Social and Environmental Standards for REDD and Other Forest Carbon Programs

Standards development workshop
May 5-7, Copenhagen, Denmark

Final Report

28 May 2007

Compiled from flipcharts, cards and discussion notes from the workshop

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

Contents

Session 1. Introduction

a. The context, role and goal of the standards initiative

There is sustained and growing support to include activities that reduce emission from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) and other forest carbon in a post 2012 climate change agreement. While REDD has the potential to deliver significant social and environmental co-benefits, many have highlighted the serious risks, particularly for Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent communities. This initiative aims to develop standards[1] that can be used by governments, NGOs, financing agencies and other stakeholders to design, implement and identify REDD and other forest carbon programs that respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and generate significant social and biodiversity benefits. Building on the experience of the existing Climate, Community and Biodiversity (CCB) Standards, this initiative will be designed to work for the new global REDD regime that will emerge out of ongoing UNFCCC negotiations, that is for government-led programs implemented at national/sub-national[2] level and for all forms of financing.

Recognizing that the UNFCCC agreement will focus on emissions reductions and that only basic provision for social and environmental safeguards and co-benefits is likely to be adopted under UNFCCC, this initiative represents a complementary process to define and build support for a higher level of social and environmental performance. If these voluntary standards are successful, they will help the early adopters to build support for their programs both nationally and internationally, for example enabling preferential access to funds within either market or fund-based mechanisms. This, in turn, will encourage improved social and environmental performance for REDD and other forest carbon programs in other countries and sub-national states/provinces.

Overall goal of the standards

> *Effective social and environmental standards for REDD and other forest carbon activities make a substantial contribution to human rights, poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation goals whilst avoiding social or environmental harm.*

b. The standards development process and the aims of the workshop

The standards are being developed through an inclusive process engaging governments, non-governmental organizations and other civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples organizations, international policy and research institutions and the private sector. This workshop was designed to provide the main initial input for the design and content of the standards. The workshop participants identified options for the key elements of the standards, based on their opinions of what would be effective and acceptable for their countries and constituencies. The workshop outputs will be used to develop draft standards that will be circulated to interested parties, stakeholders and advisors for comments and discussed during a series of visits to countries where there is interest in early adoption of the standards. Input from these consultations will be used to prepare a version of the standards for a 60-day public comment period during October-November 2009. A new version of the standards will then be prepared for presentation at UNFCCC COP15 with a view to incorporating feedback and undertaking a second public comment period before finalizing a test edition of the standards in early 2010. A second phase of piloting and testing the standards will follow later in 2010. The workshop participants also gave recommendations on the creation of a Standards Committee representing a balance of interested parties to oversee the standards development and to approve each draft of the standards. The standards development process is being facilitated by CCBA and CARE.

---

[1] 'Standards' are understood to include principles, criteria and a process for monitoring, reporting and verification.
[2] 'Sub-national' refers to states or provinces or regions within countries.

Aims of the workshop
- To define and build consensus around key elements of the standards including principles, criteria, and respective minimum requirements (i.e. where to set the bar);
- To propose processes for monitoring, reporting, verification, conformance and sanctions, identifying and prioritizing different options taking into account likely effectiveness, feasibility and likelihood of support from key actors;
- To refine the process for the standards development, including drafting standards based on workshop outputs, public comment phases, consultations and reviews;
- To agree on appropriate governance for the standards development, for example establishing a Standards Committee to oversee the development of the standards;
- To provide recommendations for a communications plan to promote awareness of, and build support for, the standards.

Workshop venue
The workshop was held at the offices of CARE Denmark (address: Nørrebrogade 68 B, DK-2200 Copenhagen N).

Workshop participants
The development of effective standards requires broad and inclusive participation of groups that have an interest in social and environmental impacts of REDD and other forest carbon including those who will actually use the standards, ensuring a strong representation from REDD countries and a balance from different geographic regions, types of affiliations and expertise. The workshop participants included representatives from:
- Indigenous Peoples and other forest dependent peoples, and southern civil society organizations representing their interests;
- Governments and other administrative bodies responsible for REDD and other forest carbon policies and programs;
- Donors and funding agencies;
- Private-sector investors;
- International environmental, development and human rights NGOs;
- Researchers and practitioners with relevant REDD, forest carbon and standards expertise.

Government and civil society representatives were invited from six different countries that are actively developing REDD and other forest carbon programs, are committed to strong co-benefits, and have expressed interest in piloting the standards - three in Latin America, two in Africa and one in Asia. Other stakeholders represent different groups with a strong interest in development of REDD with significant co-benefits who can advise on design and promote adoption of the standards at different levels. See Appendix 1 for a full list of workshop participants.

Summary Agenda

5 May
- Introductions to the standards initiative and the workshop participants
- Review of the role of voluntary standards for REDD/forest carbon
- Individual country progress on the development of REDD/forest carbon programs
- Review of elements of a standards system
- Defining key issues the standards must address and grouping within proposed principles for the standards

6 May
- Introduction to issues of gender and REDD/forest carbon
- Developing criteria and refining principles for the standards
- Review of opportunities for standards within different emerging accounting and crediting frameworks at national/sub-national/project levels

– Evaluating options for monitoring, reporting and verification

7 May
   – Evaluating options for conformance and sanctions
   – Developing recommendations for the standards development process, governance/decision making and communications of the standards
   – Presentation of summary outputs of the workshop to Danish stakeholders

c. Participants' expectations of the standards
Participants were asked to note on cards:
   ▪ What are the 1 or 2 main things we want the standards to achieve?
   ▪ What makes the standards important for our constituencies?

What are the 1 or 2 main things we want the standards to achieve?
Estebancio: Indigenous Rights (implementation)(UNDRIP). Clear concepts (B-S)
Johnson: Include IPs rights and traditional knowledge
Cecilia: Give proper value to biodiversity, Be clear and easily implemented
Charlie: Protecting ecosystem services benefits, Enable broad participation
Raja: Promote social equity
Lanto: Clear criteria and requirements on social components
Jean Roger: Good coordination between different sectors in land use planning.
Ruth: Clear and implementable.
Leo: Filling in the (probably significant) "gaps" in a future regulated REDD system relating to co-benefits.
Joanna: Consensus on defining good social and biodiversity performance. Build donor support for co-benefits of REDD programs.
Jill: Free, prior and informed consent for IP/Local communities. Biodiversity monitoring.
Phil: Increase benefits of REDD to communities and avoid negative impacts whilst achieving climate mitigation goals.
Marcelo: Improve the life of forest people. Improve the biodiversity conservation
Charles: Participatory and transparency.
Poul Erik: To address social and environmental risks related to REDD.
Tannya: Tool to define the impact of projects/national program.Tool used by donors and/or investors.
Leif : Contribute to putting social/environmental safeguards/standards higher up on the agenda at COP 15.
Andrew: Help in reducing transaction costs of getting to market.
Unknown: Secure indigenous peoples' land and resource rights.
Jeff Hayward: Fair, effective, transparent REDD programs. Actions to stop deforestation/degradation.
Felix: I want to know how we can help communities to prevent deforestation. To have good communities and good forest.
Jeff Hatcher: Promotion of recognition of customary land tenure (systems) rights by state institutions and international processes. Benefits for local forest communities for protection and maintenance of forests. Promotion of good governance in forest areas not just good forest governance.
Kilihama: Improved forest conservation. Improved performance SFM
Neeta: Establish good practice for social and environmental assessments for REDD strategies for FCPF countries. Particular emphasis on adequate consultations from inception "onwards" for stakeholders. Simple and practical in application.
Dil Raj: Establish community rights over the best resources in carbon related programs. Ensure the co-benefits from IPs and forest dependent peoples.
Angel: Propose guidance for a good governance for REDD. Promote best practices related to information sharing.
Kanyinke: To properly capture rights and interests of indigenous and local communities in relation to REDD and other forest carbon.

What makes the standards important for your constituencies?
Angel: Could guarantee equal access to potential benefits. Catalyze a broad participatory process.

Marcelo: By addressing the appropriate way to conserve and improve forest peoples" lives.
Cecilia: By having standards it gets easier to maintain quality and do monitoring.
Joanna: To ensure social and biodiversity benefits from climate action.
Leif: Addressing the development/poverty reduction aspects of REDD.
Tannya: To Ensure clear use of public funds."REDD" impact on deforestation control activities and human well-being.
Charles: Benefit and cost sharing. Address poverty.
Andrew: Complementary to rigorous carbon accounting using VCS.
Unknown: Standards give indigenous peoples potential for benefitting from REDD.
Dil Raj: -To provide the incentives and opportunities for forest communities.
Phil: They are a practical ways of operationalizing key principles relating to social and biodiversity issues.
Kanyinke: -They are meant to safeguard indigenous/local communities rights and interests. But since they are voluntary, I wonder how they can achieve the above.
Kilihama: Assist in monitoring and reporting. Preparation of management plans-REDD.
Ruth: To have a clear definition of key issues.
Johnson: Support local development and protection of local lands and forest.
Estebancio: -Safeguard (warranty). Understand clearly the information. Receive the real benefits.
Neeta: Important for consistency in approach among FCPF and countries which are beginning the planning process for REDD.
Jeff Hatcher: Forest communities often seek legal recognition of land rights and of their role in forest maintenance.
Leo: Bring broader aspects of REDD (beyond carbon) and especially the developmental dimension into future policies.
Jean Roger: Tool for monitoring together all aspects of environmental management.
Lanto: Help design tools. Help recognition and support
Raja: Moving us from theory and principle to practice and impact.
Charlie: Would like to see international recognition of the value of ecosystem services.
Jeff Hayward: Incentives to promote forest conservation consequences. Equitable transfer/distribution of funds/decisions to communities.
Jill: Concern about equity and quality of REDD programs. Looking for successful REDD (this is part of success) on the ground.
Poul Erik: Billions of USD are invested in REDD where poor and natural resource dependent groups live.

Session 2. The role of independent voluntary standards within a future REDD regime

a. Group discussion about the role of voluntary standards
▪ The standards will allow for a higher bar than can be achieved under UNFCCC.
▪ Governments must conform to high standards or they won't get funding.
▪ There is resistance in UNFCCC to develop "guidelines" – parties prefer the term "guidance" that doesn't imply anything binding.

b. Presentation on '*What is the role of independent voluntary standards in a future REDD regime?'* by Leo Peskett, Overseas Development Institute[*]

Questions and answers
▪ How realistic is it to have a constantly evolving set of standards. Maybe best to set the bar high from the start.
▪ There is a need for standards to adapt as REDD itself evolves over time eg review every 3-5 years.
▪ Is there a widely held belief that UNFCCC outcome will be weak with respect to social and biodiversity concerns? Who will be pushing for our standards to fill this void?

---

[*] See Appendix 4 for copies of all presentations

- During consultations informing Meridian report some negotiators made it clear that S&E standards within UNFCCC will be weak, but its also clear that some actors/countries are still pushing for a higher standard/bar, ie there is a fragmentation of approaches.
- UNFCCC doesn't want to deal with S&E issues so they might like our standards.
- What about compatibility between VCS and our REDD standards? Could end up with S&E standards with a high bar but carbon standards with a lower bar. Maybe need one set of standards?
- We are assuming that there will be rigorous carbon accounting under the UNFCCC regime.
- VCS is keen to collaborate and we need to avoid competing standards but right now there seems to be nothing in this (REDD+SE) space.
- We are at a very early stage in this process. Whether the standards work will depend on whether they make sense to the users (ie supply side). But it will help if the demand side also finds them useful. We need more input from the demand side.
- It is worrying if UNFCCC negotiators think they can leave S&E standards to a voluntary standards initiative. Some negotiators are implying this.
- If these standards are to be valuable to Indigenous Peoples they must be completely in line with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). If not then Indigenous Peoples will be better off doing their own negotiations that working with these standards.

Session 3. Elements of a standards system

a. **Presentation on *'The content of standards: principles, criteria, indicators and process and participation in their development'* by Ruth Nussbaum, ProForest***

Questions and answers
- The presentation seemed to be more focused on government needs that civil society needs. These standards must be applicable to Indigenous Peoples. They should focus on UNDRIP, Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) and collective rights.
- Yes they do apply to government-led programs but the standards should be defined by the relevant stakeholders. That's why we are here.
- There has been a bitter experience with FSC in Nepal. There was plenty of interest at the start but audits are very expensive and a big burden on communities. There is a need to build in country capacity for auditing.
- The Ecuador government believes that the standards also have an important role to play in communication with people within Ecuador, i.e. there is also a local dimension to the demand side.

Session 4. Country progress on REDD and other forest carbon programs

Government representatives were invited to give a presentation about the progress made in their country developing REDD and other forest carbon programs covering the following issues:
- Key drivers of deforestation/degradation?
- What policies and measures are proposed to achieve change?
- What financial mechanisms are available?
- Which social groups will be affected?
- What governance structures have been created?
- How will social and environmental co-benefits be maximized and harm avoided?

a. **Presentation on '*Socio Bosque: Avoiding deforestation while benefitting people'* by Tannya Lozada, Ministry of Environment, Ecuador***

---

* See Appendix 4 for copies of all presentations

1) Maps were displayed showing changes in native vegetation over time. Ecuador is losing 200,000 ha of forest/year. Main causes of deforestation are illegal timber exploitation, unclear land tenure and poor/misleading policies etc.
2) Strategies to reduce deforestation. Socio Bosque incentive scheme is one element. Land tenure reform, law enforcement etc are other elements of the program.
3) Socio Bosque is targeting 4 million ha forest conservation outside protected areas, 1 m beneficiaries (among the poorest of the country) and looking for significant emissions reductions and REDD accounting. 3 principles for prioritization – areas with water, carbon and biodiversity – with poor people and – areas under threat. These criteria were used to prioritize where to start – see map.
4) Implementation slide – launch of program in Sept 2008 – flow chart – shows beneficiaries gathering documentation (need for clear land tenure), MAE verifies by reviewing the documents, geographic prioritization and field verification occurs, then beneficiaries are asked to prepare an investment plan (during which time they gather final documentation at both individual and communal levels) to decide which parts are conserved, which SFM, ag, etc. and how to invest the benefits coming from SB – then need to do monitoring – then an agreement is signed for 20 years.
5) Current funding from $3M of public funding.
6) State of implementation and beneficiaries – see slide for text

Questions and answers
- How much is paid? Base of $30 per ha per year with reduced payments for areas at lower risk down to a minimum of $0.5 / ha/ year. The values depend on the risk related to the area. Indigenous Peoples hold lots of area and opportunity costs differ. Divided in payments 3 x per year – related to parties (Christmas, school start year and other "parties").
- What do they have to do? What are the responsibilities and rules on cutting trees? This is determined in the investment plan, with mixed uses as described earlier.
- More info on www.ambiente.gov.ec and questions to tlozada@ambiente.gov.ec

b. **Presentation on '*Panama's R-Plan'* by Félix Magallon, National Environment Authority, Panama**
1) Key drivers of deforestation: Need participation of communities to work on this. Have presented a REDD readiness plan to UNREDD and WB. Need to give alternatives to the communities.
2) Policies and measures: The national land program works already and since 1999 there has been a national environmental strategy. From 2000 to 2008 have reduced deforestation around 70%.
3) Financial mechanisms: Panama is participating in UNREDD and WB FCPF. They are currently working with national resources to prepare and are looking for additional funding. Thinking about one REDD fund to be developed by communities for direct sale of credits from plantations but not for credits from natural forest which are government owned.
4) Social groups affected: IPs and other rural communities. 15% of forest is managed by IPs. There have been meetings with IPs and local communities and the head of the Kuna was part of Panama's delegation in Poznan.
5) Decisions made about the program: working directly with civil society groups to create REDD committees on climate change, science committees, an international development center, IP participation etc.
6) Provisions on social and environmental: work with CATHALAC on forest cover/carbon monitoring

Questions and answers
- Why are natural forests excluded from receiving carbon credits? National Environment Authority will use the REDD funds to distribute to different communities to "do environmental business".
- If 50% of land applies to IPs, how can they participate?   Note that the Kuna people are autonomous and they preserve the forest. They must decide if they want to be involved. IPs have not been sufficiently involved. The IPs have talked with Eduardo Reyes about their concerns. We a re asking when IPs will help to develop this program. We are concerned that REDD will increase the national

authority's decision power over these areas that are owned by IPs. Reply: if a community in Panama wants to get a logging concession they need the government's approval. It would be the same for the REDD fund. We aim to work with communities to achieve consensus and will create a fund for beneficiaries.

c. **Presentation on *'The Atlantic Forest Program'* by Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito, Ministry of Environment, Brazil**
   1) The Atlantic Forest Program was designed by the Ministry with other stakeholders. This is a forest restoration program that helps to inform on REDD. Presented a biome map showing coverage of Atlantic Forest. The biome covers 1,350,000 km sq which is 17.5% of the national territory with 120 M people. It is a hotspot, with less than 2% protected by IUCN protected area categories 1-4, and these protected areas cover 65,000 km sq
   2) Drivers of deforestation: agrobusiness expansion and the changes in the environmental legislation: the Forestry Code and National Environmental Crimes Act. The forestry code requires that each property maintains 20% of native forest protected and areas near rivers protected. If there is a surplus beyond 20% they can receive payments from others who can use this protected land to reach their own 20% requirement.
   3) The Atlantic Forest Program was developed over 15 years (long term process). It gives guidance for stakeholders and is a 10 years for 700 M USD.
   4) Main Objectives are a) conservation of biodiversity (looking to achieve 5% coverage of protected areas), b) climate change mitigation (restore and reforest degraded areas and carbon sink, supporting 200 forest projects over 20 years and c) poverty reduction – see slide.
   5) Climate change mitigation and adaptation – review slide – degraded areas have low baselines – looking to link CCB and VCS standards into projects for a better quality of reforestation.
   6) Pacto pela "RESTORATION of the MA" – includes 73 institutions showing priority areas for restoration.
   7) Financial instruments – see slide – German – GEF – PES payments, etc.
   8) Social groups affected> listed in slides – etc.

Questions and answers
▪ Does zoning impose constraints on use of land for IPs? Forest Code and the Atlantic forest law do limit use of the forest.
▪ Who owns the carbon credits? Now voluntary credits from reforestation go to landowners including IPs for their land. But there is no discussion so far of what might be the case under a REDD mechanism. We are working to be flexible to adapt to the position that the government adopts for REDD. The Amazon Fund could provide funds for monitoring the Atlantic forests.

d. **Presentation on *'Background to REDD initiatives in Tanzania'* by Felician Kilihama, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Tanzania**
   1) Tanzania has 33.6 M ha of forest covering 32% of the land. Charcoal and energy use depletes forests
   2) REDD development – FCPF R-PLAN submitted to WB, made improvements and accepted at Panama
   3) Funding: main support from NORAD $17M over 5 years.
   4) Consultations are being organized among stakeholders
   5) REDD pilots are being developed to help develop methods for national MRV and promoting research and capacity building - slide on partnership – public –private and to tap into future carbon market
   6) How can REDD contribute to Poverty Reduction Strategic Plans and other poverty plans? Working with Vice President's office with a national REDD task force and oversee national strategy.
   7) Norwegian support is not give directly to government but channeled through the Institute of Resource Assessment of Univ. of Dar Es Salaam which is facilitating the process to look at

incentive schemes, baselines, participatory monitoring, assessment, verification and reporting, and governance and tenure (training with GPS techniques)

8) Way forward – plan to share experiences in Copenhagen in December – look to on-going efforts, including call for NGOs to submit concept notes, include public awareness – list of partners (Germany to support protected areas) – likely to have Clinton Foundation to assist with carbon accounting

Questions and answers
- Who owns the forest? Government and village forests – speaks about the participatory forestry program
- Conflicting interests regarding land (Kenya ex.) and this matters for REDD; how to deal with these competing interests and how can traditional knowledge systems can contribute to REDD planning – Village Land Act – indigenous knowledge is a useful tool in managing those resources – need to find incentives to make people value trees.

e. Presentation on *'Madagascar's progress of REDD development'* by Jean Roger Rakotoarijaona of the National Environment Office

1) With the political unrest in the country it remains to be seen whether the REDD program will stay intact

2) Drivers of deforestation: mainly agriculture and energy, illegal and legal logging, mining and underlying causes include poor governance, demand for resources, unclear tenure, lack of alternative fuel sources and sources of revenue.

3) Policies and measures: create new protected areas, forest use zones at regional level, create sustainable forest management sites, promote reforestation/restoration, SWAP process, multisectoral approach of land use definition, reform land tenure, promote new energy sources, rural development program

4) Financial instruments: at the national level REDD R-PLAN under development, and GTZ and Intercooperation support REDD national system establishment; at project level PES promoted, local foundations to be created to distribute funds to communities, WCS signs agreement with government to market Makira carbon program of 9 M tons – with revenue sharing example, with 50% to communities, 25% to PA management, 15% to Ministry for monitor, 5% to marketing – fund mgt, etc.

5) Social groups affected: IP forest – are in the SW of country, also local people are forest users – local communities to be active in forest mgt by transfer of forest for CFM and co-mgt of Pas, environmental and social impact assessment is required and gov't safeguard procedures are applied to all new protected areas

6) Institutions created: a climate change platform has been created to coordinate and for information sharing, include stakeholders. Technical REDD Committee (CT-REDD) provides technical support to the Environment and Forestry Ministry. The National Environment Office (ONE) is a national institution for national data and carbon monitoring.

7) Social and environmental co-benefits: Environmental Impact Assessment and WB safeguards are used and ensure local public consultations, empowerment of communities for improved resource management and plan to use REDD revenues to improve livelihoods for communities dependent on forest resources. Foundations will be used as a mechanism to distribute the funds.

f. Presentation on *'Development of REDD Forest Carbon program in Nepal'* by Dil Raj Khanal of FECOFUN (community forestry organization).

1) Drivers of deforestation: chart on slide, in lowlands, high deforestation – with direct causes and root causes

2) Policy and measures: Master Plan for forest sector (1988) and Forest Act 1993 – 22% of forest cover is under community forest management and 72% is under government management. The Forest Act gave a special recognition to IPs for tree registration.

3) Financial mechanisms: lacking a financial mechanism for REDD, but a benefit sharing mechanism is in place (CF) with benefit sharing and disbursing funds. REDD working group is preparing R-PLAN to WB, and there is also a civil society request for NORAD funds. Pilots are underway with DFID, SDC, SNV, etc.
4) Institutional arrangements: local communities may raise funds directly from carbon funds.
5) Community groups: many groups will be affected. These may include nomadic IPs such as yak and sheep grazers and non-timber forest product collectors. REDD outreach to these groups is under development.
6) Decision making: see graphic
7) Co-benefits: look to existing provision in community forestry for social and environmental co-benefits.

Questions and answers
▪ What about nomadic peoples? Will there be FPIC on traditional rights? Reply: previous conflicts between gathers and nomadic, but not completely resolved, ask REDD working group to analyze IP rights over forest resources – need to recognize rights for grazing and use. Grasslands – high altitudes – acknowledges that traditional grazing strategy needs to be recognized.
▪ Who is in REDD working group?: Note that government only has 3 members and civil society are in the majority. ILO 169 recognizes IP rights.

Session 5. Identifying key issues the standards must address

Participants worked in three groups from or with experience of Asia, Africa and Latin America to:
– Step 1: Identify opportunities/risks and key stakeholder groups.
– Step 2: Classify against draft principles.
– Step 3: Identify gaps and add potential additional principles.

Issues were grouped under principles and then consolidated as follows:

Draft Principle 1. Resource rights
• Land and resource use rights, both statutory and customary, are recognized and respected. (link to identity)

Opportunities
– Ensuring rights and being engaged in capacity building for REDD.
– Increasing rights of indigenous peoples.
Risks
– Forest/land/carbon grabbing by private sector, governments power local elites (*IP's, communities).
– Governments less willing to devolve ownership/right to communities (*IP's, or other marginalized groups).
– Protected areas violate traditional property rights.
– Focus on IP to detriment of other forest-dependent groups vs broaden to all forest dependent groups to detriment of IP rights.
– Undermining land and resource rights for IP.
– Doesn't recognize traditional practices and beliefs.
– Land tenure capture by powerful groups.
– Creating difficulties for land regularization.

Draft Principle 2. Equity
• The net benefits of REDD and other forest carbon programs are shared equitably among stakeholders.

Opportunities
- – Reinforce community resource management.
- – Greater attention to concerns of marginalized communities, IPs.
- – Additional revenue to overcome destructive policies.
- – Strong distribution mechanism means money flows to local communities.

Risks
- – Perverse incentive for communities that are excluded to deforestation.
- – Reinforcing inequity/elite capture and business-as-usual.
- – Compensation
- – Money going to powerful groups.
- – Money (expectations).
- – Money gets caught up in government bureaucracy.
- – Forest people bear the greatest cost in relative terms of CC mitigation.

Draft Principle 3. Ecosystem services and biodiversity
- • Ecosystem services and biodiversity are maintained or enhanced.

Opportunities
- – Conservation:
    - -BD
    - -Habitats
    - -Ecosystem services (beyond carbon)
- – Supports landscape approach for biodiversity conservation.
- – Increased financing for protected areas (*government, communities)
- – Conserves ecosystems services at the landscape level.
- – Environmental benefits eg. Improved water supply, more predictable rainfall (*IP's, LC's, governments)

Risks
- – Some strategies for REDD have negative impact on biodiversity e.g. intensified agricultural plantations.

Draft Principle 4. Sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation
- • [Option 1] The program contributes to sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation.

- • [Option 2] The program contributes to broader sustainable development objectives

Opportunities
- – Increased forest related income (*government, communities)
- – Empowerment of local communities to implement plans and development.
- – Harmonize Forestry - Development and other policies nationally.
- – New source of funding for public services.
- – Conserves community forests.
- – Money
- – Increased livelihood opportunities (*IP's, LC's)
- – Addressing deforestation in a more strategic way (*governments).

Risks
- – Restrictions on traditional farming practices (e.g. shifting cultivation/swidden) without adequate compensation (*farmers)
- – Disrupting traditional forest use practices (*IP's, LC's, especially mobile peoples).
- – Reducing responsibility of government to deliver on social public obligations and services (schools etc.)
- – Undermining weak states, "carbon curse" (*governments).

- Existing forest governance programs could be disrupted by REDD (*governments, donors).
- Existing development programs/approaches could be disrupted by REDD (*communities).
- Cherry-picking easy options for reducing deforestation and leaving hard solutions.
- Targeting local communities in some areas might not stop deforestation.

Draft Principle 5. Participation
- All relevant stakeholders are able to participate fully and effectively in the design, implementation and evaluation of the program.
- [Moved from the principle on grievance mechanisms which is now gone] A fair and transparent process must be in place for submission of stakeholder grievances that leads to their evaluation and a response or adaptation of the program seeking to resolve any disputes.

Opportunities
- Increase community participation in forest management/conservation (*communities).
- Representation (broad degree).
- Guidelines for good consultation.
- Get different stakeholders to talk to each other (awareness).
- Community empowerment.
- Greater attention to concerns of marginalized communities.

Risks
- Creating divisions amongst communities
- Potential to create conflict within/between communities (*IP's, LC's).
- Top down central government dominated process to standards.
- REDD could be implemented in context of weak legal systems.
- REDD could undermine cites or fleg efforts.

Draft Principle 6. Access to information
- All stakeholders have timely access to appropriate and accurate information to enable transparency, accountability and full and effective participation.

Opportunities
-Transparency
-Implementation of the free prior informed comment FPIC.
-Improved tools, techniques, and data for monitoring, reporting, and verification.

Risks
-Exploitation of uninformed communities into unfair contracts by private and NGO institutions.
-Asymmetric access to information increases inequality and power imbalance.

Draft Principle 7. Legal compliance and reform
- Compliance with applicable local and national laws and international treaties and agreements
  - Note: need to deal with policy and legal reform if the legislation is incompatible with the rest of the standard at the criterion level

Opportunities
-Better enforcement of existing laws.
-Reinforce good legislation.
-REDD to move policy/legal reform agendas.
-Improvement of legal framework, including land tenure.

Risks
-Undermines traditional decision making.
-Reducing rights of indigenous peoples. UNDRIP.

There was a brief discussion of the wording of the principles, focusing on Principles 1, 2 and 4.

1. Principle 1: Wording of 'land' – can it also include 'territories'?
    We can't accept any wording that is less than any wording that has gone before, such as that in UNDRIP – need to say 'rights to lands, territories and resources'

2. Principle 2: 'Net benefits' is a problematic term – used often by economists, but what are we netting in the REDD case (e.g. across communities or between communities?)
    Any discussion of opportunity costs in the 'cost' aspect? And any discussion of risk sharing?
    In Portuguese there is already a translation issue in terms of what is meant by equitable sharing of 'costs' – REDD involves lots of costs so some concerned that they will have to cover certain costs.
    'Equitable' is a problematic term in translation

3. Principle 4:
    In Brazil it is important to separate out the higher levels of drivers of deforestation, so therefore have it as a separate principle.
    Element of the planning (e.g. integrated land use planning, overall architecture of REDD, how does it fit with different orders of country strategies)

Session 6. Reflections on Day 1
No notes taken.

Session 7. Gender and REDD

a. Presentation on '*Gender Differentiated Impacts of REDD to be addressed in REDD Social Standards'* by Jeannette Gurung of WOCAN/Global Gender and Climate Alliance*

Jeanette Gurung discussed the gender dimensions of REDD, outlining the roles (women producing 70% of the world's food), rights (e.g. depletion of forest resources increasing labour requirements) and responsibilities (e.g. women being principle actors in agroforestry) of women within forest management.

She summarised the challenges as including:
1. Tenure inequalities
2. Inequitable governance
3. Inequitable compensation – high emissions activities likely to benefit
4. Weak capacities – baselines and methodologies difficult; men in suits as traders

And the opportunities as including:
1. Promoting more sustainable development
2. Redressing existing inequalities – e.g. legal reforms
3. Furthering the implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)

She then briefly described lessons from case studies, highlighting the Nepalese process which has provided a good opportunity for gender mainstreaming, but so far this has not happened right – they have not been included in REDD readiness preparations. She also discussed the Ghana process where it has been difficult to find any mention of women in any documents or a breakdown of 'local communities'.

Jeanette finished by describing some of the measures required for inclusion of REDD (e.g. targeting socially disadvantaged groups; standards that use a gender-based approach), the principles (e.g.

---

* See Appendix 4 for copies of all presentations

changes needed in forestry institutions themselves, compliance with laws such as CEDAW); capacity building requirements; and the need for a gender mainstreaming approach (including political commitment; expertise; accountability mechanisms; developing systems to counteract gender blindness).

Questions and answers
- Think gender is taken into account in Panama because their position in poverty reduction strategies is to take these things into account. We work with women, men, children and all groups of people.
- What specifically does REDD mean for gender – what is unique to REDD and what things we do as development organisations anyway? Much of the gender dimension of REDD involves things that we do anyway, but there is a need to reinforce the gender dimensions and especially as they relate to tenure and rights issues.
- Do we need to unpack relationship between land tenure and rights of access to trees? – two very different things that we need to be aware of. There was no defined response to this question, but agreement from the floor that this is an important point and flagging the specific issue of carbon rights (which often follow ownership of trees).
- All good REDD projects start with drivers – once you get to a significant level of granularity of the actions taken you can start to do a proper gender assessment
- In context of Nepal there are at least 1000 forest reserve groups managed solely by women, so gender issue is taken into account to some degree, but also recognise that there is a weakness in the REDD Working Group not containing women.
- The concerns about REDD not taking into account tenure issues and conservation issues are very similar to the concerns of IP groups
- The Forest Dialogue put together a set of groups on REDD – had launch at World Conservation Congress – had some language on gender issues in this. This was an entry point to bring the issue to negotiators that it may be possible to build on.
- REDD is a change in the way land is used. We need to ensure in the standards that some groups are not made poorer by REDD. Disaggregating the term 'community' will be crucial in all REDD programmes.
- How will the standards deal with conflicts such as the struggle to maintain traditional perspectives whilst paying attention to issues like gender?
- REDD can be an opportunity to improve forest governance – not just about rights but about improving the forest governance agenda and making that more equitable
- One of the big opportunities in REDD is moving beyond debate about forest governance and to debates about healthcare etc. Can it be used for improving mother and child healthcare services etc for example?
- Inevitability that when you introduce money and standards, you change things. If no one has money and then suddenly they have money, then people will mis-manage it whoever or wherever they are. Traditional systems may no longer be appropriate. Important to balance attention to traditional things
- Gets to the heart of the matter of 'benefit sharing' – direct benefit sharing can be distinguished from higher level of benefit sharing, for example at the national level. Many tiers of decision making need to be taken into account.
- In Madagascar gender is taken in a broader sense to include not only women but youth etc, so women specifically are not a major issue

Session 8. Developing key criteria

Participants worked in groups to develop draft criteria for each principle and also to propose improvements to the wording of the principles. These were presented to the plenary group as follows:

P1: Rights to land, territories and resources [, both statutory and customary] are recognized and respected
a. The program effectively defines/identifies the different rights holders (statutory/customary) to land, territories and resources

b. The program respects and recognizes customary rights to land, territory and resources which the IP/LC have traditionally owned and occupied or otherwise used or acquired.

c. Inventory and mapping of existing statutory and customary lands, territories and resources [and trees] tenure/use/access/management rights (including those of women etc.)

d. Any disputes over rights to lands resources and territories must be resolved through the free, prior and informed consent of the parties involved

e. Free, prior and informed consent required for any activities concerning rights to lands, resources and territories

f. Policies/law are in place to
   i. Resolve land claims
   ii. Secure the customary rights to lands, territories and resources of IPs/LCs
   iii. allocate carbon rights equitably based on rights to land, territories and resources (including to IPs/LC

g. Outstanding issues:
   i. carbon rights/benefits to ensure IP/LCs get same opportunity for carbon rights as other land/resource rights holders eg. IPs and LCs have the right to own, use, develop and control the lands, territories and resources including carbon rights that they possess by reason of traditional ownership or other traditional occupation or use, as well as those which they have otherwise acquired.

P2: The benefits of REDD and other forest carbon programmes are shared equitably among all stakeholders

a. Identify costs (indirect, direct and opportunity costs) and benefits (indirect and direct) by stakeholders [process]

b. Governments support benefits coming from early project actions while national programmes are being developed [process]

c. Identify stakeholders who's benefits must be equitably distributed [process]

d. Risk assessment (linked to costs and benefits) [process]

e. Clarity over where decision-making authority(ies) lies relating to carbon sales and allocation of funds and benefit sharing [policy]

f. Transparency (especially in relation to (e)) with community monitoring [policy]

g. Review of options for most efficient and equitable distribution mechanisms (e.g. trust fund or on-budget) [policy]

h. Low administration costs for fund management and project approvals and timeliness of distribution [policy]

P3: Ecosystem services and biodiversity are maintained or enhanced

Outcome criteria

a. Increased financing for maintaining and enhancing ES and BD.

b. ES and BD are maintained and enhanced.

c. Endangered species are protected where applicable.

Process criteria

d. Monitoring, reporting and verification process for ES and BD

e. Develop indicators for measurement of ES and BD.

f. ES and BD are incorporated in project design.

Policy criteria

g. Develop landscape approach for ES and BD conservation.

h. ES and BD are mainstreamed into national policy.

P4: The program contributes to sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation for forest dependent peoples

a. Use of REDD resources should lead to incremental livelihood/development benefits

b. Use of REDD resources should be defined be defined by communities through an inclusive process

c. Impact evaluation leading to adaptive management

d. Mitigation measures in place to address potential negative impacts on livelihoods
e. Social impact assessment should be carried out which should include opportunity costs assessments for relevant stakeholders
f. Issues related to livelihoods emerged from consultations addressed
g. Coherence with relevant development plans eg PRSP

P5: All relevant stakeholders are able to participate fully and effectively in the design, implementation and evaluation of the program
a. Identify and characterise stakeholders
b. Respect IP own decision-making structures and procedures and let them choose their own representatives to participate in decision-making
c. Representatives ensure effective involvement, information sharing and accountability with/to people they represent and consensus building
d. Effective representation of women and other marginalised groups in the stakeholder process
e. Inclusive dialogues and for a (eg meetings) arranged to fit local circumstances
f. Inclusion of local governments
g. Self determination of stakeholders is respected and supported
h. Identify stakeholder representatives taking account of formal and informal arrangements/institutions
i. Financial support to enable multi-stakeholder participation
j. Free, prior and informed consent
k. Education/awareness-raising so that stakeholders have a good understanding of key issues
l. Meeting minutes, decisions, outcomes are recorded, shared and made publically available
m. Mechanisms in place to receive and resolve grievances and disputes relating to planning and implementation

P6: All stakeholders have timely access to appropriate and accurate information to enable transparency, accountability and full and effective participation.
Outcome
a. Stakeholders have the information that they need about the options before making a decision.
b. Stakeholder representatives have adequate resources to enable dissemination of all relevant information to their constituencies.
c. Information is available/disseminated in time to enable stakeholder feedback to their representatives and respecting the time needed for inclusive decision making.
d. Indigenous people and LCs have the information they need in a form they understand.
Process
e. The most effective means of dissemination of information are identified and used for each stakeholder group
f. Who makes decisions about which information is available and for whom it is available
g. "Adequate" representation of all stakeholder groups to ensure effective flow of information to stakeholders
Policy
h. Refer to Aarhus Convention (?)
i. National policies / public declaration on access to information.
j. Policies to allow free access to information on property rights and ownership patterns
k. Stakeholders have access to and understanding of legal information / processes.

P7: Compliance with applicable local and national laws and international treaties and agreements
Outcome
a. Conforms with national law and international treaties and agreements.
Process
b. Where inconsistencies arise between standards and national law a review process should be undertaken
c. Improve capacity to implement and monitor legal requirements (either government or program driven – could be joint monitoring)

d. Respect and not undermine traditional and customary decision-making processes.

P8: The programme contributes to broader sustainable development objectives
Outcome
   a. Coherence with national strategies and priorities (e.g. MDGs; poverty reduction strategies; national budgets etc.)
   b. Government ownership of REDD
Process
   c. Consultation with relevant ministries/working group established to link REDD working group and inter-ministerial representations
Policy
   d. Land use planning and tenure reform addressed

Session 9. Validating and optimizing criteria

Participants worked in trios to discuss the draft criteria and to identify:
   ▪ What needs adjusting?
   ▪ Are there any contradictions?
   ▪ What's missing?

Each participant recorded their comments on cards as follows:

a) What needs adjusting
− Greater emphasis on (ex-ante) reviewing/assessing existing government systems and/or alignment with same.
− P2: "…shared equitably among all stakeholders and rights holders" (IPs not stakeholders but right holders).
− Link "PRSP" concept from 4(g) to 8(a)
− 5(i) should be number one followed by (ii)
− Access to information is the final step to meaningful participation can (5) and (6) be captured in one principle.
− P7 –Process to resolve inconsistencies among policies that might deny the REDD objectives.
− P1f needs adjusting => allocate carbon rights equitably among all stakeholders (not among land users only).
− P1 f&g. Rights to trade carbon belong to the state. Can they be given to other entities, IP's or LC's?
− P7.a Add local law (to national and international).
− P3 – Ecosystems should clearly state whether this includes carbon or not.
− P7 – Need process for reconciling when national/regional laws conflict with customary land use
− 4b. Seems to fit into the process criteria.
− 2c: Identify stakeholders "to whom" benefits…
− 2b: Not clear: which governments?
− 3b: same as principle
− 4g: How do you measure this?
− 5j: not clear
− 8b: Not clear: why just government?
− P2: Policy Criteria, f. need adjusting: -include community monitoring.
− 4(a+b)
− 7. a) …ratified/signed by the country.
− 6 f) Not formulated as a criteria. What is meant?
− 4.a) Include monitoring to check progress.
− 5.f) add national government
− 3.g) making the link from landscape to national level.
− Principle 8: "Process" instead of "objectives"

- P1(g) – Process for defining carbon rights.
- P1 (f) – Policy in place to resolve land claims may be difficult to achieve.
- P3(e) to include indigenous knowledge
- P3(d) to include community monitoring.
- P6h reference to Aarhus is not helping.
- P5. – Recognition of traditional knowledge and of local plans.
- P3. – Traditional forest management by IPs make healthy forest.
- P8. – Local plans.

b) Are there any contradictions?
- Tension between social and environmental standards vs economic imperatives.
- P1: UNDRIP does not apply to local communities.
- P1: Carbon rights should not be "allocated to" indigenous communities – their right to use, manage and control trade, territory and the resources therein, including carbon, should be respected.
- 7(d) could contradict with "compliance" of law. Law could reinforce customary decision making or NOT.
- Should P5 and P6 be combined?
- 7a: Could contradict the customary land rights identified in Principle 1.
- P.3 – Policy Criteria – i. Develop inventories of resources
- Potential contradiction between P3(a) and P4(a,b)
- Potential contradiction between 7(a) and 1(g)
- Aarhus convention is only for EU countries and what about other countries?
- Potential contradiction between P5(b) with P7d
- P1.(e) – FPIC may conflict with P8 if national laws don't recognize FPIC.
- P5 b + h may contradict but K?? can help link.

c) What's missing?
- Achieving (and measuring) changes in behavior.
- Carbon rights
- Subsidiarity principle
- More information – beyond $ (opportunities) – of the local level on carbon, carbon trading, and local responsibilities.
- P7: should comply with international instruments including IP declaration and CEDAW and rights of children.
- P2: Something missing on how stake holders/rights holders are identified -> can poor highlanders move into tropical lowland forests and claim REDD benefits? Tied to land disputes
- P4: Something missing on respecting indigenous peoples right to determine their own development so that it's not in the hands of government to "give them development" by building a school or a road, but up to themselves to define how they want their livelihoods to be improved.
- P3 – Missing criteria about leakage
- P1 – Add tracking system to spatially record and track REDD land other yearly action carbon projects in spatially explicit way.
- P4 – Add "all proposed livelihood changes for REDD must address/develop alternatives".
- P3 – If this includes carbon, add criteria "standards should support early REDD project actions and sales and provided support and approvals for inclusion in future national schemes."
- P1 – Governments/stakeholders should be prepared to adopt appropriate dispute resolution, including international arbitration for multi-country contracts.
- P2. Process criteria - establish base line (benefits) currently available.
- P5 – Traditional knowledge, Local plans
- P3 – Traditional forest management
- P8 – Local plans.
- Identification of marginalized/poor people\
- Benefit sharing not only between stakeholders but between right holders.

- P3: Environmental Impact Assessment, climate change CBD
- P6. Database, analysis, reports, results, etc from monitoring and evaluation of REDD program impacts is publicly available.
- P4: Diversity

d) Notes from plenary discussion of principles and criteria

Principle 1. Rights to land, territories and resources [both statutory and customary] are recognized and respected
- 1f. If require laws <u>to be in place</u> might not be achievable. Maybe 'policies to secure' is easier than 'laws in place to secure…'
- Standards can set a bar. Don't need to make it so every country achieves
- Could have a 'gold' level for highest achievement
- 1d. Maybe 'to resolve' is too strong
- Add a requirement for governments to track where carbon projects are being done in the country.
- 1f. allocating carbon rights not possible in Ecuador because they belong to govt.
- Should ensure that any potential allocation of carbon rights is equitable with other land owners/rights holders – if the govt decides to allocate any carbon rights
- 'Policies and laws are in place to ….' This formulation is a problem as it may be too demanding to require policies and laws to be in place.
- Should support and be consistent with UNDRIP
- NOT proposing to change UNDRIP!
- In Madagascar the rights to sell carbon lie with the State
- From a legal standpoint, in most countries the carbon rights follow the rights to the tree. In some countries all forests are owned by Govt. In others like Germany and Argentina the forests are privately owned. In those cases the State should create a policy that differentiates carbon rights from forest ownership.
- In Panama and Ecuador, the forests are the property of the state. Only if the forest is in managed land then maybe could consider private ownership of carbon rights
- Is carbon a public good or a private good?
- Refer to land, territories, resources and carbon……
- Note that IPs claim that they do have rights to forest and all resources therein

Principle 2. The benefits of REDD and other forest carbon programmes are shared equitably among all stakeholders
- Governments should be required to ensure that there are low administration costs for fund management and project approvals or at least try to ensure not huge transaction/administration costs.
- What recourse do communities have? - add to transparency 'robust process for recourse'
- Clarify what roles/contributions/traditional knowledge communities play in maintaining carbon and reward appropriately – need to consider costs in the future and reward appropriately as well as in the past
- Who gets to decide how benefits are distributed?
- Transparency – need to provide information about how funds are disbursed
- b - governments should support/facilitate early action before programs are in place
- c – identify the stakeholders
- Add a criterion to clarify the meaning of 'equitable'
- Need a process to involve stakeholders
- Bear in mind the difficulty of translation of 'equitable' into other languages eg Portuguese
- How feasible is it to define costs and benefits? Could spend whole life in meetings but wouldn't get anything done.
- Can look at general analyses/tools eg McKinsey cost curve for Brazil rather than evaluating costs and benefits for individual stakeholders
- Change wording to be more qualitative - careful 'by' stakeholders (for each major group)

- Need impact analysis of policy – eg job creation etc. social impact assessment at higher level.
- b. maybe the projects were not good so don't want to just support all projects – only positive/good ones

Principle 3. Ecosystem services and biodiversity are maintained or enhanced
- Should include/reference traditional forest management approaches
- e) could include indigenous knowledge
- And d) IP role in defining indicators
- Process for corrective action – adaptive management related to biodiversity and ecosystem services
- Just 'maintained'? Even if in a dismal condition?
- 'Maintained and enhanced' is better language for the principle
- It is OK to include principle language as a criterion
- Suggest use high conservation values for no harm
- What happens if don't have good BD information – could be very expensive
- Should require Environmental Impact Assessment for all REDD activity
- Even if not perfect information must define and measure some indicators - key indicators - same for water quality
- Panama already has an indicator – don't give Govt excuse to say we are not ready to monitor
- Should encourage some portion of estate to move towards adoption of voluntary sustainable forest management certification.
- Indicators are a tool-kit and service
- Maybe also include increased financing for enhancing social services in P4?

Principle 4. The program contributes to sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation for forest dependent peoples
- Issues related to livelihoods emerging from consultations should be addressed
- How de we identify who the people are that this principle refers to?
- All REDD programs should develop alternatives where there are negative impacts
- Need language for marginalized and poor
- Incremental – add for some things and not for others – net benefit
- Should be required to demonstrate more than business as usual
- Replace incremental with 'additional long term'
- Increases in financing/resources for social services/livelihoods
- e) social, cultural and economic
- Mustn't let govts off the hook for their social obligations
- PRSP is not a long-term plan – take out eg.
- Don't just use the term 'adaptive management'

Principle 5. All relevant stakeholders are able to participate fully and effectively in the design, implementation and evaluation of the program
- Add planning to design in the principle language,
- Or just 'in the program'? maybe don't need planning, design, implementation etc.
- Not a good idea to give general language? Better to be explicit
- Or use 'all phases'
- Careful not to exclude some important aspect
- Do they have to be included at every stage – eg local stakeholders were not included in Ecuador planning but are included in implementation?
- Maybe criteria can differentiate?
- What is 'characterise'? stakeholder analysis – define categories
- Subsidiarity? Principle of enabling decision-making at the lowest appropriate level.
- b-g-h could be strengthened by being brought together.
- Capacity building? In both ways – to assist participation and to enable effective transfer of local knowledge to contribute to the program.

Principle 6. All stakeholders have timely access to appropriate and accurate information to enable transparency, accountability and full and effective participation.
− Must have an opportunity to share own information – not just a one-way flow
− Sharing info to stakeholders and also to whole world. Need to integrate the issue of transparency.
− Information about money, who is involved etc
− h – Aarhus convention? EU convention on environmental procedural rights – only int'l document that has tried to address access to info – maybe use some language from the text.
− Make sure that government and others have information
− d – expand to all - in a form that is useful
− Collation of information
− Need to move beyond the potential amounts of money involved.
− Ecuador – totally agree about misinformation – REDD=$$$$ creates mistrust
− Should make reference to roles and responsibilities
− There is an urgent need for information but if we have to wait to ensure everyone understands before we start – forest would be gone.

Principle 7. Compliance with applicable local and national laws and international treaties and agreements
− d. is contradictory
− But UNDRIP is an international agreement so d. is OK
− How should the standards address inconsistencies?
− Need a process to resolve inconsistencies between international law and national law
− Also need a separate process to evaluate whether laws are enforced or implemented

Principle 8. The programme contributes to broader sustainable development objectives
− Coherence with community plans?
− Principle – change objectives to process
− Sustainable development objectives is a commonly used term and broader than process/policy/outcomes
− Can't use 'broader' – does this mean broader in terms of scale and sector – and broader than what?
− Government commitment/ownership/leadership/harmonization/alignment/coherence – 'Paris Declaration' kinds of words

Session 10. Opportunities and constraints for REDD relating to REDD carbon accounting/crediting approaches

a. **Presentation on '*Creating a CCB REDD Standard: Scale and Accounting'* by Charlotte Streck of Climate Focus[*]**

Need to consider what could be certified and who could be certified. This standard is covering new territory by proposing a private standard that will certify national policies and measures. There is a risk that this approach could undermine government decision-making processes if the standards evaluate the 'content' of policy. Policy formulation should include all relevant stakeholders and ministries and it is this process that gives legitimacy. The standards could more appropriately evaluate policy implementation, for example at a sub-national level such as by a forest agency or municipalities. It could be counter-productive if the standards create problems with funding agencies, NGOs. Conditionalities do not have a good track record.

---

[*] See Appendix 4 for copies of all presentations

The important issue about crediting is that this defines at which level you get the benefits. There is an ongoing disagreement about when and how a market might be implemented but there is agreement on national level of accounting. However, the government may choose to allow crediting at sub-national government or project levels. There are also examples of sub-national to sub-national agreements as with the California governor's MOU with states in Brazil and Indonesia and these could lead to sub-national crediting. However, the UNFCCC is blind to sub-national governments. Sub-national in UNFCCC context only refers to projects or territorial activities. Another idea is to embed subnational government activities or projects within a national scheme. Such an approach is possible through Joint Implementation. Note that the CDM registry only has national accounts but for Annexe 1 countries can have individual accounts.

Questions and answers
- Note that policies are often in continual development
- Standards can be used to foster improvement
- Naïve to say that most funding does not carry some kind of requirement or 'conditionality'
- Could start with voluntary standards that much later become conditionalities as the system matures

Session 11. Exploring options for monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV)

a. **Presentation on '*Developing Standards for REDD and other forest carbon programs: Evaluation'* by Ruth Nussbaum of ProForest**[*]

b. **Group work on MRV options**

Groups evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of different MRV options and the most appropriate approaches for each country. See Appendix 2 for the MRV options work sheet.

Session 12. Review and reflection on Day 2
Session 13. Group summary of Day 2
No notes taken.

Session 14. Review of MRV approaches

The country groups were asked to explain which approaches to monitoring, reporting and verification are most appropriate for a REDD program now and also how this might change in the future, based on the options provided in the MRV worksheet (see Appendix 2). During the plenary session, we first addressed monitoring, then reporting and finally verification, asking each country group to report back on their selection according to the levels 1-5 in the worksheet and comment why they thought this was most appropriate for piloting the standards in the next few years and whether they thought a different level would be appropriate in the future.

a. Monitoring
All groups selected Level 3. Government-led monitoring with some stakeholder participation.

Brazil. It's obvious that there is a need for government participation for monitoring. Monitoring should be led by government with an opportunity for other stakeholders to contribute. This is probably the easiest and cheapest way. No need to change in the future. This seems the right way. Stakeholder-led monitoring could be appropriate for some issues but not for overall program.

---

[*] See Appendix 4 for copies of all presentations

Panama. Government and stakeholders will need to participate fully.

Tanzania.

Madagascar. The REDD technical committee will help with monitoring.

Nepal. Community forestry associations are already doing their own monitoring but only for the 22% of forests that they manage. We would like to see a larger percentage of forest area in community management in the future.

Ecuador. Forest cover monitoring is done by government. In the field the communities are in charge of monitoring. Each community has 3-4 people responsible and they report back to community. There is an impressive level of monitoring for the poverty reduction payments for another direct incentive program and could learn from and maybe coordinate with this program.

Parà. Monitoring of forests is by done government, Poverty reduction would be done by NGOs. There should be good discussion to improve the quality of data and level of consultation may increase over time.

Need to be cognizant of what's already being done e.g. monitoring of progress towards Millennium Development Goals.

b. Reporting (transparency)
Responses varied between
  - Level 2. Partial monitoring report public (eg. a summary)
  - Level 3. All relevant information in the monitoring report public
  - Level 4. Monitoring report plus any reviews and comments public
  - Level 5. Monitoring report, comments, response to comments and verification report public

Nepal. Some parts of Nepal are at Level 5 because they are certified through FSC (around 15%) certified community forestry so for these areas all information is available. For government forests transparency is currently around Level 2.   Nepal as a country might move to Level 4 in the future.

Ecuador. Experience from communities is Level 2. There are some places we can show publicly and some information we will keep for the community only. For the use of funds, will send a report to government but don't expect that this is publicly available. Sometimes it is not safe for everyone know how much money goes to each community. The government information is at Level 4 since forest cover etc will be as public as possible. Any comments will be technical so do not need to be public. There will always be some level of detail that will be inappropriate for full disclosure.

Panama. Partially public now. In future think will be fully public 5.

Tanzania. Around 4. Not at 5 because of practicality and cost of sending all information to all levels.

Brazil. There is Ministerio Publico that is very 'intense' and careful to refine data. A lot of reflection on transparency and access to information. Problem with size and means of communication. There is a system for reporting, collection etc. Still needs improvement

Madagascar – There is no reason to hide anything. Plan to put all information on a website. Already doing this for environmental impact assessment.   Stakeholders are already involved. Would send summary reports to communities.

Question: What does 'readily available' mean?

c. Verification
Responses varied between Levels 2 and 5:
- Level 2. No verification but some consultation with stakeholders
- Level 3. Review by a technical advisory team appointed by government (could include experts and stakeholders) with stakeholder consultation
- Level 4. Review by technical team independent of the host government, appointed by the funders/investors, with consultation of stakeholders and a requirement for a response to comments
- Level 5. Verification by independent professional auditors accredited by an independent international body, consultation of stakeholders and public comments with a requirement to respond publicly to all comments

Panama. Level 2. Currently expect no verification but some consultation with stakeholders. Must be clear about quality of consultation. With our new government we would like to see a move to 3. Ministry would appoint technicians and IPs to review.

Ecuador. Currently Level 2. Don't have verification but we do have information sharing with communities. We want to create a Trust Fund for Socio Bosque with international funding and in that case we will need Level 5. If no international funding and just national public funds (as presently) should be at Level 3. Must include IP stakeholders in Level 5 as well as international.

Madagascar. Anticipate Level 3-4. This would involve review by the government appointed multi-stakeholder CT REDD (technical committee) and could add one or more independent consultants.

Brazil. Levels 3-5 Depends where the budget is coming from. If you have external funders will need independent audit. Would always need stakeholder involvement. If there are problems with the report and poor review it will be widely reported in the media.

Tanzania wants to be at Level 5 but this will depend on cost. It is important to be as credible as possible.

Nepal. Small part of forests are certified by FSC at Level 5. There are independent auditors for those forests. May be at level 1 or 2 for government forests.

Session 15. Conformance and sanctions

a. **Presentation on '*Developing Standards for REDD and other forest carbon programs: conformance, sanctions and governance'* by Ruth Nussbaum of ProForest**[*]

Questions and answers
- What governance at the national level?
- What level of stakeholder involvement is appropriate in decision-making about conformance?
- See Pew centre report on MRV in the climate regime. Covers carbon accounting, financial contributions. May be relevant.
- Sanctions for governments are very difficult but maybe look at this as a process of adjusting the program. Eg Corrective Action Requests – have some time and help. 'Period of adjustment'. 3rd party is always involved.
- Sanctions don't necessarily make sense when the principles and criteria are used for guidance. Once it develops into a standard with certification there would be withdrawal of certificates.

---

[*] See Appendix 4 for copies of all presentations

Session 16. Process, governance and communications for standards development

a. Process
A group of participants was asked to:
- Review proposed activity plan and timeline for Phase 1
- Consider the following questions and make recommendations to strengthen the phase 1 process:
    - Are there are major weaknesses/gaps in the proposed process leading up to first edition in March 2010?
    - Specifically regarding consultations in June-August:
        - How many pilot countries for Phase 2? With what diversity?
        - Suggested aims of the in-country consultations are to get feedback on the draft standards and also to plan a Phase 2 piloting during a one week visit. What are your recommendations for these consultations?
        - Are there some specific ongoing initiatives with which our initiative needs to establish stronger collaboration?
- Define major activities for phase 2 and develop a rough timeline

Report to plenary

Phase 1
- Need a second pilot in Asia eg SE Asia. Maybe Cambodia?
- Ask countries who participated here if they want to pilot in 2010 eg by end of June. Send them more information about the draft standard by early June.
- In-country consultations must include awareness raising event (1-2 days) as well as feedback on the standards and design of the standards.
- Include Indonesia in consultations. Not as a pilot country.
- Include Central Africa in consultation eg. Cameroon?

Levels of participation
- Pilot countries – minimum of 6
- In-depth consultation process with more countries
- Light consultations with people who don't need awareness raising.

Pilots
- Important that the pilots include a diversity of:
- National/subnational
- Size of country
- Political regime
- Forest type
- Dependence on resources

Political support is essential and also a strong commitment to community-based approaches to forest management and strong community participation.

Collaboration
Strengthen collaboration with
- Other standards applicable to REDD
- Other standards processes eg oil palm, FPIC
- IP/LCs
- overall process need to add Asia
- pilot countries add relevant IP/LCs
- Major investors in REDD

Phase 2: 2010-2011
- Detailed planning phase
    - Scale of application (re implementation)
    - Consultation processes
    - Sampling frame for field verification

- Implementation of pilot
    - Awareness raising/consultations
    - Assessments – policy, process, outcomes
- Review of experience
- Revision and 2nd edition of standards

NB. Panama has a new government and President and only take office in July so can't expect any commitment before then.

b. Governance
A group of participants was asked to:
- Review the following extract from the proposal:
    - A Standards Committee will be created representing a balance of interests to develop the new standards, and respond to comments. This Standards Committee will also be responsible for governance of the whole initiative, ensuring that the initiative itself adheres to best practice for the development of international social and environmental certification processes. Criteria for participation in the Standards Committee include: content input from a range of different perspectives, influence on adoption, potential adopters, availability and commitment. It will be important to ensure a balance between US/European /Southern representatives, to include development, human rights and environ-mental/conservation perspectives and to include civil society (including both Indigenous and local communities), government, private sector and research perspectives. The group should be limited to less than 25 individuals. The Standards Committee may create smaller working groups for specific tasks and would consult more widely with others to assist them with their tasks.
- Consider the following questions and make appropriate recommendations:
    - What are the key roles and responsibilities of the standards committee?
    - What should be the make-up of the committee to get the right balance of stakeholder groups and what key criteria should guide selection of members?
    - What should be the public identity of the initiative during the development phase

Report to plenary

- CCBA and CARE are playing role of secretariat.
- Will need advisory/steering committee for political support
- Technical working group, drafting team for technical support
- Steering committee will need high profile individuals representing high profile organisations with influence, credibility, legitimacy, enthusiasm for the standards
- Will help to sort out the more complex issues from drafting process
- Assign or pick people on drafting committee
- Make decisions on timing, content, issues related to communications
- Needs to be balanced

Representation
- Government representatives from REDD countries
- Demonstrated interest in standards
    - On fore-front of adopting the standards
    - Willing

- o Big countries high defor/forest cover
- o Some smaller countries
- IP organizations from Africa/Asia/America or also with variety of interests poverty/environmental/rights
- Conservation/Environmental NGOs – large/small, N/S
- Social/development/human rights – N/S
- Private sector – investors in forest carbon/CSR companies/Agriculture or Forestry business/association like WBCSD
- Local communities – cooperatives, associations that serve as an umbrella for community forestry like GACF
- Northern high emitting countries – from EU/US, agencies that influence standards/state government/donor agencies
- Multi-lateral might not want to engage?
- Donors/bilateral agencies

	North	South
REDD govts	0	3-5
IP		3
Community assocns		3
Social NGOs	1-2	2
Env NGOs	1-2	2
Private sector	2	1
High emitting govts	2-3	0
Multi-laterals	0	0
Donor agencies	??	
Sub Total	6-9	14-16
Overall Total	20-25	

Comments
- Steering committee could meet at SBSTA in June.
- Should get suggestions from workshop participants.
- Must be able to speak broadly about global interests rather than own local interests.
- Research eg CIFOR, CATIE– technical drafting level rather than political
- Great idea but everyone wants the same group of people and hard to find the right people.
- UNFF has groups: Private sector, IPs, women, youth, etc. Look at existing networks.
- Good to have people representing regions but sometimes don't have the right people available. Maybe need to some background on this issue. Need to develop criteria for the individuals.
- Must be able to put time into this.
- Important to have a gender balance on the committee. Make sure some women.

c. Communications
A group of participants was asked to consider the following questions and make appropriate recommendations:
- What are the key opportunities and risks that a communication strategy/plan for this initiative (and phase 1 in particular) needs to address?
- What are the key messages we need to present?
- To which target audiences? Internationally and in pilot countries
- When?
- How?

Report to plenary

Opportunities:
- Possible reference to generic standards
- Willingness of FCPF and UNREDD to consider standards
- Trying to understand the options for standards
- Wide circulation of ideas on standards (tie to R-PLAN process)
- Seen as helpful to governments
- Communicating the support for social and env goals is good for successful REDD
- Tap networks from THIS WORKSHOP to communicate a key message

Risks:
- UNFCCC using standards as an opt-out option
- Presenting a "complete" standard may not be viewed well
- If people not involved – they will not go forward
- Selling the case to the government
- If seen as an imposition = resistance, must make it clear that adoption is voluntary
- Getting lost in the crowd!
- Potentially not sufficient participation and voice of Indigenous People in this process
- Perception of a market-focus or bias to this initiative may create problems

MESSAGES:
- Its not just about carbon, and not just about markets
- We can address different country circumstances and could apply to projects or just use to think about how to address these issues
- We can use as an opening with countries to operationally or use as a guide
- REDD is part of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) and SFM is part of REDD
- Effectiveness (social and environmental) can be improved for REDD programs
- Builds on solid community forestry and Indigenous Peoples management results
- Builds on good governance or enables good governance
- REDD will fail if we don't use these standards *(this was stated a little strongly)
- Speak about "best practices" and looking for good country stories – need to build on efforts in country and deliver these stories

Objectives of communication:
- advocate
- awareness raising
- information sharing
- look for feedback
- report on status / progress
- making a helpful guide to countries – already implementing projects

Target Audiences
At pilot country level:
- Government: forestry and environment or natural resources ministries, also other ministries – dealing with agriculture, poverty and/or climate change working groups, also local government authorities
- NGOs: human rights groups, women's groups, IP, environmental groups
- Media: full range to include newspapers, TV and radio
- Private sector
- Development partners writ large (bilaterals, multilaterals, development NGOs – both local and international, etc.)

International audience:
UNFCCC negotiators, IUCN, Katoomba Group, Coalition of Rainforest Nations, Global Gender Climate Alliance, Prince's Rainforest Trust, The Forest Dialogue (TFD), CIFOR, CCBA members, UNREDD, FCPF, FAO, major groups of UNFF, FAO, CPF = Collaborative Partnership on Forests, IP networks,

International Alliance of IP and Tribes of TF, African Forum on Forests, private sector (including carbon traders), human rights networks, RRI, etc.

When to start?
Tomorrow/manana!!
We had a long list of upcoming meetings to consider:
Immediate:
1) Yauonde: conference RRI, ITTO, FAO – from 25-29 May 7, 2009
▪ 2) Norway meeting – see note from Jean Roger
▪ 3) CAN 92 DK meeting
▪ 4) Global Gender and Climate meeting – Jeanette – Washington D.C.
▪ 5) UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous peoples

Upcoming:
▪ Chatham House in London RRI July
▪ Oslo (September) RRI –
▪ Readiness for Africa meeting
▪ World Forestry Congress – Jeanette to check on a slot
▪ Community forestry congress in Nepal - Jeanette to check on a slot
▪ Tanzania – Sept. meeting to prepare African – INSERT NAME – to allow a 1 hour presentation slot
▪ Beijing meeting on forest tenure SFA and RRI – regional – September
▪ Prince's Rainforest Trust meetings

2010
▪ Commonwealth forestry UK 2010
▪ Ghana meeting of CSOs – June 2010

What do we want other than events?
▪ a generic PPT
▪ brochure
▪ a factsheet – including schedule, process information, and how actors to engage
▪ story
▪ a little REDD/green book
▪ video (you tube) experience – or short documentary – simple form, experiences and stories from the field
▪ tapping into REDD networks (learning networks and activists networks)

Comments
▪ As long as have FPIC and our language in we can support and show to our communities. Many IPs are just anti-REDD
▪ Use consultation process to raise awareness
▪ Haven't had it explained it in a simple way
▪ Need examples
▪ We don't need to explain REDD but explain what standards are what they can do.
▪ Don't yet have standards so could be too early to communicate a lot about this initiative.
▪ Even REDD is very new. Most foresters don't go to UN negotiations. Implementing agencies don't understand because they have not been involved in the discussions.

Session 17. Reflections and closing
▪ A great opportunity to start to give investors an new way to think about countries because of their willingness to adopt standards.
▪ Standards are very necessary for engaging, building awareness.
▪ Great to meet many people from around the world and have a good process.
▪ Realize the importance of raising awareness.

- Pleased to give input from our perspective. Our concern is that REDD is not taking account of local people. This standards process will help to consider their perspective.
- Appreciate the level of interest in IP/LC issues want to see CI and CCI go to ground and start organizing.
- Great to voice concerns and have open discussions. I hope others can participate also and give their input.
- I am more familiar about standards and feel more responsible.
- Very useful for our country as we need clear guidance.
- Starting to understand standards.
- Understanding perspectives of other groups.
- Learned about standards will take share with colleagues.
- Have learned a lot and see standards are very important.
- Learned a lot about standards. It was a very well organized workshop and we got through a lot.
- Very pleased to contribute. Did not know about standards before. Will help us to plan our REDD.
- Learned a lot here, will take these ideas back.
- Great potential to advise on the ideal REDD process very participatory.
- This was a very helpful introduction to the REDD issues.
- Very well organized to get powerful and clear results. Thanks for different views. Idea of standards can make it easier for us to introduce into the agenda for country. Will help us build better social and biodiversity monitoring.
- Thanks for the training on standards. Enjoyed learning from everyone.

Appendix 1. Workshop participants

Brazil
Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito, Secretary of Biodiversity and Forests, Ministry of Environment, Brazil
Marcelo Françozo, Deputy Secretary of the Environment for the State of Pará, Brazil

Ecuador
Tannya Lozada, Ministry of Environment, Socio Bosque Program
Johnson Cerda, Kiwicha Indian Leader from Limoncocha in the Ecuadorian Amazon and Conservation International

Panama
Félix Magallon, National Environment Authority
Estebancio Castro, International Alliance of Indigenous & Tribal Peoples of Tropical Forest

Madagascar
Jean Roger Rakotoarijaona, National Environment Office, National REDD Commission
Lanto Andriamampianina, Wildlife Conservation Society Makira project

Tanzania
Dr Felician Kilihama, Director, Forestry and Beekeeping Division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Charles Meshack, Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG)

Nepal
Dil Raj Khanal, Federation of Community Forestry Users (FECOFUN)

Other Stakeholders
Kanyinke Sena, Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee, Kenya
Asian Indigenous Peoples representative, TBD
Jeannette Gurung, Global Gender and Climate Alliance, GGCA
Jeffrey Hatcher, Rights and Resources Initiative
Sille Stidsen, International Working Group on Indigenous Peoples
Andrew Wardell, Clinton Climate Initiative-Forestry, Cambodia, PNG & Indonesia
Neeta Hooda, Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
Leif Tore Traedal, Norad
Charlotte Streck, Climate Focus
Leo Peskett, Overseas Development Institute
Leslie Durschinger, Terra Global Capital
Ruth Nussbaum, ProForest
Charlie Parker, Global Canopy Programme
Angel Parra, Conservation International
Jeffrey Hayward, Rainforest Alliance
Jill Blockhus, The Nature Conservancy
Phil Franks, CARE
Poul Erik Lauridsen, CARE
Joanna Durbin, Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance
Liz Zeidler (Facilitator)

Appendix 2. Monitoring, Reporting and Verification options worksheet

MRV Options	1	2	3	4	5
Monitoring	Self assessment by the government agency responsible for program (e.g. Ministry of Environment)	Self assessment by a different government agency or a combination of government agencies	Government-led monitoring with some stakeholder participation	Stakeholder-led monitoring	Monitoring by an independent body
Reporting (transparency)	No public report	Partial monitoring report public (eg. a summary)	All relevant information in the monitoring report public	Monitoring report plus any reviews and comments public	Monitoring report, comments, response to comments and verification report public
Verification	No verification and no consultation of stakeholders	No verification but some consultation with stakeholders	Review by a technical advisory team appointed by government (could include experts and stakeholders) with stakeholder consultation	Review by technical team independent of the host government, appointed by the funders/investors, with consultation of stakeholders and a requirement for a response to comments	Verification by independent professional auditors accredited by an independent international body, consultation of stakeholders and public comments with a requirement to respond publicly to all comments

Country responses about MRV options

Brazil - Federal

Monitoring

−   By whom? Gov't/NGOs/civil society/research institutions
−   Appointed by? Tendering procedures/donors/NGOs
−   Report approved by? Gov't + funders + civil society
−   What degree of independence (or what relation with government/funders/stakeholders)? High degree of independence
−   How are stakeholders involved in monitoring? Gov't – completely/NGOs – completely/civil society - mostly providing info/research institutions - completly

Reporting

−   What information is made public? Budgets/tendering procedures/relatories
−   How is the information made public? Through internet, paper reports, workshops, public hearing
−   Is the information readily accessible to all stakeholders (national and international?) No. For the local communities we need a bit more effort. For funders and gov't agencies and NGOs is easier.

Verification

−   Are monitoring reports checked by another party? It depends on the source of the resources
−   By whom? It depends on the sources but civil society/media/other levels of govt/other sectors of govt
−   Using what methods – site visits and stakeholder interviews or just document reviews? All of these.
−   Appointed by? Govt/funders
−   Who approves the verification report? Govt/funders
−   What degree of independence (or what relation with government/funders/stakeholders)? Great degree of independence
−   Same MRV for all principles?

Brazil – State of Parà

Monitoring

−   By whom? Federal institute also an NGO (IMAZON)
−   Appointed by? Federal govt (NGO is independent) and if necessary State govt.
−   Report approved by? Federal and State govt. Maybe, in some cases, funders also.
−   What degree of independence (or what relation with government/funders/stakeholders)? 100% of independence
−   How are stakeholders involved in monitoring? Now, almost all are involved. In a REDD project perspective all will be involved, for sure.

Reporting

−   What information is made public? All information
−   How is the information made public? With no 'adjustings' and much discussion
−   Is the information readily accessible to all stakeholders (national and international?) Yes. They are written in an understandable way and all made available on the internet.

Verification

−   Are monitoring reports checked by another party? Yes
−   By whom? Usually by civil society, NGOs, media etc.
−   Using what methods – site visits and stakeholder interviews or just document reviews? Interviews, debate, reviews, sites etc.
−   Appointed by? Civil society mobilization
−   Who approves the verification report? We don't have the approval of anybody but usually report is refined based on the discussion.
−   What degree of independence (or what relation with government/funders/stakeholders)? 100%
−   Same MRV for all principles? Maybe

Madagascar

Monitoring
− By whom? ONE (national environment office) coordinates and manages the collection of information. Information comes from the field officers of the Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests (MEEF) and partners
− Appointed by? MEEF
− Report approved by? MEEF and technical REDD Committee (CT REDD)
− What degree of independence (or what relation with government/funders/stakeholders)? Independent from funders but controlled by Govt.
− How are stakeholders involved in monitoring? Supply information.

Reporting
− What information is made public? Monitoring report and reviews and public comments
− How is the information made public? Web site, summary reports at site level
− Is the information readily accessible to all stakeholders (national and international?)

Verification
− Are monitoring reports checked by another party? CT REDD (composed of Ministry, ONE, ANGAP, donors, conservation NGOs, foundation-TanyMeva, private sector, local community orgs)
− By whom? CT REDD and independent external consultant
− Using what methods – site visits and stakeholder interviews or just document reviews?
− Appointed by? MEEF
− Who approves the verification report ? MEEF
− What degree of independence (or what relation with government/funders/stakeholders)? Controlled by Govt.
− Same MRV for all principles?

Nepal

Monitoring
− By whom? Dept of Forest
− Appointed by? DG, DOF
− Report approved by? Secretary, Ministry
− What degree of independence (or what relation with government/funders/stakeholders)? No stakeholders
− How are stakeholders involved in monitoring? Should be involved through local development committee

Reporting
− What information is made public? Partial monitoring report
− How is the information made public? Publication of annual report by Dept of Forests
− Is the information readily accessible to all stakeholders (national and international?) No – very limited access

Verification
− Are monitoring reports checked by another party? Yes - for FSC certified forests only. No verification for Govt managed non-FSC forests.
− By whom? Rainforest Alliance
− Using what methods – site visits and stakeholder interviews or just document reviews? Site visits, stakeholder interviews, document review
− Appointed by? RFA
− Who approves the verification report ? RFA
− What degree of independence (or what relation with government/funders/stakeholders)? Highly independent

–   Same MRV for all principles? Different

Panama
   Monitoring
–   By whom? Govt-led monitoring
–   Appointed by? Govt
–   Report approved by? Govt with stakeholder participation
–   What degree of independence (or what relation with government/funders/stakeholders)? No independence between govt and stakeholders. Independence from funders.
–   How are stakeholders involved in monitoring? Directly by their participation

   Reporting
–   What information is made public? All the information
–   How is the information made public? Web pages, meetings with stakeholders, publication of documents, reports (translated into indigenous languages)
–   Is the information readily accessible to all stakeholders (national and international?) readily available to people who have access to internet. To others not really 'readily available'.

   Verification
–   Are monitoring reports checked by another party? Yes, funders, UNREDD, WB, others
–   By whom? Maybe by the funders in the future
–   Using what methods – site visits and stakeholder interviews or just document reviews? All of these methods are necessary
–   Appointed by? Maybe funders or other independent organization
–   Who approves the verification report? Maybe funders or other independent organization
–   What degree of independence (or what relation with government/funders/stakeholders)? Between funders and government/stakeholders total independence
–   Same MRV for all principles? Maybe will be different.

Tanzania
   Monitoring
–   By whom?
–   Appointed by?
–   Report approved by?
–   What degree of independence (or what relation with government/funders/stakeholders)?
–   How are stakeholders involved in monitoring?

   Reporting
–   What information is made public?
–   How is the information made public?
–   Is the information readily accessible to all stakeholders (national and international?)

   Verification
–   Are monitoring reports checked by another party? Yes
–   By whom? In country and/or international/independent if cost is justified
–   Using what methods – site visits and stakeholder interviews or just document reviews?
–   Appointed by? Government from a list of approved verifiers
–   Who approves the verification report
–   What degree of independence (or what relation with government/funders/stakeholders)?
–   Same MRV for all principles?

Appendix 3. Background documentation

Reports are available from Joanna Durbin jdurbin@climate-standards.org where no weblink is provided.

- Developing social and biodiversity standards for REDD and other forest carbon policies, programs and activities: A review of existing standards and verification systems – ProForest, May 2009

- A review of the gender differentiated impacts of REDD and key gender-related issues that must be addressed in development of REDD social standards – Global Gender and Climate Alliance, May 2009

- A review of the implications of alternative models for national/sub-national REDD accounting/crediting for development and implementation of social and environmental standards – Climate Focus, May 2009

- Social and environmental standards for national and sub-national REDD and other forest carbon activities – CCBA/CARE, December 2008.

- Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD): An Options Assessment Report – Meridian Institute, March 2009 http://www.redd-oar.org/

- Governance of Forests Initiative Draft Indicator Framework – WRI, ICV. IMAZON, April 2009 http://www.wri.org/climate/governance-of-forests-initiative

- Making REDD work for the Poor: Policy Brief – Poverty and Environment Partnership, September 2008 http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/economics/?2052/Making-REDD-Work-for-the-Poor

- Accra Caucus on Forests and Climate Change: Principles and Processes as Preconditions for REDD, August 2008 http://www.recoftc.org/site/fileadmin/docs/Events/Features/ACCRA_Caucus__REDD_Principles_FINAL.pdf

- Accra Caucus on Forests and Climate Change: Accra Caucus Statement for COP 14, December 2008 http://www.recoftc.org/site/fileadmin/docs/Themes/Climate_change/ACFCC_StatementCOP14.pdf

- The Anchorage Declaration: Indigenous Peoples Global Summit on Climate Change, April 2009. http://www.indigenoussummit.com/servlet/content/declaration.html