruption and fiduciary risks

Recommended Risk Mitigation Action:

POLICY

Has the government ratified the UN Convention against Corruption and/or other regional or international anti-corruption instruments [1]?

NO → Does the country have its own credible legislation in place enforcing this criterion?

NO → Has the programme demonstrated how it will go beyond current national practice?

NO → Anti-corruption strategy to be prepared

YES → Does the country actively enforce the principles from these conventions?

YES → Does the country have its own credible legislation in place enforcing this criterion?

YES → Has the programme demonstrated how it will go beyond current national practice?

NO → Does the country actively enforce the principles from these conventions?

YES → Is there a recent assessment of corruption in the country [2]?

PROGRAMME

YES → Has the country been assessed to have a high level of perceived/ experienced corruption?

YES → Has the programme analyzed corruption types, magnitude and points of occurrence and emerging corruption risks and demonstrated how it will overcome these challenges?

NO → Corruption risks and mitigation measures to be identified

NO → Is corruption known or likely to be common in the country's forestry and other natural resources sectors?

YES → Are there transparent anti-corruption controls or similar programmes for the forestry and natural resources sectors offered in the country?

NO → Will the programme participate in such anti-corruption controls?

NO → Has the programme established plans to work with national or local anti-corruption bodies (footnote : e.g. anti corruption commissions of or anti corruption units within other relevant institutions)

NO → Relevant national and/or local anti-corruption bodies and partnership strategies to be identified

OPERATION

Does the programme apply the accepted United Nations process for fund management and dispersal (eg. Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT)) to the use of all UN-REDD funds [3]?

NO → Appropriate process to be followed / measures to be in place in accordance with UN standards

YES → Will any UN-REDD funds be transferred to implementing partners before a micro-assessment is undertaken and assurance measures are in place [3]?

NO → Appropriate process to be followed / measures to be in place in accordance with UN standards

YES → Do all UN-REDD agencies apply the same cash transfer modality [3]?

NO → Does the programme have a results-based monitoring and reporting system?

NO → Appropriate result-based management measures to be applied in accordance with RBM Guidelines

YES → Does the programme have a results-based monitoring and reporting system?

YES → Social principles risk screens should apply to programme components delivered by partners, contractors and other third parties

Principle 1 – Good governance

Criterion 2 - Transparency and Accountability:
programme administration and REDD+ readiness activities are carried out in an accountable and transparent manner.

Recommended Risk Mitigation Action:

PROGRAMME

Does the programme disclose information to rights holders and stakeholders in accordance with UN-REDD policies? [1]

NO → If not, does the programme clearly justify why disclosure practice differs?

NO → Appropriate justification to be provided

YES

Are all public and private institutions that are involved in programme design, implementation, administration and monitoring identified ?

NO → All programme actors and their responsibilities to be clearly identified

YES → Are all decision-makers and programme actors within these institutions identified and held accountable for their actions [1]?

NO

YES

Is there a recent national multi-stakeholder governance assessment for REDD+ [2]?

NO → Is there a recent third-party governance assessment recognized in the country?

NO → Governance risk assessment to be undertaken

YES → Does the national government commit to recognize and build upon the results of the assessment?

NO

YES

OPERATION

Are reliable channels for dissemination of information to stakeholders and the general public established [3]?

NO → Appropriate mechanisms to be placed

YES

Is accurate and comprehensive information available in a format that is accessible for all relevant stakeholders in a timely manner to enable participation[4]?

NO

YES

Does the programme affect, establish or allocate land or property or user rights?

NO

YES → Has the programme established a transparent establishment/allocation mechanism?

NO → Necessary mechanisms /processes to be established in accordance with UN-REDD policies

YES

Does the programme involve the distribution of REDD+ benefits?

NO

YES → Has the programme established a transparent benefit distribution mechanism?

NO → Necessary mechanisms /processes to be established in accordance with UN-REDD policies

YES

Are appropriate processes in place for stakeholders to provide feedback on the distribution of benefits from REDD+ ?

NO → Necessary mechanisms /processes to be established in accordance with UN-REDD policies

YES

Does the programme incorporate an accessible, impartial and transparent mechanism to resolve disputes under this criterion?

NO → Necessary mechanisms /processes to be established in accordance with UN-REDD policies

YES

Social principles risk screens should apply to programme components delivered by partners, contractors and other third parties

UN-REDD PROGRAMME

Principle 1 – Good governance

Criterion 3 – Stakeholder participation[1]:
a) All relevant stakeholders are identified and enabled to participate in a meaningful and effective manner.

Recommended Risk Mitigation Action :

PROGRAMME

- Have all relevant groups of stakeholders been identified [2]?
  - NO → Stakeholders and their interests should be identified and documented
  - YES → Have stakeholder interests been identified and documented?
    - NO → Stakeholders and their interests should be identified and documented
    - YES →
- Have rights (statutory and customary) to land, territories and resources been documented comprehensively?
  - NO → Stakeholder rights, land and resource claims should be documented
  - YES → Have reliable maps been established for affected forest areas?
    - NO → Stakeholder rights, land and resource claims should be documented
    - YES → Have (potentially) overlapping claims for land or resources been identified?
      - NO → Programme should include process for maintaining impartial and equitable distribution of benefits
      - YES → Does the programme outline how carbon rights and other benefits are distributed impartially?
        - NO → Programme should include process for maintaining impartial and equitable distribution of benefits
        - YES → Has the programme demonstrated that it will not impact decisions in dispute situations?
          - NO → Programme should include process for maintaining impartial and equitable distribution of benefits
          - YES →

OPERATION

- Have all relevant stakeholder groups been actively invited to engage in a timely manner and in appropriate format/language?
  - NO → Programme must follow the Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities
  - YES → Do representatives have authority to represent stakeholder groups and can be held accountable by them[3]?
    - NO → Programme must follow the Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities
    - YES → Are representatives able to report all relevant information accurately back to stakeholder groups in a timely manner to seek their feedback?
      - NO → Programme must follow the Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities
      - YES → Are stakeholders meaningfully involved in designing the stakeholder participation process and mechanism?
        - NO → Programme must follow the Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities
        - YES → Have potential positive and negative impacts been communicated comprehensively to corresponding stakeholders?
          - NO → Programme must follow the Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities
          - YES → Do stakeholders have access to additional external and independent expertise including legal advice?
            - NO → Programme must follow the Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities
            - YES → Are stakeholders regularly, timely , free of costs, accurately and in appropriate format/language informed about program updates?
              - NO → Programme should include an accessible and impartial recourse mechanism
              - YES → Are consultations and received feedback documented in a comprehensive and consistent manner and made available for further review by stakeholders?
                - NO → Programme should include an accessible and impartial recourse mechanism
                - YES → Does the programme incorporate an accessible, transparent and impartial grievance mechanism for all stakeholders?
                  - NO → Programme should include an accessible and impartial recourse mechanism
                  - YES → Social principles risk screens should apply to programme components delivered by partners, contractors and other third parties

Criterion 3 – Stakeholder participation[1]:
b) Special attention is given to most vulnerable groups and the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples.

Recommended Risk Mitigation Action :

POLICY

Did the country vote in favor of or endorse the UN Declaration on the rights of indigenous people [4]?
- NO → Has the programme analyzed reasons for lack of support and demonstrated how it will overcome areas of country-specific concerns?
  - NO → Programme demonstrate how it will go beyond current national practice
  - YES
- YES

Has the country ratified the ILO Convention 169 (Indigenous and Tribal Populations Convention) [5]?
- NO → Has the programme analyzed reasons for lack of support and demonstrated how it will overcome areas of country-specific concerns?
- YES → Does the country have effective and active legislation in place that reflects the commitments made through these treaties?
  - NO → Indigenous peoples' rights and territories should be documented
  - YES

PROGRAMME

Will the programme impact the rights of indigenous peoples to their traditional lands, territories, resources or livelihoods?
- NO → National commitments to respect indigenous peoples rights should be documented
- YES

Does the program provide comprehensive documentation identifying affected indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities?
- NO → Programme should include arrangements to protect the rights of indigenous peoples living in isolation
- YES

Are some indigenous people living in voluntary isolation?
- YES → Are measures taken to protect these groups' rights even in absence of direct consultation?
  - NO → Programme should include arrangements to protect the rights of indigenous peoples living in isolation
  - YES
- NO

OPERATION

Have interest and rights (both statutory and customary) of indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities and potential impacts of REDD programmes been thoroughly analyzed and communicated to these groups?
- NO → Indigenous peoples' rights and territories should be documented
- YES → Are existing local institutions, processes, networks and authorities leveraged to engage indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups?
  - NO → Indigenous peoples' rights and territories should be documented
  - YES → Are consultations conducted and information disseminated in a culturally appropriate manner and sufficiently timely to allow for effective participation?
    - NO → Programme must follow the Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities
    - YES → Are clear objectives for consultations laid out including indicators for success/results?
      - NO → Programme must follow the Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities
      - YES

Will the programme undertake a consultative process to seek the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities that may be impacted by the programme? [6]
- NO → Programme must follow the Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities
- YES

Are mechanisms for dispute resolution established and consequences and procedures defined for cases where consent is not given or the community's decision is not respected?
- NO → Programme should include an accessible and impartial recourse mechanism
- YES → Will there be external/independent verification of stakeholder engagement processes?
  - NO → Programme should include an accessible and impartial recourse mechanism
  - YES

Social principles risk screens should apply to programme components delivered by partners, contractors and other third parties

Criterion 4 – Avoidance of involuntary resettlement:
The programme is not involved and not complicit in involuntary resettlement.

Recommended Risk Mitigation Action:

POLICY

Has the government ratified the ILO convention 169 [1]?

NO → **Does the country have its own legislation in place prohibiting involuntary resettlement?**

YES → National commitments to respect indigenous peoples rights should be documented

NO → **Has the programme demonstrated how it will go beyond current national practice?**

NO → Programme demonstrate how it will go beyond current national practice

YES

YES

PROGRAMME

Is any resettlement envisaged by the programme ?

YES → **Can the programme demonstrate that where any relocation or displacement, whether physical or economic, occurs in accordance with free, prior and informed consent, there is prior agreement on the provision of alternative lands and/or fair compensation, and the right to return once the reasons for the displacement have ceased?**

NO → Programme must follow the Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities

NO

YES

Are there communities/individuals with statutory and/or customary rights to forest land and/or resources relevant to the programme ?

NO → Stakeholder rights, land and resource claims should be documented

YES

OPERATION

Is a mechanism in place to receive and resolve grievances and disputes effectively relating to resettlement?

NO → Programme should include an accessible and impartial recourse mechanism

Social principles risk screens should apply to programme components delivered by partners, contractors and other third parties

Criterion 5 – Traditional Knowledge:
The programme is not involved and not complicit in alteration, damage or removal of any critical cultural heritage or the erosion of traditional knowledge.

Recommended Risk Mitigation Action:

POLICY

Has the country signed/ratified or adopted relevant international treaties, conventions and/or other instruments and enforces them [1]?

NO → **Does the country have its own legislation in place protecting traditional knowledge and/or cultural heritage?**

YES → National commitments to respect cultural heritage and traditional knowledge should be documented

NO → **Has the programme demonstrated how it will go beyond current national practice?**

NO → Programme should demonstrate how it will go beyond current national practice

YES

YES

PROGRAMME

Are any possible areas where the programme does not, or may not, comply with the relevant local and national laws and international treaties, conventions and other instruments identified and monitored?

YES → Programme should demonstrate how it will comply with relevant legal instruments

NO

Does the programme include any MRV and/or monitoring activities, that could affect traditional usufruct rights?

NO → Stakeholder rights, land and resource claims should be documented

YES

OPERATION

Is a mechanism in place to receive and resolve grievances and disputes effectively relating to traditional knowledge?

NO → Programme should include an accessible and impartial recourse mechanism

YES

Social principles risk screens should apply to programme components delivered by partners, contractors and other third parties

Criterion 6 – Social and political well-being:
Social and political implications are assessed and adverse impacts on social and political structures mitigated. Benefits are shared equitably. [1]

Recommended Risk Mitigation Action:

POLICY

Has the country signed/ratified or adopted relevant international treaties, conventions and/or other instruments [2]?

NO → Does the country have its own credible legislation in place enforcing this criterion?

NO → Has the programme demonstrated how it will go beyond current national practice?

YES → Appropriate measures to be introduced

NO → Are there possible areas where the design and/or implementation of the programme does not, or may not, comply with the relevant local and national laws and international treaties, conventions and/or other instruments?

YES → Appropriate justification to be provided

NO → Appropriate assessment to be conducted

YES (Has the country signed/ratified…?) / YES (Does the country have its own credible legislation…?) / NO (Are there possible areas…?)

PROGRAMME

Is there an participatory assessment of positive and negative social, cultural, human rights and political impacts of the REDD+ programme for Indigenous Peoples and local communities including both predicted and actual impacts [3]?

NO → Is there a participatory process to assess how programme activities might impact social and political structures and in particular how empowerment of most vulnerable groups might be impacted?

NO → Appropriate assessment to be conducted

YES → Are any of the intended impacts of the programme expected to be negative?

YES → Will the risks of negative impacts on social and political well-being be reviewed throughout the programme cycle?

NO → Have social and political drivers of deforestation been analyzed and does the programme address the underlying interests of stakeholders?

NO → Appropriate analyses to be carried out

YES (Is there an participatory assessment…?) / YES (Are any of the intended impacts…?) / YES (Will the risks of negative impacts…?) / YES (Have social and political drivers…?)

Are there transparent, participatory, effective and efficient mechanisms for establishing equitable sharing of benefits of the REDD+ programme among and within relevant rights holder and stakeholder groups taking into account costs, benefits and associated risks?

OPERATION

YES → Is a mechanism in place to receive and resolve grievances and disputes effectively relating to the distribution of benefits?

NO → Does the programme identify and use a process for effective resolution of any disputes over rights to lands, territories and resources related to the programme?

NO → Appropriate mechanisms /processes to be established in accordance with Operational Guidance

YES (Is a mechanism in place…?) / YES (Does the programme identify…?)

Is there is full and effective participation of relevant rights holders and stakeholders that want to be involved, including the marginalized and/or vulnerable people among them, in defining the decision-making process and the distribution mechanism for equitable benefit-sharing among and within relevant rights holders and stakeholder groups?

NO → Appropriate mechanisms /processes to be established in accordance with Operational Guidance

YES → **Social principles risk screens should apply to programme components delivered by partners, contractors and other third parties**

Criterion 7 – Low Emission, Climate Resilient Development Coherence
Economic implications are assessed and adverse impacts are mitigated except for where they are intended.

Recommended Risk Mitigation Action:

POLICY

Is there an detailed assessment of the GHG abatement potential of REDD+ in the country?
- NO → Appropriate assessment /estimation to be completed
- YES → Have the potential economic costs of implementing REDD+ been estimated for the country[1]?
  - NO → Appropriate assessment /estimation to be completed
  - YES → Has a cost curve been estimated for REDD+ in the country at different CO2e prices?
    - NO → Appropriate estimation to be completed
    - YES → Will the estimated costs be more than the potential benefits?
      - YES → Appropriate strategic adjustments to be made
      - NO

PROGRAMME

Does the programme elaborate how its policies and measures will contribute to the implementation of existing sustainable development and poverty reduction policies, strategies and plans developed at national and other relevant levels?
- NO → Appropriate strategic integration process to be completed
- YES → Is the national REDD+ strategy part of a low-emission, climate resilient development strategy?
  - NO → Appropriate strategic integration process to be completed
  - YES → Is there a regular and ongoing multi-sectoral process involving national planning and other relevant bodies of governments/institutions/divisions to implement the strategy?
    - NO → Appropriate multi-sectoral mechanism(s) to be established in a nationally acceptable manner
    - YES

Is there an assessment of the likely impact of implementing REDD+ on job creation and off-farm rural livelihoods?
- NO → Appropriate assessment to be conducted
- YES → Are stakeholders provided access to alternative livelihoods?
  - NO → Appropriate options to be assessed and presented
  - YES

Social principles risk screens should apply to programme components delivered by partners, contractors and other third parties

Criterion 1 – Integrity of Fiduciary and Fund Management Systems

[1] Status of ratification can be found at http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/signatories.html.
[Need to add in references for appropriate regional instruments]

[2] [Need to add examples of possible assessments, potentially such as http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2009/cpi_2009_table]

[3] See http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=255 for more information concerning the HACT

Criterion 2 – Transparency and Accountability

[1] UN-REDDProgramme Information Disclosure Policy will be presented to the Policy Board during the November 2010 meeting. Once approved, the Policy will be available for download at www.un-redd.org

[2] National multi-stakeholder governance assessment for REDD+ are modeled on UNDP's "Country-led Governance Assessments". See http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=1296&Itemid=53 for more details.

[3] "Reliable channels" also refers to assigning clear responsibility for information dissemination to one or more appropriate persons and to identifying appropriate forums for information dissemination (websites, expert groups, etc.).

[4] Accessibility of information refers in particular to language (i.e. local language necessary for example for indigenous peoples and English for international community) and medium (e.g. online, via mail, stakeholder meetings, expert forums, radio where high rate of illiteracy etc.)

Criterion 3 – Stakeholder participation*

[1] See the *UN-REDD programmeme Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities:* **http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=455&Itemid=53**.

[2] Stakeholder refers to a person or group of persons that can affect or may be affected by the programme. In the context of REDD, stakeholder include in particular the following groups:

- Forest dwellers including both persons/communities with statutory and with customary rights to land, territories and forest products/services
- Forest-dependent persons and communities including those that depend on upstream/downstream industries (e.g. wood working and transporting industry) and consumers of essential forest goods and services (in particular fuelwood and agricultural products) and who might be impacted by price changes
- programme developers and employees as well as contractors and supplying companies or organizations
- All levels of government in the country
- Civil society in the country and internationally
- UN REDDprogrammeme representatives

Note that stakeholders may live in REDD-targeted forest areas but also outside these areas and even outside the national boundary (in particular stakeholders that might be impacted by price changes for fuelwood).

[3] Note that representative might not necessarily be form within the group – For example, a (male) lawyer might represent a group of indigenous women. This is in line with the criterion as long as it was an informed and free selection and as long as the representative can be fully held accountable by the group.

Criterion 3 – Stakeholder participation (continued)

[4] The Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (document A/61/L.67) was adopted by a recorded vote of 143 in favour to 4 against, with 11 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia (endorsed later), Canada, New Zealand, United States.

Abstain: Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burundi, Colombia (endorsed later), Georgia, Kenya, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Samoa (endorsed later), Ukraine.

Absent: Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Israel, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Tajikistan, Togo, Tonga, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu.

[6] Ratification status can be checked at http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/cgi-lex/ratifce.pl?C169 .

[7] The Report of the *International Workshop on Methodologies Regarding Free Prior and Informed Consent E/C.19/2005/3,* endorsed by the UNPFII at its Fourth Session in 2005, defines the elements as follows:

Free *should imply no coercion, intimidation or manipulation;*

Prior *should imply consent has been sought sufficiently in advance of any authorization or* commencement of activities and respect time requirements of indigenous consultation/consensus processes;

Informed *should imply that information is provided that covers (at least) the following aspects:*
a. The nature, size, pace, reversibility and scope of any proposed project or activity;
b. The reason/s or purpose of the project and/or activity;
c. The duration of the above;
d. The locality of areas that will be affected;
e. 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;
f. Personnel likely to be involved in the execution of the proposed project (including Indigenous Peoples, private sector staff, research institutions, government employees and others)
g. 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 is 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.

Criterion 4 – Avoidance of involuntary resettlement

[1] Ratification status can be checked at http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/cgi-lex/ratifce.pl?C169 .

Criterion 5 – Traditional Knowledge

[1] Relevant conventions include in particular the UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext) and the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=17716&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html).

For ratification status, refer to http://portal.unesco.org/la/convention.asp?language=E&KO=13055 and http://portal.unesco.org/la/convention.asp?language=E&KO=17116&order=alpha.

See table prepared by CIEL of relevant human rights conventions and treaties: http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=2327&Itemid=53

Criterion 6 – Social and political well-being

[1] ***Social*** well-being refers to an individual's or a group of individuals' standing within the community, social networks and opportunities, social security etc.

Political well-being refers to an individual's or a group of individuals' empowerment and influence on decision-making within the community and beyond. It furthermore includes the freedom to express opinion without the fear of negative consequences.

[2] Relevant treaties include in particular:

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-4&chapter=4&lang=en
International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination
http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-2&chapter=4&lang=en
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-8&chapter=4&lang=en

[3] For further explanation of appropriate participatory processes, see the *UN-REDD programme Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities:* **http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=455&Itemid=53**.

Criterion 7 – Low-Emission, Climate Resilient Development Coherence

[1] **will need to put in a note explaining what is meant by economic costs, including opportunity costs**