

# REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards

Consultation meetings  
9<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> Sept 2009, Tanzania



Report  
7<sup>th</sup> October 2009

Please contact Joanna Durbin [jdurbin@climate-standards.org](mailto:jdurbin@climate-standards.org) with any comments or for copies of presentations and supporting documents

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	2
<b>2. Workshop on the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards and their potential use in Tanzania</b> 4	
2.1 Participants and agenda .....	4
2.2 Overview presentations and discussion .....	4
2.3 Group work to comment on the principles and criteria and develop indicators.....	7
<b>3. Meetings with REDD Task Force members and other partners to discuss next steps</b> .....	7
Appendix 1. List of participants	
Appendix 2. Draft Principles, Criteria and Indicators with comments from the Tanzania workshop	

## 1. Introduction

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

While activities that reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) and contribute to conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+) have the potential to deliver significant social and environmental co-benefits, many have also highlighted the serious risks, particularly for Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent communities. Recognizing growing awareness at both international and national levels of the need for effective social and environmental safeguards, this initiative aims to define and build support for a higher level of social and environmental performance from REDD and other forest carbon programs.

This initiative will develop standards that can be used by governments, NGOs, financing agencies and other stakeholders to design and implement REDD and other forest carbon programs that respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and generate significant social and biodiversity co-benefits. These standards will be designed to work for the new global REDD+ regime expected to emerge out of ongoing UNFCCC negotiations, that is for government-led programs implemented at national or state/provincial/regional level and for all forms of fund-based or market-based financing.

If these 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;
- encourage improved social and environmental performance for REDD and other forest carbon programs in other countries and sub-national states/provinces;
- build enhanced global support for effective and equitable REDD+ action.

### **Overall goal of the standards**

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

**b. The standards development process and the aims of the consultation meetings**

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. A Standards Committee representing a balance of interested parties will oversee the standards development and approve each draft of the standards. The majority of committee members will be from REDD countries recognizing that southern governments and civil society should lead the adoption of the standards. The standards development process is being facilitated by the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) and CARE International.

The following steps have been adopted for Phase 1 of standards development:

A multi-stakeholder workshop in Copenhagen to provide initial input for the design and content of the standards	May 2009
Draft principles and criteria circulated to interested parties, stakeholders and advisors for comments	Jun-Aug 2009
Consultation meetings with diverse stakeholders in three countries interested in early adoption of the standards	Jul-Oct 2009
A draft version of the standards posted on-line for public comments during 60 days	Oct-Nov 2009
Comments addressed in a new draft version of the standards for presentation at UNFCCC COP15	Dec 2009
A second public comment period and additional consultations with stakeholders	Jan-Mar 2010
Standards finalized for testing	Mar 2010

Testing the use of the standards in several countries is planned for Phase 2 starting in April 2010.

**Objectives for the consultation meetings in Tanzania:**

- To raise awareness and discuss the role that social and environmental standards can play to support Tanzania's REDD+ program;
- To solicit feedback on the draft principles and criteria to ensure they are relevant and useful for Nepali stakeholders;
- To develop indicators that would show whether Tanzania's REDD+ program is achieving the criteria in the standards.
- To discuss potential approaches to monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) with respect to the standards to evaluate the most feasible and effective options for Tanzania;
- To develop an overall plan for piloting the standards in Tanzania from 2010 and get a first sense of budget implications.

*Programme*

*8 Sept*

- Preparations with Forests and Beekeeping Division (FBD) of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, CARE-Tanzania and Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG)

*9 Sept*

- Workshop with diverse stakeholders to present the REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards and the context for their use in Nepal and to solicit feedback on the draft principles, criteria and indicators

*10 Sept*

- Meeting with World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)
- Meeting with Royal Norwegian Embassy
- Meeting with MJUMITA (Community Forest Conservation Network)

*11 Sept*

- Meeting with REDD Task Force members at FBD
- Meeting with Chair person of REDD Task Force at the Vice President's Office (VPO)

The REDD+ SE Standards team comprised:

- **Phil Franks**, Global Coordinator, Poverty, Environment and Climate Change Network, CARE International
- **Joanna Durbin**, Director, Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA)
- **Kanyinke Sena**, East Africa Regional Representative, Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee (IPACC) and Standards Committee member for the REDD+ SE Standards

## **2. Workshop on the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards and their potential use in Tanzania**

### **2.1 Participants and agenda**

The workshop was held on 9 Sept 2009 at the Peacock Hotel, Dar es Salaam. There were approximately 32 participants<sup>1</sup> including members of the National REDD Task Force, Forests and Beekeeping Division of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, national and international NGOs, funding agencies, UN agencies and journalists.

#### **Agenda**

0900	Introductions
0915	Opening - Dr Felician Kilahama, Director of FBD, MNRT
0930	Background and objectives
0945	REDD+ overview - Joanna Durbin, CCBA

#### *Coffee/tea break*

1100	Overview of the development of REDD in Tanzania - Sawe C.T., CMEAMFP Plenary discussion of drivers of deforestation and degradation and potential REDD policies and measures in Tanzania
1130	Introduction to standards and overview of experience from the forest sector – Joanna Durbin, CCBA
1200	Overview of the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards initiative – Phil Franks, CARE
1230	Discussion

#### *Lunch*

1400	Group work to review and improve the existing principles, criteria and indicators. Three groups focused on 2-3 of the overarching principles and the associated criteria and indicators
1800	Close

### **2.2 Overview presentations and discussion**

#### *Questions and comments following REDD+ Overview presentation*

What elements of the + will be eligible in the US market? The + refers to 'the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries' as defined in the Bali Action Plan. The current language in the American Clean Energy and Security Act (ACESA) creates a special opportunity for REDD and would also potentially allow CDM credits to enter as part of the 1 billion ton CO<sub>2</sub>e annual window for international offsets. The CDM credits could include afforestation and reforestation credits. Both the eligibility for CDM post 2012 and the ACESA provisions are still under negotiation.

---

<sup>1</sup> A list of people who attended the workshop and provided contact details is included in Appendix 1.

How will a country REDD program be evaluated against the standards if some areas of the country don't perform well? This is not yet clear and would need to be addressed during the testing phase of the standards from 2010 to 2012. One solution would be to report separately for different parts of the country, or to use the standards to produce a qualitative report rather than a pass-fail assessment for the entire country.

Do you aim for these standards to be absorbed into UNFCCC and rules/requirements for other schemes like the US market? It is expected that these standards will define social and environmental performance above and beyond the minimum requirements that are adopted by UNFCCC, the US market and other forest carbon schemes. The standards aim to help the REDD+ programs to demonstrate their eligibility for these schemes and also to attract additional support for higher performance.

#### *Questions and comments following Overview of development REDD in Tanzania presentation*

There may be an expansion of the REDD task force to include NGOs, research institutes and university, IPs and local people.

Finnish money is available through FAO to collect data and do national forest inventory. Will take 2 years. Will have permanent sample plots in reserves for carbon.

In the first week of November, Tanzania will host REDD Africa workshop. 35-40 countries. This will assist these African countries to prepare their positions and examples for the UNFCCC COP in Copenhagen.

UNREDD will train 2 people in Cambridge on use of technology for forest carbon monitoring. Tanzania aims to have a reliable baseline defined in 3 years.

Tanzania is participating in FCPF and hopes to learn from other participants. Tanzania does not expect to receive funding from FCPF.

The REDD strategy aims to build trust and deliver incentives among the communities. It will be important to motivate people towards more sustainable use.

#### *Plenary discussion of drivers of deforestation and degradation and potential REDD policies and measures*

##### **Drivers of deforestation and degradation**

- Shifting cultivation
- Illegal logging
- Charcoal
- Wildfires
- Expansion of agriculture
  - o Subsistence
  - o Commercial
  - o Biofuels
  - o livestock
- Salt production in mangroves
- Fuelwood
- Infrastructure
- Lack of effective law enforcement
- Refugees
- Expansion of settlement
- Mining
- Inadequate land use planning

##### **Potential policies and measures for the REDD+ programme**

- Awareness raising
- Alternative livelihoods
- Incentives for conservation (PES)

- Land use planning
- Land tenure security
- Alternative energy/energy efficiency
- Equitable sharing of benefits from carbon credits
- Political will
- Collaboration and networking
- Efficient and transparent monitoring
- Policy and legal reform
- Forest management (participatory, sustainable)
- Alternative timber and fuelwood
- Improved agricultural practices
- Fuel switching
- Law enforcement

*Questions and comments following presentations on How do standards work? and REDD+ SE Standards*

Are these national standards? The standards are designed for any government-led programme and could also be used at a State/Province level.

Will the MRV required for these standards conflict with IPCC MRV? The MRV requirements for these standards are not yet clarified. The level of effort required to ensure transparent and accurate monitoring will depend on the users of the standard and the benefits associated with the use of the standards. We should bear in mind that most countries failed to participate in CDM because standards were too stringent. This initiative should set the minimum level first and develop the details as it proceeds. There must be some areas of compromise as the standards must be useable and show a progression/intent etc

There are some good potential linkages with the forest inventory and monitoring process currently under development for Tanzania. There is an interview level to the survey in which some of the information needed for these standards could be integrated. The sampling design is being developed now and the inventory work will start next year. (FAO)

Some of principles have guidance for progressively realizing principles. Others are more pass/fail. Is that intentional? It is important that the standards encourage a pathway to good performance.

REDD is essentially a payment for an international service. Are there any other PES standards? There are no other standards quite like these for PES schemes. We can look to some other standards that apply to national-level programs like the Voluntary Partnership Agreements between countries and the European Union as part of the Forest Law Enforcement and Governance and Trade programme, the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), the Kimberly process that aims to keep conflict-diamonds out of the market and the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES).

Any potential for use of the standards by communities? What is the potential involvement of local communities in the use of the standards? This has been raised in other countries. It is true that local communities and other stakeholders at the national level, as opposed to the international level, have an interest in ensuring REDD+ programs are adequately addressing the social and environmental aspects. The results of monitoring should be accessible at the local level. We also need to make sure that local concerns are adequately addressed in the standards. Local communities can also play a key role in collecting and reporting information about conformance to the standards. This can be addressed through the MRV system.

What is the likely cost of the monitoring associated with the use of these standards? What are the tradeoffs between cost and effectiveness? We will aim to learn more about this during the testing phase. Tanzania is doing an analysis of costs and benefits of REDD with the REDD framework and UNREDD and this could potentially include an evaluation of the cost implications of using these standards.

## 2.3 Group work to comment on the principles and criteria and develop indicators

Working groups were formed and addressed the principles as follows:

- Group 1 (Nashanda, Melamari, Henman, Campese, Sena) - Principles 1,2
- Group 2 (Swai, Mndolwa, Haule, Doggart, Sawe, Mpanda) - Principles 3,4,5
- Group 3 (Ngatigwa, Senya, Njaidi, Otieno, Bulu) – Principles 6,7,8

The principles and criteria discussed during the workshop in Tanzania derive from a multi-stakeholder workshop on the development of social and environmental standards for REDD+ programs held in Copenhagen 5-7 May 2009 and comments received from government and NGO representatives in Nepal 29 June-3 July. The principles, criteria and indicators were formulated based on the following guidelines<sup>2</sup>:

- **Principles** (P1-P8) are the 'intent' level of a standard which elaborate on the objectives of the standard and define the scope. They are fundamental statements about the desired outcome and are not designed to be verified.
- **Criteria** (a.,b., ..... ) are the 'content' level of a standard which set out the conditions which need to be met in order to deliver a principle. It can be possible to verify criteria directly but they are usually further elaborated by indicators.
- **Indicators** (I, ii ..... ) are quantitative or qualitative parameters which can be achieved and verified in relation to a criterion.

A few of the criteria proposed at the workshop in Copenhagen were later classed as indicators. The indicators proposed during the workshops in Copenhagen and Nepal were discussed by the working groups in Tanzania and were amended or new indicators added as relevant to the Tanzanian use of the standards. Many excellent suggestions were also made to improve the principles and criteria.

The new indicators and comments proposed by the working groups in Tanzania are shown in Appendix 2.

## 3. Meetings with REDD Task Force members and other partners to discuss next steps

### Recommendations

- Six NGO REDD projects are likely to be approved for funding through the Norwegian Embassy. These projects are not all site delimited as some are at a larger landscape scale and will be testing a diversity of REDD mechanisms. These projects should be integrated into the testing phase of the REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards.
- While the workshop in Dar es Salaam on 9<sup>th</sup> September enabled input into the standards from the partners represented at the national level, it would be very good to create an opportunity to seek input on the standards from local communities. As mentioned at the national workshop, these local stakeholders are also potential users of the standards and it will be important to ensure that their concerns and interests are reflected in the standards. MJUMITA is willing to assist CARE and CCBA to organize a meeting with some representatives of grassroots organizations and others potentially affected by REDD including Indigenous Peoples such as pastoralists. Some district-level forest service representatives should also be involved in this meeting.
- FBD as the lead agency for the implementation, supervision and operationalisation of Tanzania's REDD programme should take the lead in exploring the use of the standards to strengthen the development and implementation of the REDD programme, keeping the REDD Task Force members and VPO informed of progress.
- Once the testing phase of the standards commences, a 'steering committee' should be created that includes a diversity of stakeholders and partners who are working with the government to develop and implement Tanzania's REDD programme.

---

<sup>2</sup> Based on a report prepared for the workshop by ProForest 'Developing social and biodiversity standards for government-led REDD and other forest carbon programs: A review of existing standards and verification systems'.

**Next steps:**

- Report from CCBA and CARE of the outputs from the consultation meetings – Oct
- MJUMITA and CARE organize a meeting to consult with local stakeholders about the REDD+ Standards – early 2010
- Develop multi-country funding proposal in late 2009 – CARE to take the lead with FBD.
- Tanzanian Government representative to join the REDD+SE standards (CCBA/CARE) Standards Committee.
- Meeting of the Standards Committee Friday 4<sup>th</sup> and Saturday 5<sup>th</sup> December in Copenhagen prior UNFCCC COP 15.

## Appendix 1. List of participants

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>email</b>
Dr Felician Kilahama	FBD – Director	<a href="mailto:fkilahama@gmail.com">fkilahama@gmail.com</a>
Jenny Henman	Green Resources	<a href="mailto:jenny.henman@greenresources.no">jenny.henman@greenresources.no</a>
Paul Barker	CARE	<a href="mailto:barker@care.org">barker@care.org</a>
Nike Doggart	TFCG	<a href="mailto:ndoggart@tfcg.or.tz">ndoggart@tfcg.or.tz</a>
Mathew Mndolwa	TAFORI	<a href="mailto:mathewmndolwa@yahoo.com">mathewmndolwa@yahoo.com</a>
Sawe C T	CMEAMFP	<a href="mailto:sawe59@yahoo.com">sawe59@yahoo.com</a>
Mary Swai	TATEDO	<a href="mailto:energy@tatedo.org">energy@tatedo.org</a>
Jessica Campese	IUCN	<a href="mailto:jesscampese@gmail.com">jesscampese@gmail.com</a>
Charles Meschack	TFCG	<a href="mailto:cmeshack@tfcg.or.tz">cmeshack@tfcg.or.tz</a>
Alfei Daniel	IUCN-Climate Change	<a href="mailto:alfei.daniel@iucn.org">alfei.daniel@iucn.org</a>
Benedict Komba	Tanzania Broadcasting Corporation	<a href="mailto:benkomba6@yahoo.com">benkomba6@yahoo.com</a>
Rahima Njaidi	MJUMITA	<a href="mailto:rnjaidi@gmail.com">rnjaidi@gmail.com</a>
Kanyinke Sena	IPACC	<a href="mailto:kanyinke@yahoo.com">kanyinke@yahoo.com</a>
Ivar Jorgensen	Embassy of Norway	<a href="mailto:ivjo@mfa.no">ivjo@mfa.no</a>
Simon Milledge	Embassy of Norway	<a href="mailto:simi@mfa.no">simi@mfa.no</a>
Lota Melamari	WCST	<a href="mailto:melamarilota@yahoo.co.uk">melamarilota@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Evarist Nashanda	FBD	<a href="mailto:evarist.nashanda@gmail.com">evarist.nashanda@gmail.com</a>
Vedasto Msungu	ITV & Radio One Morogoro	<a href="mailto:vmsungu@yahoo.com">vmsungu@yahoo.com</a>
David Ramadhan	Channel ten	<a href="mailto:davidrms@yahoo.com">davidrms@yahoo.com</a>
Moses Masenga	Channel ten	<a href="mailto:davidmasenga@yahoo.com">davidmasenga@yahoo.com</a>
Christian Peter	World Bank	<a href="mailto:cpeter@worldbank.org">cpeter@worldbank.org</a>
Charles Ngatigwa	FBD-FOPU	<a href="mailto:ngatigwa@hotmail.com">ngatigwa@hotmail.com</a>
Gemma Aliti	UNDP	<a href="mailto:jemma.aliti@undp.org">jemma.aliti@undp.org</a>
Soren Dalsgaard	FAO-NAFORMA	<a href="mailto:soren.dalsgaard@fao.org">soren.dalsgaard@fao.org</a>
Gerald Otieno	FBD, DSM	<a href="mailto:otienozuk@yahoo.com">otienozuk@yahoo.com</a>
Kahana Lukumbuzya	HTSPE TZ	<a href="mailto:kahana.lukumbuzya@htspe.co.tz">kahana.lukumbuzya@htspe.co.tz</a>
Sheiba L. Bulu	MNRT- Communication	<a href="mailto:sheibalal@yahoo.co.uk">sheibalal@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Christognus A. Haule	FBD-Forest Officer	<a href="mailto:hauleca@yahoo.com">hauleca@yahoo.com</a>
Mathew Mpanda	FBD/ICRAF	<a href="mailto:mshauri2005@yahoo.com">mshauri2005@yahoo.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:m.mpanda@cgiar.org">m.mpanda@cgiar.org</a>

**Appendix 2. Draft Indicators for REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards<sup>1</sup>**  
**Version July 9<sup>th</sup> 2009 with new indicators and comments proposed by working groups in Tanzania on Sept 9<sup>th</sup> 2009**

<b>P1: Rights to land, territories and resources are recognized and respected.</b>	
1.a The REDD+ program <sup>2</sup> effectively identifies the different rights holders (statutory and customary) and their rights to land, territories and resources relevant to the program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A process is established to inventory and map existing statutory and customary land, territories and resources [and trees] tenure/use/access/management rights (including those of women etc.) relevant to the program identifying where there is 'overlap' of rights or conflicts.</li> <li>-</li> </ul>
1.b The REDD+ program respects and recognizes customary rights to land, territory and resources which Indigenous Peoples or local communities have traditionally owned and occupied or otherwise used or acquired <sup>3</sup> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Forestry management plans including community management plans will be developed recognizing customary rights</li> <li>- The spatial boundary of all traditional activities is clearly defined on community forestry management plans</li> <li>- National REDD strategy should have an appropriate clause that depicts the customary rights of Indigenous People's and local communities</li> <li>- Cross-cutting policy documents have the appropriate clauses (land, water, local development,)</li> <li>- Policies are in place to ensure forest user's rights</li> <li>- Forestry management plans including community management plans ensures identification of rights of all users</li> </ul>
1.c The REDD+ program requires the free, prior and informed consent of rights holders for any activities affecting their ownership and rights to lands, resources and territories.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A mechanism is developed that eases access to information</li> <li>- Process supports full implementation and awareness at all levels, particularly local level.</li> <li>- Existence of an agreed process that ensures, among other things, a clarity and consensus on who has the authority to consent.</li> </ul>
1.d The REDD+ program includes a process to resolve any disputes over rights to land, territories and resources <sup>4</sup> related to the program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A mechanism of local/community/national mediation is formed/developed</li> <li>- xx cases/disputes settled under the mechanism</li> <li>- Resolution of disputes is done in a timely manner/agreed upon time frame.</li> </ul>

**Comment [j1]:** Not a word used in Tanzania. A definition would be needed for reference

**Comment [j3]:** Under Tanzanian Law some communities may not have rights to use government forest, but they do use the forests frequently and depend upon them. i.e. ceasing illegal activities might not be recognized.

Note that legal reform in Tanzania is trying to resolve the rights issue in relation to use and access.

**Comment [j2]:** What are 'customary rights' and what happens if this conflicts with the law? Customary and statutory rights might overlap or conflict. Note that there may be a difference between land rights, access rights and use rights. There are some cases in Tanzania where customary and statutory rights conflict.

**Comment [j4]:** Is there a need to mention statutory rights either here or in another criterion – see new criterion 1f.

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to an accompanying fact sheet about the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards or contact Joanna Durbin [jdurbin@climate-standards.org](mailto:jdurbin@climate-standards.org) or Phil Franks [phil@ci.or.ke](mailto:phil@ci.or.ke) for more information about the initiative.

<sup>2</sup> The REDD+ program comprises objectives, policies and measures developed for the program and other relevant policies that support it.

<sup>3</sup> In particular, recognizing that Indigenous Peoples have the right to own, use, develop and control the lands, territories and resources that they possess by reason of traditional ownership or other traditional occupation or use, as well as those which they have otherwise acquired.

<sup>4</sup> Including but not limited to ownership and access rights.

based on the free, prior and informed consent of the parties involved.	- Mechanism is transparent/accessible.
1.e Where the REDD+ program enables private ownership <sup>5</sup> of carbon rights, they are allocated equitably based on rights to the land, territories and resources (as identified in P1.a) that are generating the greenhouse gas emissions reductions and removals.	- Process for negotiating carbon rights is agreed upon and implemented. - Process (above) adheres to principles of good governance. <sup>6</sup>
1.f The REDD+ program promotes securing of statutory rights to land and resources.	- Increased demarcation of community/village lands. - Increased allocation of titles to communities (in a timely manner).

**Comment [j7]:** This indicator should be added to other indicators about 'processes' or 'methods'

**Comment [j5]:** Is this word necessary? Does it need clarity given that it refers to already secured land rights? Is it the carbon 'rights' that need to be equitably distributed or the carbon 'benefits'.

**Comment [j6]:** NB. Most of forest in Tanzania and elsewhere in Africa is government owned.

**Comment [j8]:** Consider linkage with sustainable livelihood benefits. NB. Land use planning is also needed when title is allocated.

**P2: The benefits of the REDD+ program are shared equitably/ among all stakeholders and rights holders.**

Criteria	Indicators
2.a The REDD+ program identifies projected costs (indirect, direct and opportunity costs) and potential benefits (indirect and direct) of the program, and associated risks, for stakeholder <sup>8</sup> groups with respect to the reference scenario. <sup>9</sup>	- Stakeholder analysis (a report) - Study report about projected costs, revenues and other benefits and risk factors - Dissemination of the report to rights holders and stakeholders

**Comment [j9]:** Is this necessary?

**Comment [j10]:** Including carbon price

<sup>5</sup> Including collective and individual ownership.

<sup>6</sup> Need definition of 'good governance'

<sup>7</sup> Equitable needs definition especially in the context of other languages.

<sup>8</sup> The term 'stakeholders' is defined for the purposes of these standards to include rights holders whose rights are potentially affected by the REDD+ program and other stakeholders whose interests are potentially affected by the program. It is important that both groups are included, acknowledging a differentiation between interests and rights.

<sup>9</sup> The 'reference scenario' is the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the implementation of the REDD+ program.

<p>2.b A transparent, participatory and efficient<sup>10</sup> process must be established for equitable sharing of benefits of the REDD+ program taking into account costs, benefits and associated risks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financing management mechanism or financing channel should be independent of government.</li> <li>- Clarity over where decision-making authority lies relating to carbon crediting/sales and allocation of revenues and benefit sharing.</li> <li>- A review of options for the most efficient and equitable distribution mechanisms</li> <li>- Legal framework (Act...Policy...)</li> <li>- Implementation guidelines</li> <li>- National level stakeholders committee to oversee benefit sharing including representatives of stakeholders at all levels, including civil society.</li> <li>- Annual report on benefit sharing</li> <li>- There is a procedure for decision-making about benefit distribution/sharing which includes all stakeholders and rights holders using a multi-stakeholder forum.</li> <li>- There should be a proportionate mechanism for benefit-sharing eg. at least 80% of revenues should go to rights holders</li> <li>- There is a transparent and accessible mechanism for complaints and their resolution.</li> </ul>
<p>2.c There is transparent and participatory monitoring of the the full range of costs and benefits of the REDD+ program, including any revenues, and their distribution among stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National level stakeholders committee to oversee monitoring of benefit sharing</li> <li>- Reporting/monitoring should disaggregate full range of costs and benefits by standard socio-economic indicators and gender.</li> <li>- Number of public hearings/auditing</li> <li>- Report on participatory monitoring</li> </ul>

**Comment [j11]:** This qualification can be added to other 'process' and 'mechanism' references.

**Comment [j12]:** Not appropriate for this to be specified in the standards.

**Comment [j13]:** Who monitors? (who is in charge of facilitating participation? Want to avoid conflict of interests.

<b>P3: The REDD+ program contributes to sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation for forest- dependent<sup>11</sup> peoples.</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
<p>3.a The REDD+ program leads to additional and long-term livelihood and poverty alleviation benefits. with respect to the reference scenario and existing commitments, emphasizing the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The REDD+ program generates increased financing to contribute to sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation.</li> <li>- Processes are in place to ensure that women and forest-dependent peoples benefit from the REDD+ program.</li> <li>- Improved livelihoods/per capita income of the poor and marginalized.</li> </ul>

**Comment [j14]:** No need to refer to the reference scenario as this will be relevant for all outcome criteria.

**Comment [j15]:** Existing commitments are frequently not realized so not appropriate to include here.

<sup>10</sup> 'Efficient' is defined for the purpose of these standards as achieving the target with minimum cost, effort and time.

<sup>11</sup> Forest-dependent peoples include Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

poor and marginalized.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mechanism for cost-benefit sharing developed and tested and all levels.</li> <li>- National livelihood/poverty monitoring shows improvements in areas where REDD programs are implemented.</li> </ul>	<b>Comment [j16]:</b> No need to refer to the poor and marginalized as alleviation of poverty is necessarily for the poor.
3.b The relevant forest-dependent peoples define how the REDD+ program improves their livelihoods and alleviates poverty through an inclusive and transparent process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- REDD+ national policy and guidelines specify involvement of rural communities in the monitoring of the poverty alleviation impacts of REDD+.</li> <li>- Poverty alleviation measures and monitoring is planned with the involvement of relevant rural communities</li> </ul>	<b>Comment [j17]:</b> Tanzania requests redefining the term 'forest dependent peoples' to 'rural communities' since the term 'forest dependent peoples' is not used in any policy documents and not appropriate for Tanzania.
3.c There is participatory assessment of positive and negative livelihood and poverty impacts of the REDD+ program including both predicted (ie social impact assessment <sup>12</sup> ) and actual impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Independent local monitoring system (NGO/GO) for all types of forest.</li> <li>- Study report/minutes of impact assessment</li> <li>- Participatory self-evaluation and monitoring provision in their operational plan and make mandatory to conduct on a regular basis.</li> <li>- Existence of separate committee for self/participatory monitoring and evaluation.</li> <li>- Participatory monitoring system in place for REDD.</li> </ul>	<b>Comment [j18]:</b> Propose combining 3b and 3c.
3.d The REDD+ program is adapted based on predictive and ongoing impact assessment to mitigate negative, and enhance positive, livelihood and poverty impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommendations of participatory evaluation are incorporated into program planning.</li> <li>- Mitigation measures (for leakage) adopted</li> </ul>	<b>Comment [j19]:</b> Suggest making this an indicator.

<b>P4: The REDD+ program contributes to broader sustainable development and good governance<sup>13</sup> objectives.</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	
4.a The REDD+ program is coherent with national and state/provincial sustainable development policies and strategies <sup>14</sup> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Forests and other relevant policies address REDD+ issues</li> <li>- Land-use plans include elements of the REDD+ program</li> </ul>	<b>Comment [j20]:</b> Delete for Tanzania. There are no State/Provincial policies
4.b Where the REDD+ program is not	- NB: change can't be expected quickly because REDD+ program and SE standards did not exist when policies were	<b>Comment [j21]:</b> Recommend that 4a and 4b are combined.

<sup>12</sup> Social impact assessment should include social, cultural and economic impacts.

<sup>13</sup> 'good governance' needs definition.

<sup>14</sup> e.g. poverty reduction strategies/targets, national budgets, national biodiversity strategies, national climate change strategies, national adaptation plans etc.

<p>consistent with national and state/provincial sustainable development strategies, a review process is undertaken to resolve the inconsistencies.</p>	<p>developed</p>
<p>4.c There should be strong government ownership of the REDD+ program in their country.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- REDD carbon monitoring center developed and functional.</li> <li>- REDD institutional arrangements developed.</li> <li>- National REDD Strategy developed and implemented.</li> </ul>
<p>4.d There should be effective coordination between government agencies/institutions responsible for the design, implementation and evaluation of the REDD+ program and other relevant government agencies/institutions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- REDD+ coordination bodies established and functional.</li> </ul>
<p>4.e. The REDD+ program leads to sector-wide improvements in forest governance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- REDD standards developed participatory and institutionalized.</li> </ul>

<b>P5: Biodiversity and ecosystem services<sup>15</sup> are maintained and enhanced.</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
5.a. Biodiversity and ecosystem services enhanced. <del>including any nationally or locally defined high conservation values, are maintained and enhanced at landscape and national scale with respect to the reference scenario<sup>16</sup>.</del>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carbon stock increased.</li> <li>- Increased fauna and flora species.</li> <li>- Protection and conservation of habitat for endangered species improved.</li> <li>- Forests and forest products improved.</li> <li>- Soil fertility and productivity improved.</li> <li>- Decreased incidences of wildfire, illegal logging and forest encroachment.</li> <li>- A national REDD fund established.</li> <li>- Water quality and quantity improved.</li> <li>- Human and financial resources for critical ecosystem areas increased.</li> <li>- Management plans for ecosystem/landscape management developed and implemented.</li> </ul>
5.b The positive and negative impacts of the REDD+ program on ecosystem services and biodiversity are assessed. <del>including both predicted (i.e. environmental impact assessment) and actual impacts,</del>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Standards for measuring and monitoring developed and tested.</li> <li>- Stakeholders involved in assessment.</li> </ul>

**Comment [j22]:** This detail can be included in indicators.

<sup>15</sup> 'Ecosystem services' in this context refers to services other than greenhouse gas emissions reductions or removals

<sup>16</sup> 'High Conservation Values' are defined by the High Conservation Value (HCV) Resource Network <http://hcvnetwork.org/>

1. Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values; protected areas, threatened species, endemic species, areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle (e.g. migrations, feeding grounds).
2. Globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape-level areas where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance;
3. Threatened or rare ecosystems;
4. Areas that provide critical ecosystem services (e.g., hydrological services, erosion control, fire control);
5. Areas that are fundamental for meeting the basic needs of local communities (e.g., for essential food, fuel, fodder, medicines or building materials without readily available alternatives); and
6. Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of communities (e.g., areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in collaboration with the communities).

involving forest dependent peoples and other stakeholders as appropriate.	
5.c The REDD+ program design addresses maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity and ecosystem services. in its objectives, policies and measures, building on relevant traditional knowledge and management practices of forest dependent peoples and other stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NGOs, CBOs and private organizations involved in REDD+ program.</li> <li>- Local and cultural values of biodiversity identified.</li> </ul>

**Comment [j23]:** This level of detail should be transferred to the indicators.

**Comment [j24]:** Should be transferred to indicators.

<b>P6: All relevant stakeholders and rights holders are able to participate fully and effectively in the REDD+ program.</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
6.a The REDD+ program identifies and characterises stakeholders, including Indigenous Peoples, local communities, women and other potentially marginalized groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of stakeholders by categories: (Jangati, Dalit, women etc in Nepal)</li> <li>- Program annual report on the status of the identified stakeholders.</li> </ul>
6.b All relevant stakeholders are involved in program design, implementation and evaluation through effective consultation or more active participation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- % stakeholders by participation in design, implementation, evaluation</li> <li>- Number of programs adopting a participatory approach of consultation/discussion</li> <li>- Number of community groups with improved livelihood</li> <li>- Program annual reports</li> <li>- Number of meetings and consultations tailored to the local context.</li> <li>- Number of programs financially supported.</li> <li>- Effective gender representation and potentially marginalized groups in the stakeholder consultation/participation process.</li> <li>- Number of local government as well as national government included in the program.</li> </ul>
6.c Stakeholders determine how they will be represented, taking account of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Guideline for stakeholders representation in place and implemented.</li> </ul>

formal and informal arrangements/institutions.	
6.d Stakeholder representatives ensure effective involvement, information sharing and accountability with/to the people they represent and assist with consensus building.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of stakeholders participating in decision making process.</li> <li>- Information sharing mechanism in place and implemented.</li> <li>- Number of local meetings organized.</li> <li>- Number of issues raised and actions taken.</li> <li>- Participatory forest management guidelines in place and implemented.</li> <li>- Number of program reports.</li> </ul>
6.e Stakeholders have a good understanding of the key issues related to the REDD+ program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of awareness raising programs</li> <li>- Number of publications/reporting</li> <li>- Increased % of budget invested in REDD+</li> <li>- Number of REDD+ operational plans.</li> <li>- Number of stakeholders reached.</li> </ul>
6.f Mechanisms are in place to receive and resolve grievances and disputes relating to planning and implementation of the REDD+ program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dispute mechanisms in place.</li> <li>- Number and nature of cases resolved.</li> </ul>
6.g Program planning and implementation builds on and supports stakeholders' knowledge, skills and management systems including those of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of indigenous knowledge (IKAP) documented.</li> <li>- Number of programs using indigenous technical knowledge.</li> </ul>

<b>P7: All stakeholders and rights holders have timely access to appropriate and accurate information to enable good governance of the REDD+ program.</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>

7.a Stakeholders have the information that they need before making a decision, including information about potential social, cultural, economic and ecological risks and opportunities, legal implications, and the global and national context.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of comments or issues received from the stakeholders</li> <li>- Number of stakeholders and rights holders accessing the information.</li> <li>- Number of effective means of dissemination identified and used.</li> <li>- Number of local communities having informing in a form they understand.</li> <li>- Number of documents available in simple language.</li> </ul>
7.b Stakeholder representatives collect and disseminate all relevant information from and to their constituencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of representatives collecting and disseminating relevant information.</li> <li>- Number of constituencies receiving information.</li> <li>- Number of information sharing meetings held.</li> </ul>
7.c Information is available and disseminated in time to enable stakeholder feedback to their representatives and respecting the time needed for inclusive decision making.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of information released in time.</li> <li>- Number of documents published and disseminated in time.</li> </ul>
7.d National policies support stakeholder access to information about the REDD+ program, including information on rights to land, territories and resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of policies addressing the issues in place.</li> <li>- Number of policy documents disseminated.</li> <li>- Mechanism for right to information in place.</li> </ul>
7.e Stakeholders have access to legal advice and understand relevant legal implications and processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of legal aid services in place and accessed.</li> <li>- % of stakeholders aware of legal and legislation services.</li> <li>- Number of legal and legislation programs aired and published.</li> </ul>

<b>P8: The REDD+ program complies with applicable local<sup>17</sup> and national laws and international treaties and agreements.</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
8.a The REDD+ program complies with local law, national law and international treaties and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- List of local and national laws and international treaties and agreements relevant to REDD+</li> <li>-</li> </ul>

<sup>17</sup> Local laws include all legal norms given by organisms of government whose jurisdiction is less than the national level, such as departmental, municipal and customary norms.

agreements ratified or adopted by the country.	
8.b Where local or national law is not consistent with the standards, a review process should be undertaken that results in a plan to resolve the inconsistencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mechanism to resolve inconsistencies in place.</li> <li>- Number of local and national laws reviewed.</li> </ul>
8.c Relevant stakeholders have the capacity to implement and monitor legal requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Existence of support mechanisms for implementing and monitoring legal requirements</li> <li>- Number of stakeholders having capacity to implement and monitor legal requirements</li> <li>- Number of legal requirements monitored and implemented.</li> </ul>