**DRAFT UN-REDD Programme - Social Principles Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool - Overview**

**Introduction**

The UN-REDD Programme is developing a [framework of environmental and social principles](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4592&Itemid=53) to ensure that UN obligations and commitments are met in REDD+ programmes. These obligations, encompassing UN policies and declarations together with international law, represent the output of a wide range of international processes and negotiations. The framework is organized into a set of broad principles, within which a number of criteria describe the dimensions to be considered. The framework will also provide guidance as to how the potential environmental and social multiple benefits of REDD+ can be enhanced and optimized.

The Framework is made up of two components, a minimum standard risk identification and mitigation framework and an assessment of impact magnitude for multiple benefits from REDD+. Through this Framework, the Programme aims to support countries in carrying out due diligence with respect to assessing risks to the multiple benefits that forests provide. The framework has been developed to complement safeguard processes being elaborated by other multi-lateral REDD+ initiatives and civil society coalitions, such as FCPF’s Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) approach and the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (SES), being facilitated by Care and CCBA. For example, the risk assessment tool can be used to inform these processes or demonstrate how national readiness activities meet safeguard standards.

The Social Principles Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool is an initial step in rolling out the full framework. The purpose of the tool is to identify and mitigate risks to social principles at a national programme scale. Its objectives are to improve program design and increase program’s sustainability, and to assist in prioritizing programs for UN-REDD participation and in efficiently managing resources for further due diligence work. Draft Environmental Principles and Criteria are also being developed, along with tools for the application of environmental principles and criteria.

|  |
| --- |
| **UN-REDD Programme Social Principles and Criteria** |
| **Principle 1 – Democratic governance: The programme complies with standards of democratic governance** |
| Criterion 1 – Ensure the integrity of fiduciary and fund management systems: The programme has assessed and addressed fiduciary and fund management risks |
| Criterion 2 – Implement activities in a transparent and accountable manner: Programme administration and REDD+ readiness activities are carried out in an accountable and transparent manner. |
| Criterion 3 – Ensure broad stakeholder participation: a) All relevant stakeholder groups 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: The programme carefully assesses potential adverse impacts on stakeholders’ long-term livelihoods and mitigates effects where appropriate.** |
| Criterion 4 – Promote gender equality Programme planning and REDD+ readiness activities are carried out with attention to different gender roles and women’s empowerment. |
| Criterion 5 – Avoid involuntary resettlement The programme is not involved and not complicit in involuntary resettlement. |
| Criterion 6 – Respect 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. |
| Criterion 7 – Develop equitable benefit distribution systems Benefits (including revenues) are shared equitably |
| **Principle 3 – Policy coherence: The programme contributes to a low-carbon, climate-resilient and environmentally sound development policy, consistent with commitments under international conventions and agreements.** |
| Criterion 10 – Ensure consistency with development policy objectives The programme is designed to be compatible with and contribute to poverty reduction strategies and other existing sustainable development goals at all levels of government. Social and economic implications of REDD+ programme are carefully assessed and adverse impacts mitigated where appropriate. |

The AWC-LCA outcome of the UNFCCC COP 16 requests developing countries to, among others, develop a system for providing information on how the AWC-LCA safeguards are addressed and respected throughout the implementation of REDD+ activities to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, while conserving and enhancing forest carbon stocks and sustainably managing forests. The table below aims to illustrate how the UN-REDD framework of social and environmental Principles mirrors the AWC-LAC safeguards, as well as how the UN-REDD safeguarding framework together with the AWC-LAC safeguards is positioned within a national REDD+ programme in a generic term.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Principle** | **Relevant section of** [**Cancun Agreement**](http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/cop_16/application/pdf/cop16_lca.pdf)**, Annex I** |
| Principle 1 – Democratic governance: The programme complies with standards of democratic governance | 2(b) Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty  2(d) The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular, indigenous peoples and local communities (…) |
| Principle 2 – Stakeholder livelihoods: The programme carefully assesses potential adverse impacts on stakeholders long-term livelihoods and mitigates effects where appropriate | 2(c) Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities, by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws, and noting that the General Assembly has adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples |
| Principle 3 – Coherence with broader policy framework: The programme coheres with and complements sustainable development strategies and priorities, forest plans and other relevant policies and treaties | 2(a) Actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements  2(f) Actions to address the risk of reversals |
| Principle 4 – Protect and conserve natural forests: The programme protects natural forests from degradation or conversion to other land uses, including plantation forests | 2(e) Actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that actions (…) are not used for the conversion of natural forests but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services (…) |
| Principle 5 – Maintain and enhance multiple functions of forest: The programme increases benefits delivered through ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation | 2(e) Actions that (…) incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services (…)  2(e) Actions are (…) used to (…) enhance other social and environmental benefits |
| Principle 6 – Minimise indirect land-use change: The programme minimises displacement of emissions, and of harm to biodiversity, at and beyond national levels | 2(e) Actions that are consistent with the conservation of… biological diversity…  2(g) Actions to reduce displacement of emissions |

### How and When to Apply the Tool

The risk identification and mitigation tool presents a series of risk identification questions organized under each criterion. The tool leads the user through a matrix of risk identification questions that provides an indication for whether or not the program has the potential to create social risks in the areas of good governance, stakeholder livelihoods and policy coherence. Where risks are identified, the tool recommends risk mitigation actions to be taken by the program.

The tool presents a series of risk identification questions organized as a screen for each criterion. Starting from the criterion statement in the blue box at the top of each screen, the tool leads the user through a matrix of risk identification questions that can be answered on a YES/NO basis and provide an indication for whether or not the program has the potential to create social risks in the areas of good governance, stakeholder livelihoods and policy coherences.

Recognizing that countries participating in the UN-REDD Programme are at different stages in programme development and implementation, the tool can be applied iteratively and at different points in the programming process:

* For countries in the process of planning UN-REDD National Programme activities, the risk assessment screens should be used as a guide for program formulation so as to avoid risks from the outset;
* For countries that have already begun implementing UN-REDD National Programme activities, the risk assessment screens can be used as part of the annual and mid-term review processes or as part of the stakeholder participation activities already incorporated in programme design; and
* For partner countries seeking general guidance for their readiness planning, the risk assessment tool can be applied to the national readiness planning framework to identify risks and increase the overall sustainability and effectiveness of readiness interventions.

For UN-REDD Programme countries, risks identified by the tool will be detailed in the National Programme document ‘risk log’ – where risks and associated risk mitigation measures are listed for the purpose of monitoring. Recommended risk mitigation measures should be undertaken during program elaboration, inception, and implementation, as indicated when the measures are recorded in the risk log. The risk assessment tool should be accessible to program stakeholders for their reference. As such, the tool serves as guidance to improve program rigor and sustainability over time.

***Tool overview:*** 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 risk log report based on Risk Mitigation Action Plan Instructions *(below).*

Identified risks are categorized as follows:

**Policy Risks:** Risks identified at the policy level present potential strategic risks to the programmeme. Risk mitigation actions should be taken during programme scoping and formulation.

**Programmatic Risks:** Risks identified at the programme level present potential risks to programme design. Risk mitigation actions should be taken during programme inception and implementation.

**Operational Risks:** Risks identified at the operational level present potential risks to the operation of the programme. Risk mitigation actions should be taken during programme implementation.

***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 programme formulation or inception. 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. Recommended risk mitigation actions may either be implemented .early in programme design and development or as part of implementation, as appropriate.

***Iterative application:*** Rather than a rigid one-time assessment, the tool should be applied to a different extent and iteratively throughout the readiness phase, programme 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 to improve the potential for the REDD+ country to demonstrate that its overall REDD+ strategy fulfills broader safeguard requirements, such as those elaborated by UNFCCC.

***National Context:*** There is no “one tool fits all” approach since programmes may include a large range of activities and may be affected by nationally specific circumstances. Due to the nature of the social issues covered by the tool’s principles and criteria, it is important to recognize that the identification of risks may be subjective, according to the role and objectives of the entity performing the assessment. In order to ensure as credible and legitimate evaluation of social risks as possible, it is essential to link the risk identification process to the stakeholder participation mechanism being employed as part of the national programme development, approval process and implementation, as described in the Instructions below

Where risk areas are identified that cannot be sufficiently mitigated as part of programme planning and design, the tool should be used in conjunction with other standards and best guidance for addressing these particular risk areas, these are captured in the tool’s recommended risk mitigation actions.

The tool is designed 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!

**Instructions**

1. **User and Purpose of the Tool**

The Social Principles Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool may be used by different actors, including the UN-REDD Programme staff, national government counterparts, development partners, NGOs and other interest groups, with varying objectives.

The tool may initially be used by the UN-REDD Programme staff to screen for major risk areas to identify specific capacity and investment gaps of potential REDD+ countries to provide key information to be considered during a country programme prioritization process.

The tool, however, is designed primarily to assist national UN-REDD programme countries to screen for specific risk areas to be considered and addressed during their programme design, and to monitor those identified risks and screen for any new risks that might arise during programme implementation through periodic review process in order to avoid the risk of adverse social and environmental impacts.

Meanwhile, other stakeholders may apply the tool to better understand their rights and opportunities for participation.

It can also be expected that the tool ownership will shift over time from UN-REDD agency staff conducting programme-level assessments to national programme administrators and stakeholders monitoring ongoing compliance.

1. **Consultative Process**

As briefly mentioned above, the tool can assist its users to identify potential programme countries, and to design and implement a national programme with clear risk identification parameters and a framework for mitigation actions.

In designing a national programme, the tool should be applied in conjunction with the consultative process undertaken as part of the programme planning and approval process. The tool may also be used as an input to the participatory process undertaken as part of the national programme activities, including the consultation of national and local governments, Indigenous Peoples and other forest dependent communities, NGOs, industries, development partners and academia. Aligning the stakeholder participation and social principles due diligence processes, ensures that any nuances and subtleties found in the tool are recognized and clarified collectively to authenticate specific national circumstances which a national REDD+ programme should be designed to respond to. Therefore, it is desirable for the multi-stakeholder body engaged in the participatory process for the national programme to be fully involved in the identification, monitoring and updating of any social and environmental risks as part of the broader national consultation process during programme design and throughout the national programme implementation.

**Stakeholder Engagement in the UN-REDD Programme:**

The [FCPF and UN-REDD Programme Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness with a Focus on Indigenous Peoples and Other Forest Dependent Communities](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4628&Itemid=53) outlines the measures that must be included in programme design and implementation to ensure that stakeholders are fully engaged in all aspects of programme development, implementation and monitoring.

Each programme must undergo a consultation process, which is broadly described in eight-steps. Entry-points for linking application of the Social Principles Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool are described below:

**1- Define the desired outcomes of consultations:** Participatory application of the Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool may be a desired outcome of the consultation process.

**2- Develop a Consultation and Participation Plan and request endorsement through a national stakeholder workshop:** The initial results of the application of the tool during programme planning and development should be shared with the national stakeholder workshop for review.

**3- Select the consultation and outreach methods:** The initial results of early application of Social Principles Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool (risks identified and mitigation measures planned) should be among the information disseminated as part of the consultation and outreach methods.

**4- Define the issues to consult on:** Social risks and mitigation measures may be among the issues that stakeholders wish to engage on – they may wish to conduct a full application of the tool, review the results of earlier application of the tool, or review and comment on risk mitigation measures planned or underway.

**5- Identify stakeholders:** Programme stakeholders are broadly defined as representatives of the public sector, the private sector, civil society, academia, and indigenous peoples and forest dependent communities. Each of these groups may have different perspectives on social risks and mitigation measures.

**6- Establish grievance redress mechanism:** A key component of risk mitigation is access to an effective grievance redress mechanism. This mechanism should be established via the national consultation process.

**7- Conduct the consultations:** Consultations should include a component on the UN-REDD Programme’s Social Principles and Criteria, with the option of reviewing the Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool and any risk mitigation measures that are planned or underway.

**8- Analyze and disseminate results:** The results of the consultation process should include, among other elements, any results from application Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool or review of planned risk mitigation measures and a description of the agreed mechanism for grievance redress.

1. **Creating a Risk Log**

Based on consultations undertaken during programme planning and development, the multi-stakeholder body should contribute to the population of the risk log, which is a required element of the national joint programme document at the time of submission. The multi-stakeholder body should also provide key information during annual, mid-term and terminal reviews and periodically update the risk log as programme implementation progresses and new consideration arise,

Three major risk categories for readiness activities are proposed – Policy, Programme and Operational Risks – as described earlier. Based on these categories, each risk and mitigation action identified through the application of the tool should be described succinctly in a risk log along with a specific success indicator, milestone date and means of verification. In addition, each identified risk should have a clear reference to a specific question under specific principle and criterion. The below table illustrates how a risk log should look like:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Principle One: Democratic Governance | | | | | | |
| Criterion One: Integrity of fiduciary and fund management | | | | | | |
| Risk Category | Risk[[1]](#footnote-1) Code | Description | Mitigation Action | Indicator | Milestone date | Verifier |
| Policy | i. B.1. | The country has not ratified UN Convention against Corruption. Although it has its legislation addressing issues of corruption, it does not provide comprehensive instruments. | A national corruption task force is set up under the leadership of Ministry of Finance to propose a revised Law on Anti-corruption to the parliament. | Revised Law on Anti-corruption adopted by the parliament | Oct 2011 | Official announcement |
| Programme | i.C.2. | The programme has analyzed corruption risks and prepared a strategic document but not been implemented effectively | The programme implements the anti-corruption strategy in partnership with a national anti-corruption body. | Anti-corruption monitored and reported regularly | Aug 2011 | Periodic reports |
| Operational | 1.A.3. | HACT not used for the programme | The programme will install HACT or other appropriate measures in place | HACT /similar operational | May 2011 | Signed agreement |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Monitoring of Risks**

Once a risk log is prepared, programme staff, national counterparts and multi-stakeholder body engaged in the process should closely track and update the progress. Systematic monitoring mechanisms should be agreed and established among stakeholders to allow for effective monitoring through the stakeholder consultation process. The responsibilities for monitoring include regular follow-ups with entities responsible for specific actions to ensure the implementation of actions and monitoring and updating of baseline conditions.

1. Each risk should indicate a specific risk code to which it refers in the screens. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)