**Table 3: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (a) - Consistency with national objectives and international agreements**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benefit** | | **PLRs relevant to this benefit** | **How does this PLR cover this benefit?** | **How effectively the PLR is being implemented?** | **Conflicting PLRs?** | **Identified Gaps** |
| EXAMPLE | Efforts at better coordination initiated through the REDD+ process lead to improved communication between Ministries and greater consistency between sectoral policies overall. | Poverty Reduction Strategy. | Existing inter-ministerial communication on achieving the poverty reduction strategy. | Some ministries have more influence than others. | No. | Current practice limits inter-ministerial communication, e.g. few meetings involving personnel; from multiple ministries. |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (a) - Consistency with national objectives and international agreements**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | | **PLRs relevant to this risk** | **How does this PLR cover this risk?** | **How effectively the PLR is being implemented?** | **Conflicting PLRs?** | **Identified Gaps** |
| EXAMPLE | There are overlaps between the areas designated as production and protection forest. The resulting delay and confusion limits management effectiveness and gives rise to local conflicts. | 1. Centralised map database for land-use designations.    2. Process to resolve conflicts. | 1. Centralised database helps identify conflicts.  2. Directly intended to reduce this risk. | 1. Database under construction, some map layers more up-to-date than others.    2. Slow implementation of the process. | 1. Separate actors are responsible for designation of protection and production forest, without requirement for coordination.  2. No. | 1. Limited coordination between actors.  2. Capacity gap in implementation. |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (b) - Transparent, effective forest governance and sovereignty**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benefit** | | **PLRs relevant to this benefit** | **How does this PLR cover this benefit?** | **How effectively the PLR is being implemented?** | **Conflicting PLRs?** | **Identified Gaps** |
| EXAMPLE | If tender process for plantation concession is done transparently, can favor easier monitoring due to smaller number of concessions. | Ministry regulation and system to grant concessions. | Covers concessions at national level, but not at provincials and district levels. | When polled, 60% of users expressed satisfaction. | No. | PLR could be more effective if provincial and district level processes were integrated with national level. |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (b) - Transparent, effective forest governance and sovereignty**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | | **PLRs relevant to this risk** | **How does this PLR cover this risk?** | **How effectively the PLR is being implemented?** | **Conflicting PLRs?** | **Identified Gaps** |
| EXAMPLE | Lack of capacity in enforcing existing laws/ regulations may lead to strengthening the incentives of the drivers of deforestation and negatively affect stakeholders’ trust in the REDD+ process. | National or state budget and trainings for law enforcement | Inadequate. | Poorly. | No. | Need more funding for increased human resources and enhanced skills. |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (c) - Respect for knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benefit** | | **PLRs relevant to this benefit** | **How does this PLR cover this benefit?** | **How effectively the PLR is being implemented?** | **Conflicting PLRs?** | **Identified Gaps** |
| EXAMPLE | Strengthened use rights. | Land tenure regulations. | Complete. | It guides land tenure. | Customary rights. | Lack of alignment between regulations and customary rights. |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (c) - Respect for knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | | **PLRs relevant to this risk** | **How does this PLR cover this risk?** | **How effectively the PLR is being implemented?** | **Conflicting PLRs?** | **Identified Gaps** |
| EXAMPLE | Land titling process proposed could lead to dispossession of lands from indigenous peoples. | National legislation on land titling and international Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD). | National legislation coverage is incomplete (ie does not address the risk). | The national legislation is not being implemented effectively due to protests and conflicts between the government and indigenous peoples where the titling process is proposed to occur. | The national legislation conflicts with the international Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD). | Lack of alignment between national and international law. |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (d) - Full and effective participation of stakeholders**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benefit** | | **PLRs relevant to this benefit** | **How does this PLR cover this benefit?** | **How effectively the PLR is being implemented?** | **Conflicting PLRs?** | **Identified Gaps** |
| EXAMPLE | Extending community forest management may increase the numbers and groups of stakeholders involved in decision-making related to forests local to them. | Community forest management policy. | Community forest management policy sets principles for ensuring involvement of relevant stakeholders in establishing community forest management in new areas. | While the policy is effectively implemented for engagement of local communities, it does not include specific consideration for indigenous populations. | Community forestry management policy is not fully consistent with FPIC and its specifications for indigenous communities. (This is not a conflict with a national PLR but with what is required under REDD+.) | Lack of explicit consideration of indigenous population in the existing community forest management policy. |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (d) - Full and effective participation of stakeholders .**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | | **PLRs relevant to this risk** | **How does this PLR cover this risk?** | **How effectively the PLR is being implemented?** | **Conflicting PLRs?** | **Identified Gaps** |
| EXAMPLE | The failure to provide stakeholders with appropriate information may hinder their ability to participate in an effective and meaningful way and cause frustration with the REDD+ process. | Freedom of information law. | Freedom for information law mandates proactive disclosure of information and sets rules for requests and replies. | "Despite implementation of the law, stakeholders are unaware of their legal right to information. | Freedom of information law. | Freedom for information law mandates proactive disclosure of information and sets rules for requests and replies. |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (e) - Natural forest, biological diversity and enhancement of benefits**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benefit** | | **PLRs relevant to this benefit** | **How does this PLR cover this benefit?** | **How effectively the PLR is being implemented?** | **Conflicting PLRs?** | **Identified Gaps** |
| EXAMPLE | Planning that prioritizes the protection of natural forest halts the decline in availability of non-timber forest products. | 1. Definition of natural forest.  2. Forest zoning plan. | 1. Enables identification of natural forest, as covered by the safeguard.  2. Identifies that some areas of natural forest are to be protected. | 1. Single definition for natural forest exists and is adopted REDD+ purposes.  2. Variable implementation: very effective in Province X but encroachment in Province Y. | 1. No.  2. Oil and gas concessions. | 1. No gaps identified.  2. No integrated land-use planning. |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (e) - Natural forest, biological diversity and enhancement of benefits**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | | **PLRs relevant to this risk** | **How does this PLR cover this risk?** | **How effectively the PLR is being implemented?** | **Conflicting PLRs?** | **Identified Gaps** |
| EXAMPLE | The afforestation of a grassland ecosystem with high biodiversity value leads to losses in breeding bird populations. | National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). | NBSAP sets national targets for conservation of biodiversity. | Incomplete – the targets are broad and non-binding. | No. | The non-binding nature of the targets might not ensure the conservation of biodiversity. |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (f) - Address risk of reversals**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | | **PLRs relevant to this risk** | **How does this PLR cover this risk?** | **How effectively the PLR is being implemented?** | **Conflicting PLRs?** | **Identified Gaps** |
| EXAMPLE | Fire from agricultural burning spreads into the new forest, leading to the reversal of carbon sequestration, and may also impair future sequestration potential. | Regulation on controlled burning. | Identifies conditions under which burning is acceptable, e.g. weather. | Ineffective implementation due to lack of enforcement / incentives. | No. | Implementation gap. |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (g) - Reduce displacement of emissions**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | | **PLRs relevant to this risk** | **How does this PLR cover this risk?** | **How effectively the PLR is being implemented?** | **Conflicting PLRs?** | **Identified Gaps** |
| EXAMPLE | Reduction in domestic timber production due to REDD+ actions increases unsustainable logging in a neighbouring country. | Cross-border forest cooperation agreement. | Directly intended to address illegal logging. | Includes joint law enforcement unit, sharing intelligence and establishes check points in border areas. Monitoring of effectiveness underway. | No. | Not all unsustainable logging is illegal. Additional measures to encourage use of sustainable timber may be required. |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |