

REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards

Report of Consultation Meetings
22-26th October 2009, Ecuador



30th November 2009

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

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Workshop on REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards and their potential use in Ecuador	4
3. Consultation workshop with Indigenous Peoples representatives	7
4. Debriefing and planning next steps	9

Appendix 1. List of participants in Quito Consultation Workshop 23 Oct 2009
Appendix 2. List of participants in Lago Agrio Workshop 24-25 Oct 2009
Appendix 3. Draft Principles, Criteria and Indicators with comments from the Quito workshop
Appendix 4. Full report of discussions at the Lago Agrio workshop

1. Introduction

a. The context, role and goal of the standards

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 is developing standards that can be used by governments, NGOs, financing agencies and other stakeholders to design and implement REDD and other forest carbon programs in a form that respects the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and that generates significant social and biodiversity co-benefits. These standards are being designed to work for the new global REDD+ regime expected to emerge out of ongoing UNFCCC negotiations, that is designed 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 is overseeing the standards development and approve each draft of the standards. The majority of committee members are 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 Ecuador

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

Programme

22 Oct

- Preparations for the consultations with Ministry of Environment and Conservation International

23 Oct

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

24-25 Oct

- Workshop with representatives of Cofan and Kichwa Indigenous Peoples communities involved in Socio Bosque in Lago Agrio

26 Oct

- Meeting with Ministry of Environment and Conservation International to assess the feedback from the consultations and discuss next steps

The REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards team comprised:

- **Joanna Durbin**, Director, Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA)
- **Dawn Robinson**, Consultant, ProForest, UK
- **Mauricio Voivodic**, IMAFLORA, Brazil, and member of the Standards Committee that oversees the development of the REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards

2. Workshop on the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards and their potential use in Ecuador

2.1 Participants and agenda

The workshop was held on 23rd Oct 2009 at FLACSO, Quito. There were approximately 30 participants including staff of the Ministry of Environment, the Coordinating Ministry for Natural and Cultural Heritage, regional governments, national and international NGOs and funding agencies (see Appendix 1).

Agenda

0930	Introductions
0935	Opening – Marco Chiu, MAE
0945	Introduction to the REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards and workshop objectives– Dawn Robinson, ProForest
1000	What is a REDD+ program – Free de Koning, CI for Joanna Durbin, CCBA

Coffee/tea break

1045	From Socio Bosque to REDD – Daniela Carrion, MAE
1115	How standards work and introduction to the REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards – Dawn Robinson, ProForest
1145	Discussion
1230	Introduction to group work to review and improve the draft principles, criteria and indicators.

Lunch

1400	Group work. Four groups each focused on 2 of the overarching principles and the associated criteria and indicators
1600	Report back from groups and plenary discussion of monitoring, reporting and verification options
1630	Close

2.2 Presentations and discussion

Discussion after the presentation 'Introduction to the REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards and workshop objectives'

Q: Need to take account of the political structures of the communities. It is important not only to consult with communities but also to engage with the organizations that work with indigenous peoples (IP) and the networks that represent IPs interests.

A: We are engaging at the international level with IP networks and NGOs. The IP representative on the Standards Committee from Latin America is Estebancio Castro the head of the International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of Tropical Forests who is based in Panama. The African IP representative is Kanyinke Sena of the Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee and the Asian Representative is Jennifer Rubis of the Indigenous Peoples Network of Malaysia. Here in Ecuador we will be talking to some community representatives in Lago Agrio on Saturday 24th -Sunday 25th October. We plan to conduct a more comprehensive consultation in the second phase when we start testing the standards.

Comment: It is a good idea to have different levels to make it easier to achieve and also to demonstrate progress.

Discussion after the presentation 'From Socio Bosque to REDD'

Q: Will there be payments for communities in protected areas?

A: Not for now. We are reviewing this.

Q: Communities are worried about the government taking possession of their land.

A: The communities must present legal title to their land to be eligible for Socio Bosque. The Government will not remove this legal title.

Discussion after the presentation 'How standards work and introduction to the REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards'

Q: Who will check whether there is a positive social impact over time? It's not good enough to check once at the beginning.

Q: How will the standards be implemented? What will be the mechanism for certification/qualification? Will there be third party verification?

A: The monitoring, reporting and verification systems have not been decided. This will depend on the way they are used. The standards may just be a guideline to define best practice for development and implementation of REDD programs or may be used to demonstrate to a funder or other interested parties that the REDD program is effectively delivering social and environmental benefits. The relative importance given to impartial assessment of performance will determine the level of verification, bearing in mind that more rigorous and independent verification will involve greater costs.

Q: Why do the standards include mostly social criteria and not so many environmental criteria?

A: When we started to develop these criteria we found that most of the concerns about REDD were related to social issues. There is one principle that focuses on maintaining biodiversity and ecosystem services (other than climate change mitigation).

Q: The poorest often get left behind. We should make sure that the poorest also benefit from Socio Bosque.

A: The Socio Bosque program has a major objective of providing assistance to some of the poorest rural communities. We are keen to monitor and demonstrate the poverty alleviation impacts of our REDD program which is why we are interested to use these standards. We are also participating in the discussion of these social and biodiversity impacts of REDD at the international negotiations and analyzing with other countries how to include a requirement for biodiversity conservation and equitable participation. Even if these things are not included as requirements in the UNFCCC agreement, Ecuador will respect the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Ecuador is also a signatory of ILO 169.

Q: We are concerned that a market approach will lead to a price war that will lead to a low price for credits. We should collaborate with the Amazon countries to create a strong negotiating block. How is the government approaching this?

A: It is not always easy to collaborate with the other Amazon countries because there are a lot of political differences between us. We have started to discuss our shared interests but a clear negotiating position will probably not be agreed before COP 15.

Q: The government needs to organize more workshops about these issues. We would like to understand more about the government's position and also to contribute to the development of the national strategy for REDD.

A: We had been planning a workshop about the national REDD strategy after Copenhagen. We would like to get input from NGOs and other partners. We will think about the feasibility of holding this workshop sooner before Copenhagen.

Comment: There is an environmental network about payment for ecosystem services called RISAS (Red de Interesados en Servicios Ambientales or Network of people Interested in Environmental Services) facilitated by EcoDecision. This network could be used to help disseminate information about the national REDD strategy and about this standards initiative and to receive feedback.

Comment: The next workshop like this should include representatives of indigenous peoples. We have been talking about them and their interests but they should participate in the discussions.

Q: How will the standards be revised?

A: We will collect all your comments and write them up as comments and track-changes on a Word version of the standards. We will send these back to you to check that your comments have been faithfully captured. The Standards Committee will review all the comments received during the public comment period and use these to produce a new version of the standards.

Comment: The Ministry of Environment has developed new environmental policies to bring policies in line with the new constitution.

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 – Principles 1 and 2

Wain Collen, Belen Cordovez, Martha Nuñez, Paulina Baca

Group 2 – Principles 3 and 4

Daniela Carrión, Elba Fiallo-Pantziou, Maria Belén Herrera, Mateo Espinosa, Mauricio Voivodic

Group 3 – Principles 6 and 7

Lourdes Barragan, Free de Koning, Marco Chiu, Belen Paez, Dawn Robinson

Group 4 – Principles 5 and 8

Federico Starnfeld, Andrea Crosby, Luis Ordoñez, Jorge Rivas, Andrea Garzón

The draft version of the standards discussed during the workshop in Ecuador derives from a multi-stakeholder workshop held in Copenhagen 5-7 May 2009, consultations with government and non-government representatives in Nepal 29 June-3 July and in Tanzania 9-11 September and other comments received. . The standards consist of principles, criteria and indicators that define the issues of concern and the required levels of social and environmental performance:

- **Principles** 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** 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** are quantitative or qualitative parameters which can be achieved and verified in relation to a criterion.

Originating at the Copenhagen workshop, the principles and criteria in this draft have been subject to a series of consultations and revisions over a period of five months. Work on indicators started more recently with the country consultations in Nepal and Tanzania. These consultations and other discussions have identified key issues on which indicators should be based (i.e an overall framework for the indicator level). Further input is needed to define the formulation that will be most effective for the monitoring, reporting and verification processes to be developed.

The comments made by the working groups in Ecuador are shown in Appendix 3.

2.4 Plenary discussion about options for monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV)

- When considering a voluntary standard we should recognize that more independent monitoring and verification will be more costly. It seems adequate for us at this stage to choose an intermediate path with participatory monitoring and transparent reporting. We want our process to be as simple and flexible as possible and don’t want to add too much complexity and high cost processes. We should avoid the costly and complicated monitoring required for CDM.
- The indicators are defined in very general terms. There should be a process to make them more specific for Ecuador.
- We could use a process of self-evaluation. These standards will be very helpful to get our house in order. They will make it very clear what should be done and we can check ourselves if we are complying with these good practices.
- Monitoring should include the participation of local communities, since they know the local realities and can tell if the indicators are being met.
- We can’t define now what level of independent monitoring we will need.
- The MRV will depend on the funding source. If Socio Bosque continues to be funded with national public funds a national multi-stakeholder review committee would be appropriate. If funding comes from an international donor or source then it could be appropriate and worth the extra expense of including some international observers. The countries that use the standards could create a peer-review body.
- It is important that we don’t make MRV too expensive and that we avoid unnecessary costs. We should make good use of local people. The private sector could also help.

3. Consultation workshop with Indigenous Peoples representatives

3.1 Participants, objectives and agenda

Nine representatives of 5 different communities participated in a consultation workshop in Lago Agrio on 24th and 25th October. The list of participants is given in Appendix 2.

The workshop began with an explanation of the role of forests in climate change mitigation and of the international interest in assisting countries like Ecuador to maintain their forests through a framework agreement on climate changes that includes activities that reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD). The Socio Bosque program is an example of a program where the government provides economic incentives or other benefits to indigenous peoples and local communities for the good management or the conservation of the forests.

The standards were explained as a voluntary initiative which would allow countries to show where their policies and programs are having positive environmental and social benefits. This initiative will describe how governments should take into account social and environmental impacts when designing REDD programs. This international initiative is led by CCBA (Climate Community and Biodiversity Alliance) and CARE International. Representatives from CCBA / CARE are visiting Ecuador to understand how these standards might work in a country like Ecuador, and to learn from the experiences and programs that already exist here.

The objectives of the workshop were to listen to the points of views of the members of communities present at the workshop and participating in Socio Bosque and to learn from them in order to help design international standards about the social and environmental impacts of REDD programs and policies like Socio Bosque.

Discussions were focused on the responses to the following questions:

Understanding Socio Bosque

- What changes has Socio Bosque meant for you and for your communities? What are the positive changes? What are the negative changes?

Benefits and Participation

- Does everyone in the community participate in the same way? Why? Is that ok?
- How are the benefits shared?
- Sometimes there can be problems between communities, or inside a community - among families - about participating in this kind of program or about how the benefits are used. Do you have any experience of this?
- What kind of information helps you to participate in Socio Bosque?

Influencing the way programs like this work

- For the communities, what are the most important aspects of a program like Socio Bosque? What would you recommend to others?
- Is it possible that communities – both leaders and community members – participate in the design of programs like Socio Bosque? If so, how? What are the challenges to this? How can these be overcome?
- If you were going to give recommendations to other countries – to their governments or to other communities about a program like Socio Bosque, what would your recommendations be?

3.2 Output from the meeting with Indigenous Peoples representatives

A full report of the discussions at the meeting is given in Appendix 4. The comments and suggestions related to the REDD+ SE Standards are presented here.

What type of information would help your communities to participate in Socio Bosque or a similar program?

- A workshop is good. Documents are important but it is much better if things are explained in person. Maybe a video would be good. We also want to hear from other communities who have experience of the program. Sometimes it is hard to believe one person so it is better to hear from many people, especially from others like us who share their experiences.

- It is important to explain both positive and negative aspects. You must explain the advantages and the disadvantages, explaining the whole system and identifying all the potential impacts.
- Only a few people in our community speak Spanish, and it is mostly the men. The government should choose one person who understands our language to work on translation and to explain things to our community.
- There is a program in the Ministry to employ local outreach workers for Socio Bosque - This is a good initiative and will help to provide feedback about our concerns to the ministry.
- Socio Bosque is organizing a workshop to train one person from each community on how to prepare reports and that person can become a more direct link between Socio Bosque and the community.

Socio Bosque should be a State program and not a government program. It should not change when a new government comes to power. Socio Bosque should be adopted by law.

Comments on Principle 1: Rights to land, territories and resources are recognized and respected

"Respected by whom? By the State?"

This principle is favorable for the indigenous communities, but if we talk about resources we are only talking about what is on the surface, not about what is under the soil. It should also be based on respect for the resources inside the territory.

When we talk about resources, are they considered renewable or nonrenewable?

Land rights? They should be rights and requirements in terms of the obligations that need to be fulfilled

It is unclear whether we are talking about land that is for example within Socio Bosque or about the entire territory, including what is not within the program.

The idea of including the term territory is precisely to include the ancestral aspect.

The difference between land and territory management?

We suggest that before the term 'territory' the word 'ancestral' should be used. Ancestral territories should be included to emphasize the ancestral aspect, because if we speak of land, that refers to the settlers, but they are not ancestral. The term ancestral includes our life experience and culture.

One of the criteria says "use and access" what does that mean?

Comments on Principle 2: The benefits of the REDD+ program are shared equitably among all stakeholders and rights holders

It should determine what the communities are gaining: Resources? Knowledge? Human resources? Cultural Resources?

What do I gain if I am part of the REDD Program?

It is necessary to present the costs and benefits to clarify that they are not just financial.

2.2 It says 'participatory', can we add 'community participatory'? In order to clearly include community participation. The text should clearly say that the participatory process is at the local and indigenous community levels.

"Community participatory" should perhaps be added as an explanatory note.

Comments on Principle 3: The REDD+ program contributes to sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation for forest-dependent peoples

What does poverty alleviation mean? We do not have money but nature provides us our livelihood, we are not poor.

This issue is seen from a Western point of view, they think we are poor and vulnerable groups, but we are not poor.

4. Debriefing and planning next steps

A debriefing meeting was held at the Ministry of Environment on Mon 26th with representatives from the Ministry, CCBA, ProForest and Conservation International at which the plans for testing the standards from April 2010 were also discussed. The following recommendations were made.

Recommendations

- Ensure that the feedback and recommendations made by the Indigenous Peoples representatives about the Socio Bosque Program are given to the appropriate people in the Ministry of Environment.
- Create a 'working group' with representatives from key stakeholders to work on an 'interpretation' of the standards for Ecuador during the first part of the Phase 2 testing the standards. The interpretation could be in the form of a 4th column providing guidance for use of the standards in Ecuador or more detailed/clearer indicators (eg all disputes go through x committee/process and are dealt with in a max of x days). The working group could hold several meetings and then present its suggestions to a larger workshop of stakeholders.
- Extend the consultations with Indigenous Peoples and small holders during the testing phase.
- Include funding for someone within the Ministry of Environment to focus on facilitating the standards interpretation work and also collecting the information needed to demonstrate the standards are achieved. CI is willing to play a support role in this work.
- Use the network RISAS facilitated by Ecodecision on environmental services to promote participation and discussion about REDD (RISAS – Red de Interesados en Servicios Ambientales).

Next steps

- Report from CCBA of the outputs from the consultation meetings – Nov 2009
- CCBA to ensure that outputs from the consultations workshops in Ecuador (in Quito and Lago Agrio) are addressed in the next draft version of the standards.
- Develop multi-country funding proposal in late 2009 – CARE/CCBA to take the lead with Ministry of Environment.
- Ecuador Government representative to join the REDD+SE standards Standards Committee.
- Meeting of the Standards Committee Friday 4th and Saturday 5th December in Copenhagen prior UNFCCC COP 15.

Appendix 1. List of participants at the Quito workshop, 23rd Oct 2009

Veronica Arias	TNC	vearias@tnc.org
Andrea Crosby	Fundacion Ceiba	acrosby@ceiba.org
Jorge Rivas	Fundacion Natura	jrivas@fnatura.org.ec
Frederico Starnfeld	GTZ-Gesoren	frederico.starnfeld@gtz.de
Mateo Espinosa	Fundacion Cofan	mateoespinosa@yahoo.es
Belen Paez	Fundacion Pachamama	mbpaez@pachamama.org.ec
Wain Collen	Fundacion Pachamama	awcollen@pachamama.org.ec
Free de Koning	Conservation International Ecuador	fdekoning@conservation.org
Veronica Munoz	Rainforest Alliance	vmunoz@ra.org
Andrea Carzón	EcoDecision	andrea@ecodecision.com.ec
Alonso Moreno	Gersoren-GTZ	alonso.moreno-diaz@gtz.de
Adriana Burbano	WCS	aburbano@wcs.org
Elba Fiallo	Fundacion Natura	efiallo@fnatura.org.ec
Maria Belén Herrera	PROFAFOR SA	mherrera@profafor.com
Guillermo Sanchez R.	Ministry of Environment	gsanchez@ambiente.gov.ec
Miguel Vazquez	MCPNC	mvazquez@minsteriopatrimonio.gov.ec
Luis Ordoñez	ECOPAR	luisordonezg@yahoo.es
Victor Lopez A.	Ecociencia/Climate Alliance	vlopez@ecociencia.org vlopez@flacso.org.ec
Paulina Baca	MAE-PRODERENA-	paulinabaca@gmail.com
Carla Cardenas	SEDETA	carlaximenac@yahoo.com
Belen Cordovez	CARE	bcordovez@care.org.ec
Carolina Mancheno	CARE	carolina.mancheno@care.org.ec
Lourdes Barragan	Rainforest Foundation Norway	barragan.lourdes@gmail.com
Martha Nuñez	F.Ambiente et Sociedad	marthan@uio.satnet.net
Janette Ulloa	Ecociencia	direccion@ecociencia.org
Rolando Jélez	Junta Parroquial Reventador	
Manuel Ramirez	Municipio Gonzalo Pizarro	manra09@yahoo.es gomungopi@yahoo.es
Randy Borman	Fundacion Cofan	randy@cofan.org
Daniela Carrión	Ministerio de Ambiente	dcarrion@ambiente.gov.ec
Marco Chiu	Ministerio de Ambiente	mchiu@ambiente.gov.ec
Joanna Durbin	CCBA	jdurbin@climate-standards.org
Dawn Robinson	ProForest	dawn@proforest.net
Mauricio Voidovic	IMAFLOA	mauricio@imaflora.org

Appendix 2. List of participants at the workshop in Lago Agrio, 24th- 25th Oct 2009

Luis Navarez	President Cofan Federation	luis.narvaez.feince@gmail.com
Roberto Aguinda	Comuna Cofan Dureno	robertotsampi@yahoo.com
Nahum Cerda	Santa Elena	nahumcerda@hotmail.com
Fidel Aguinda	Comuna Cofan Dureno	aj.once@hotmail.com www.cofanes.wordpress.com
Gladyz Vargas	Comuna Cofan Dureno	
Nicolas Ortiz	Comuna Cofan Dureno	
Lino Cerda	Atari	lino_c@gmail.com
Angela Cerda	Santa Elena	angycerda@hotmail.com
Enoc Cerda	Santa Elena	enocerda@yahoo.es
Marco Chiu	Ministry of Environment	mchiu@ambiente.gov.ec
Daniela Carrion	Ministry of Environment	dcarrion@ambiente.gov.ec
Joanna Durbin	CCBA	jdurbin@climate-standards.org
Dawn Robinson	ProForest (facilitator)	
Paulina Muñoz	Interpreter (Spanish-English)	

Appendix 3. Draft REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards
Version 2 October 2009 with comments from participants in workshop in Quito, Ecuador
23 October 2009

General Comment: Improve Spanish translation. Also use 'los/las' so as not to have sexist language.

Principle 1: Rights to land, territories and resources are recognized and respected.	
Criteria	Framework for indicators ¹
1.1 The REDD+ program ² effectively identifies the different rights holders (statutory and customary ³) and their rights to land, territories and resources relevant to the program.	1.1.1 A process is established to inventory and map existing statutory and customary land, territories and resources tenure/use/access/management rights (including those of women and other potentially marginalized groups) relevant to the program including and any overlapping or conflicting rights. 1.1.2 Land-use plans including forest management plans in areas included in the REDD+ program identify the rights of all rights holders and their spatial boundaries.
1.2 The REDD+ program respects and recognizes both statutory and customary rights to land, territories and resources which Indigenous Peoples or local communities ⁴ have traditionally owned and occupied or otherwise used or acquired. ⁵	1.2.1 Land-use plans including forest management plans in areas included in the REDD+ program recognize customary and statutory rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. 1.2.2 The policies of the National REDD+ program include recognition of the customary rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. 1.2.3 The REDD+ program promotes securing statutory rights ⁶ to land, territories and resources which Indigenous Peoples or local communities have traditionally owned and occupied or otherwise used or acquired.
1.3 The REDD+ program requires the free, prior and informed consent of rights holders for any activities affecting their rights to lands, territories and resources.	1.3.1 The policies of the National REDD+ program uphold the principle of free, prior and informed consent of rights holders for any activities affecting their rights to lands, territories and resources. 1.3.2 The REDD+ program effectively disseminates information about the requirement for free, prior and informed consent of rights holders for any activities affecting their rights to lands, territories and resources. 1.3.3 Collective rights holders define a verifiable process of obtaining free, prior and informed consent including who has authority to give consent on their behalf.

Comment [j1]: Point of contextual interest for Ecuador 'there are rights that are overlapping or in conflict'

Comment [j2]: What are the relevant resources of the program

Comment [j3]: Various doubts about these plans: who formulates them, who defines them, who verifies them.

Comment [j4]: Forest management plans (FMP): are FMPs needed to participate in REDD? Who does the FMP? Communities? Government?
Suggestions (2 alternatives):
1. Management plan as to be done by the community (or include the community) and the State (for the national REDD plan)
2. State Guidelines – community decides

Comment [j5]: For use plans include collective title holder.

Comment [j6]: 1.2.1 Question: who recognizes? Where are they recognized? The State recognizes? – following the logic of a national project
Question: is the forest use plan the 'correct' place to recognize rights?

Comment [j7]: 1.2.2 should go before 1.2.1

Comment [j8]: Exercise of rights

Comment [j9]: Ecuador's national context: possible conflicts between what the standards say and the constitution 'free, prior, informed consent'.

Comment [j10]: We like this indicator. It is an applicable indicator.

¹ This framework for indicators identifies key elements for each criterion, recognizing that further input will be needed to define the formulation that will be most effective for the monitoring, reporting and verification processes to be developed.

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

³ 'Customary rights' to lands and resources refers to patterns of long-standing community land and resource usage in accordance with Indigenous Peoples' and local communities' customary laws, values, customs, and traditions, including seasonal or cyclical use, rather than formal legal title to land and resources issued by the State.

⁴ Including individual and collective rights. Comment: should include private ownership and community ownership and State ownership. Also this footnote should come with the first mention of rights.

⁵ 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. Comment: needs to be better specified. It's not clear if this means that community land is not accepted.

⁶ Includes securing existing statutory rights and conversion of customary rights to statutory rights.

	1.3.4 Free, prior and informed consent is obtained from rights holders for any activities affecting their rights to lands, territories and resources following the agreed process.
1.4 The REDD+ program includes a process to resolve any disputes over rights to land, territories and resources related to the program based on the free, prior and informed consent of the parties involved.	1.4.1 A transparent and accessible mechanism of local/community/national mediation to resolve any disputes over rights to land, territories and resources and benefit-sharing or other issues related to the REDD+ program is developed and functional. 1.4.2 Disputes are resolved in a timely manner within an agreed time frame.
1.5 Where the REDD+ program enables private ownership ⁷ of carbon rights ⁸ , these rights are based on the statutory and customary rights to the land, territories and resources (as identified in 1.1) that generated the greenhouse gas emissions reductions and removals.	1.5.1 A transparent and participatory process for defining carbon rights is developed and implemented based on the statutory and customary rights to the land, territories and resources (as identified in 1.1) that generated the greenhouse gas emissions reductions and removals.

Comment [j11]: We like this.

Comment [j12]: We like this but we have to define who defines this process. Make sure that collective title holders are included.

Comment [j13]: Distribution of benefits and others. Note 2.2.5 talked about the same process.

Comment [j14]: A new formulation is suggested. ... include that the mechanism should specify the adequate/sufficient time for solving disputes' and be resolved in a timely manner.

Comment [j15]: The carbon rights MUST benefit the collective title holders

Comment [j17]: Make the indicator more specific (example add 'participatory')

Comment [j16]: Formulate this criterion better

Principle 2: The benefits of the REDD+ program are shared equitably ⁹ among all stakeholders and rights holders.	
Criteria	Framework for indicators
2.1 The projected costs potential benefits and associated risks ¹⁰ of the REDD+ program are identified for each stakeholder group. ¹¹	2.1.1 Projected costs, revenues and other benefits and associated risks are analyzed for each stakeholder group identified in 6.1.
2.2 A transparent, participatory and efficient ¹² process is established for equitable sharing of benefits of the REDD+ program taking into account costs, benefits and associated risks.	2.2.1 There is effective participation of stakeholders and rights holders in defining the decision-making process and the distribution mechanism for equitable benefit-sharing, including poor and marginalized groups. 2.2.2 Clear guidelines for benefit-sharing are established, disseminated and followed. 2.2.3 Administrative procedures for fund management and benefits distribution are timely and cost-effective. 2.2.4 The design of the benefit-sharing mechanisms is based on a review of options with respect to the equity, effectiveness ¹³ and efficiency of the REDD+ program.

Comment [j18]: Question: Has REDD thought about how 'benefits' will be distributed within the community?

Costs would be better written as 'costs/benefits' and should include both indirect and direct costs/benefits.

Need to use the correct terms and specify them in the footnote.

Comment [j19]: Should be clearer that this is about the program. And need to 'verify' who is responsible for this.

Comment [j20]: REDD should promote the establishment of a mechanism for this within the communities..

⁷ Ownership of carbon rights may be individual or collective.

⁸ For the purposes of these standards, 'carbon rights' are defined as the rights to enter into contracts and transactions for the transfer of ownership of greenhouse gas emissions reductions or removals.

⁹ 'Equity' and 'equitable' are defined as just, impartial and fair to all parties.

¹⁰ All analysis of costs, benefits and risks should include those that are direct and indirect as well as opportunity costs and should be compared against the reference scenario. The 'reference scenario' is the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the implementation of the REDD+ program

¹¹ The term 'stakeholder group' is defined for the purposes of these standards to include groups of rights holders whose rights are potentially affected by the REDD+ program and groups of 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.

¹² 'Efficient' is defined as achieving the target with minimum cost, effort and time.

¹³ The 'effectiveness' of the REDD+ program is defined as the extent to which the emissions reductions and other goals of the program are achieved.

	2.2.5 The benefit-sharing process includes a transparent and accessible procedure for submitting and resolving disputes/complaints.
2.3 There is transparent and participatory monitoring of the costs and benefits of the REDD+ program, including any revenues, and their distribution among stakeholders.	2.3.1 Stakeholders and rights holders participate effectively in monitoring of the implementation of the agreed benefit-sharing process at national and local levels. 2.3.2 Stakeholders and rights holders participate effectively in the reporting and review of costs, revenues and other benefits and how they are distributed taking into account the initial analysis of projected costs, revenues and other benefits and associated risks for each stakeholder group.

Comment [j21]: 1.4.2 can be included here. Justification: Its part of the same process, but more explicit.

Comment [j22]: There should be an adjudicator (3rd party) , agreed by all parties. Justification: for objectivity.

Principle 3: The REDD+ program contributes to improve sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation for forest-dependent¹⁴ peoples.	
Criteria	Framework for indicators
3.1 The REDD+ program leads to additional and long-term livelihood and poverty alleviation benefits, emphasizing the poor and marginalized. ¹⁵	3.1.1 The objectives of the REDD+ program include making a significant contribution to sustainable livelihoods (and poverty alleviation) for forest-dependent peoples. 3.1.2 The most vulnerable Poor and marginalized groups are identified among the forest-dependent peoples participating in the REDD+ program. 3.1.3 Communities of the forest-dependent peoples, including poor and marginalised the most vulnerable groups, acknowledge that they have received benefits from participation in the REDD+ program. 3.1.4 The REDD+ program generates increased resources increased financing to contribute to sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation. 3.1.5 National livelihood poverty monitoring shows improvements in areas where REDD+ program activities are implemented. 3.1.6 Measures are adopted to ensure that livelihood and poverty alleviation benefits are sustainable.
3.2 The relevant forest-dependent peoples define how the REDD+ program improves their livelihoods and alleviates poverty through an inclusive and transparent process.	3.2.1 The REDD+ program adopts a transparent process that requires that forest-dependent peoples, including poor and marginalized groups among them to define the form that the benefits will take and how they are delivered and how they will be used to improve their livelihoods.
3.3 There is participatory assessment of positive and negative livelihood and poverty impacts of the REDD+ program including both predicted (i.e. social impact assessment ¹⁶) and actual impacts.	3.3.1 A participatory process is established and implemented to assess the predicted and actual positive and negative impacts of the REDD+ program for forest-dependent peoples, and specifically for poor and marginalized groups. 3.3.2 The social impact monitoring takes a differentiated approach that can identify positive and negative impacts on the most vulnerable on poorer people and other marginalized groups.
3.4 The REDD+ program is adapted based on predictive and ongoing impact assessment to mitigate	3.4.1 Measures are developed and implemented to mitigate potential and actual negative impacts on forest-dependent peoples in general, and poor and marginalized in particular, both during in the

Comment [j23]: Improve people's quality of life

Comment [j24]: Change the term 'poverty alleviation'.
The term 'poverty' should not be included, because there is no definition of this term. Therefore it's very subjective to alleviate poverty via a REDD+ program.
The meaning of the Principle 'alleviation of poverty' could have many interpretations. The suggestion is to put 'improve livelihoods (condiciones de vida)

Comment [j25]: In order to participate in the REDD+ program

Comment [j26]: Justification: Its clear that they are already in the program.

Comment [j27]: ¿how to measure this?

Formatted: Not Highlight

Comment [j28]: The social impact monitoring identifies the positive and negative impacts on the most vulnerable people

Comment [j29]: Adaptation based on the assessment. The results of 3.3 are used to adapt the program.

¹⁴ Forest-dependent peoples include Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

¹⁵ Individuals or groups that are disadvantaged by gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status etc.

¹⁶ Social impact assessment should include social, cultural and economic impacts and a risk analysis.

negative, and enhance positive, livelihood and poverty impacts.	design and implementation phases of the REDD+ program.
---	--

Principle 4: The REDD+ program contributes to broader sustainable development and good governance¹⁷ objectives.	
Criteria	Framework for indicators
4.1 The REDD+ program is coherent with national sustainable development policies and strategies ¹⁸ and those at other relevant levels.	<p>4.1.1 Land use planning elements of the REDD+ program including recognition of customary rights to land territories and resources are consistent with other land use planning processes.</p> <p>4.1.2 The REDD+ program policies and strategies elaborate how the REDD+ program will contribute to the implementation of any existing poverty reduction strategy developed at national or other relevant levels of government.</p> <p>4.1.3 The REDD+ program policies and strategies elaborate how the REDD+ program will contribute to the implementation of any existing biodiversity strategy developed at national level or for relevant ecological regions.</p> <p>4.1.4 The REDD+ program is supported by is inserted into the broader policy framework for forests and other relevant sectors.</p>
4.2 Where the REDD+ program is not consistent with national sustainable development strategies and those at other relevant levels, a review process is undertaken to resolve the inconsistencies.	<p>4.2.1 Inconsistencies between the REDD+ program and other sustainable development strategies are identified.</p> <p>4.2.2 A review process and timeline for resolving the inconsistencies is established.</p> <p>4.2.3 The process for resolving the inconsistencies is implemented.</p>
4.3 There is strong government ownership of the REDD+ program in their country.	<p>4.3.1 REDD+ program institutional arrangements reflect government leadership.</p> <p>4.3.2 Government agencies/organizations play a leading role in the development, implementation and evaluation of the REDD+ program.</p>
4.4 There is effective coordination between government agencies/organizations responsible for the design, implementation and evaluation of the REDD+ program and other relevant government agencies/organizations.	4.4.1 An effective and efficient process is established to link the REDD+ program with all relevant ministries and government agencies/organizations.

Comment [j30]: OK

Comment [j31]: OK

Comment [j32]: Leave this at a general level.

¹⁷ The elements of good governance include accessibility, people's participation, transparency, accountability, rule of law, predictability, justice and sustainability.

¹⁸ e.g. poverty reduction strategies/targets, national budgets, national biodiversity strategies, national climate change strategies, national adaptation plans etc.

<p>4.5 The REDD+ program leads to sector-wide improvements in forest socio-environmental governance.</p>	<p>4.5.1 The REDD+ program identifies the broader forest governance issues that it can address, particularly those related to the equity, effectiveness and efficiency of the REDD+ program, and establishes country-specific performance targets.</p> <p>4.5.2 The REDD+ program includes measures that aim to improve these governance aspects.</p> <p>4.5.3 The REDD+ program monitoring and evaluation plan includes key social and environmental forest governance indicators.</p>
<p>4.6 <u>There is a strong sense of ownership of the REDD+ program by the beneficiaries.</u></p>	<p>4.6.1 <u>The beneficiaries of the REDD+ program play a leadership role in the development, implementation and evaluation of the REDD+ program.</u></p>

Comment [j33]: Justification: It's important that a sense of commitment is generated among the participants in the REDD+ program .

Principle 5: Biodiversity and ecosystem services¹⁹ are maintained and enhanced.	
Criteria	Framework for indicators
<p>5.1 Biodiversity and ecosystem service values are maintained and enhanced.</p>	<p>5.1.1 The objectives of the REDD+ program include making a significant contribution to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>5.1.2 Biodiversity and ecosystem service values²⁰ potentially affected by the REDD+ program are identified and mapped at a scale and level of detail appropriate to each element/activity within the program including but are not limited to areas of significance for threatened or endemic species, for significant concentrations or source populations of other species, for ecosystems and for ecosystem services of cultural, economic or religious importance to stakeholders, particularly forest-dependent peoples.</p> <p>5.1.3 The REDD+ program includes measures that aim to maintain and enhance the identified biodiversity, ecosystem service values.</p> <p>5.1.4 Increased financing from the REDD+ program contributes to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity and ecosystem service values.</p>
<p>5.2 The positive and negative impacts of the REDD+ program on biodiversity and ecosystem service values are assessed.</p>	<p>5.2.1 A monitoring plan and indicators are defined for measurement of the identified biodiversity and ecosystem service values drawing from traditional knowledge and scientific research as appropriate.</p> <p>5.2.2 There is an assessment of both predicted (e.g strategic environmental assessment or environmental impact assessments) and actual impacts, involving forest-dependent</p>

Comment [j34]: Reverse the order of the criteria: 5.3, 5.2, 5.1
In order to start with the design phase

Comment [j35]: Create/design a baseline for the parameters of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services to be measured (maintained and enhanced) = Proxies.

Comment [j36]: Specify the meaning of 'values' (#species, distribution of species, cultural value)

Comment [j37]: Use the baseline defined in 5.1 for monitoring.

¹⁹ 'Ecosystem services' in this context refers to services other than greenhouse gas emissions reductions or removals

²⁰ Including those identified in existing national biodiversity strategy and action plans (NBSAP), gap analyses supporting the Convention on Biological Diversity 2010 targets or application of frameworks aligned with these efforts such as multilateral development bank safeguards (World Bank OP 4.04, IFC Performance Standard 6), key biodiversity areas, high conservation value areas and other relevant systematic conservation planning approaches.

	peoples and other stakeholders as appropriate.
5.3 The REDD+ program design addresses maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity and ecosystem service values.	<p>5.3.1 The REDD+ program is designed to maintain and enhance identified biodiversity and ecosystem service values building on relevant traditional knowledge and management practices of forest-dependent peoples and other stakeholders.</p> <p>5.3.2 Measures are developed and implemented to mitigate identified potential and actual negative impacts on the identified high conservation values both during the design and the implementation phases of the REDD+ program.</p>

For both P6+P7 National policies should include capacity building.

Principle 6: All relevant stakeholders and rights holders are able to participate fully and effectively in the REDD+ program.

Criteria	Framework for indicators
6.1 The REDD+ program identifies and characterizes stakeholder groups.	<p>6.1.1 Stakeholder groups are identified including Indigenous Peoples, local communities, women and other potentially marginalized groups.</p> <p>6.1.2 The rights and interests of each stakeholder group in relation to the REDD+ program are characterized including potential barriers to their participation.</p>
6.2 All relevant stakeholder groups are involved in program design, implementation ²¹ and evaluation through effective consultation or more active participation.	<p>6.2.1 A process and institutional structure are established and functional to enable all relevant stakeholder groups to participate in program design, implementation and evaluation.</p> <p>6.2.2 There is effective representation of <u>Indigenous Peoples</u>, women, youth and other potentially marginalized groups identified in 6.1 in the stakeholder consultation and participation process.</p> <p>6.2.3 Consultations are tailored to the local context using socially and culturally appropriate methods and are conducted at mutually agreed locations.</p> <p>6.2.4 <u>The different levels of local government are</u> involved in the REDD+ program <u>as well as national government</u> and <u>their</u> role is clearly defined.</p> <p>6.2.5 The REDD+ program <u>plan/strategy</u> is revised based on the stakeholder consultations.</p>
6.3 Stakeholder groups determine how they will be represented, taking account of formal and informal arrangements/institutions.	<p>6.3.1 The REDD+ program respects and does not undermine stakeholder groups' own decision-making structures and processes particularly those of Indigenous Peoples and local communities,</p> <p>6.3.2 Stakeholder groups select their own representatives to participate in decision-making about the REDD+ program.</p>
6.4 Stakeholder group representatives ensure effective involvement of and accountability to the people they represent and assist with consensus building.	6.4.1 Stakeholder representatives have designed and are implementing a transparent process to inform the people they represent about how the REDD+ program could potentially affect them and facilitate discussion and feedback.

Comment [j38]: Who defines which are the relevant rights?

Comment [j39]: This phrase is not very clear. We suggest explaining that REDD could marginalize certain groups.

Comment [j40]: Who will define which are the relevant stakeholders? (mechanisms?)

Comment [j41]: Effective participation is required in each of the phases. For the Ecuadorian government, in some cases participation is only included for VALIDATION. Therefore we need the standards to include the participation of stakeholders in all phases.

Comment [j42]: Justification: there are different levels of local government.

²¹ 'implementation' is understood to include on-going planning/decision-making as well as the implementation of the activities.

6.5 Stakeholders have a good understanding of the key issues related to the REDD+ program.	6.5.1 Information dissemination and other awareness-raising activities ensure stakeholders and rights holders have a good understanding of the REDD+ program, particularly forest-dependent peoples and the poor and marginalized groups among them.
6.6 Mechanisms are in place to receive and resolve grievances and disputes relating to planning and implementation of the REDD+ program.	6.6.1 A transparent and -accessible, independent and timely process is established to address grievances and disputes that arise during project planning and implementation including a process for hearing, responding to and resolving stakeholder grievances within a reasonable time period. 6.6.2 The grievance process is publicized to all stakeholders. 6.6.3 The grievance process is managed by a third party or mediator to prevent any conflict of interest.
6.7 Program planning, and implementation and evaluation builds on and supports stakeholders' knowledge, skills and management systems including those of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.	6.7.1 A process is established to identify indigenous and other stakeholder knowledge, skills and management systems of relevance to the REDD+ program. 6.7.2 The REDD+ program incorporates, as appropriate, the identified knowledge, skills and management systems in planning, implementation and evaluation.

Comment [j43]:
The participation of these stakeholders (Indigenous peoples and communities) in the evaluation, would be helpful.

Principle 7: All stakeholders and rights holders have timely access to appropriate and accurate information to enable good governance of the REDD+ program.	
Criteria	Framework for indicators
7.1 Stakeholders and rights holders 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.	7.1.1 Stakeholders and rights holders know what information is available and how to access it. 7.1.2 The most effective means of dissemination of information are identified and used for each stakeholder group. 7.1.3 Stakeholders and rights holders have access to relevant information about the REDD + program including the results of monitoring and evaluation of the REDD+ program, and potential social, cultural, economic and ecological risks and opportunities, legal implications, and the global and national context. 7.1.4 Indigenous peoples and local communities have the information they need in a form they understand.
7.2 Stakeholder group representatives collect and disseminate all relevant information from and to the people they represent.	7.2.1 Stakeholder group representatives collect and disseminate all relevant information related to the REDD+ program from and to the people they represent. 7.2.2 MA-echanisms and processes are established which guarantee process is established to ensure that stakeholders receive and supply all relevant information related to the REDD+ program through their representatives.
7.3 Information is available and disseminated in time to enable stakeholder feedback to their representatives and respecting the time needed for inclusive decision making.	7.3.1 There is adequate time between information release and decision-making to enable stakeholders to coordinate their response.

Comment [j44]: Who establishes the process?

<p>7.4 National policies support stakeholder access to information about the REDD+ program, including information on rights to land, territories, and resources and environmental services.</p>	<p>7.4.1 Policies and/or legislation <u>guarantee access</u> uphold the right to information about the REDD+ program.</p> <p>7.4.2 The right to <u>access</u> information <u>policies and/or legislation are is</u> implemented.</p> <p>7.4.3 <u>Mechanisms for access to information. are implemented</u></p>
<p>7.5 Stakeholders and rights holders have access to legal <u>(technical and financial)</u> advice and understand relevant legal implications and processes.</p>	<p>7.5.1 A legal advice service <u>(technical and financial) defined by the stakeholders and rights holders</u> is available and accessible to stakeholders and rights holders to advise them on the legal <u>and financial</u> implications of the REDD+ program and on legal processes.</p>

Comment [j46]: Better in Spanish to say 'guarantee access to'

Comment [j45]: Faced with a lack of knowledge, this principle runs the risk of not being effectively implemented. Information / Knowledge. We need to convert access to information into knowledge.

Principle 8: The REDD+ program complies with applicable local²² and national laws and international treaties and agreements.

Criteria	Framework for indicators
<p>8.1 The REDD+ program complies with local law, national law and international treaties and agreements ratified or adopted by the country.</p>	<p>8.1.1 International treaties and agreements relevant to the REDD+ program are identified.</p> <p>8.1.2 National and local laws relevant to the REDD+ program are identified.</p> <p>8.1.3 Any possible areas where the REDD+ program does or may not comply with the relevant local and national laws and international treaties and agreements are identified and monitored.</p>
<p>8.2 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.</p>	<p>8.2.1 A review process is established to address the inconsistencies between the standards and local or national law.</p>
<p>8.3 Relevant stakeholders have the capacity to implement and monitor legal requirements.</p>	<p>8.3.1 Relevant stakeholders have the capacity to enable them to implement and monitor legal requirements related to the REDD+ program.</p>

Comment [j47]: We believe that there should only be 1 indicator: 8.1.1 and 8.1.2 are not necessary because 8.1.3 includes the identification of relevant treaties, laws and agreements.

Comment [j48]: This isn't clear enough. For example we think that it may be saying that the State has the capacity for forest control. In this case, it is relevant.

²² 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.

Appendix 4. Lago Agrio Consultation Workshop

October 24 & 25

Participants:

1. Cofán Dureno Commune:
 - a. Roberto Aguida-President for two years; works with Cofan Foundation coordinating the activities of the different communities within the Cofan territory. Currently there are 54 park rangers working in the protected areas. In addition, with the support of Socio Bosque we have three people working with community surveillance and monitoring and two other people working with support from WCS, for a total of 59 park rangers.
 - b. Fidel Aguida- Collaborates with the Socio Bosque project in the Cofan Dureno community. He coordinates the project with the community; he also works with the community school. It is important to learn how the other communities are working with conservation.
2. Rio Cofanes Commune:
 - a. Luis Narvaez .- President of the Cofan Nationality Federation for 6 years, his term ends next year. They are a second-tier organization that covers all the Cofan communities. Their goal is the sustainable management of the community, with an emphasis on conservation. I think the government has made a first attempt to provide incentives for conservation, through Socio Bosque, this is important for us. It was about time the government provided support for conservation in order to combat the existing pressure on the resources. Our livelihood depends on the collection of products, fishing, and hunting therefore it is important to have an incentive to support conservation. The Cofan nationality has 14 communities, forming 1 to 100 families; by 2007 we numbered about 1200. The Cofan territory includes protected areas as well as areas with title deeds.
 - b. Elisa Mena, from the Cofa community, works as crafts coordinator.
3. Santa Elena Commune:
 - a. Nahum Sucre Cerda .- Lives in Shushufindi, belongs to the Kichwua community. I have two points of views regarding Socio Bosque that will be discussed later. We have been with the program since the beginning. The community has about 3500 ha of which 3000 are within the Socio Bosque Program; the rest are used to sustain the community of 150 families. Works advising his Brother who is chairman of the community and he also works with the local government.

Purpose, Objectives, and Background of the Workshop

Why are we here?

The first link is the Socio Bosque program, what we're trying to do is find a mechanism to create incentives for those protecting the forest because we are interested in conservation. At the international level the importance of forests is being discussed in regards to topics such as: biodiversity and conservation of the identity of the indigenous communities. Finally, there are several international initiatives that have focused on forest conservation to combat global climate change. We are talking about an interest at the state and society levels.

At the international level there are discussions that support forest conservation and the people who are doing conservation. We, as Ecuadorians, are exploring this process to find ways to help Ecuador to conserve its forests. What we want to guarantee at this time is that the Socio Bosque initiative and any other initiative seeking to conserve the forests at the international level, are implemented correctly.

An international initiative called REDD is being discussed; the purpose of today's meeting is to define from its perspective, who is using the forest and who wants to conserve it; how can we make this initiative work well.

There are two things in Ecuador that we want to pay attention to in order for REDD to work well: human issues and biodiversity. We want to find ways that allow us to verify that what we are doing in regards to these two aspects that concern us, is helping to make it work well.

If you do not destroy the forest, you are reducing the emissions to the atmosphere and therefore you are reducing climate change.

Questions and discussion

Why are they called greenhouse gases?

They are called greenhouse gases because when they are emitted into the atmosphere they generate heat that reaches the earth's surface and remains in the atmosphere and this causes the planet to warm up, because the gases help retain the energy within the planet. This causes changes in the weather patterns, and affects human beings because we are not adapted to live under such weather conditions.

What is the relationship between forests and CC?

Forests contain carbon, when the forest is cut, burned or the trees rot, we release the stored carbon into the atmosphere where it becomes carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas, and this means that the planet warms up because it retains the heat.

The REDD initiative seeks to keep the carbon in the forests, preventing it from being released into the atmosphere and making climate change worse.

The idea is that those who conserve the forest should be compensated for their conservation efforts, we are interested in this to help maintain the Socio Bosque program. If a REDD mechanism is able to function, the Socio Bosque Program will be able to remain in place over the long term.

In what countries can CC be seen? In island countries because the polar caps are melting, sea level is rising and the coastlines are affected.

Effects? More rain or longer droughts, we do not know what the changes will be; a system that was regular during the year might be gone the next. The term is "change in the climate system"

It is a fact that the weather is changing, we do not know when it is summer or winter, and we do not know when it will rain.

Luis: This whole dialogue about climate change and conservation leads to environmental services, because people that conserve provide a service to the world. People who conserve are providing an environmental service to the world.

In fact, when we make a voluntary conservation effort we are providing a service. At the international level, discussions are under way to compensate people who provide this service. As in the case of Socio Bosque, we want the international arrangements to guarantee benefits in terms of the people and biodiversity.

Internationally, there is talk that countries with forests could receive funding at the national level because they are conserving and managing their forests adequately. This funding could come from countries that pollute more.

CCBA is looking at the fact that while there are good initiatives to conserve the forest there are also negative social and environmental impacts. The governments could introduce programs without taking into account the impacts and so we want to identify the positive and negative impacts.

The end result of the initiative is a document that presents the rules that a government or program should take into account as best practices to ensure that a partner such as Socio Bosque has positive impacts at the social and environmental levels.

Nahum: The government has now adopted "our" model because communities have decided -as a lifestyle- to take care of the forests in order to live. We do not market it, we use it for local consumption in terms of crops, fishing, and hunting. If the communities were to cut down the forest as the settlers do, we would not have forest in the Amazon region.

The communities and their experience with the Socio Bosque Program

Cofan Dureno

Conservation is a cultural thing in our community, as Cofan people we are aware that the territory belongs to everyone, we are all owners. Many years before the arrival of the oil developers we were already doing conservation. Several areas within the Cofan territory were declared as protected areas. We have begun working with several projects and we have also started working with zoning. Later on we had the option to work closely with the MAE, with whom we worked in Cuyabeno. When we were told that there was a Socio Bosque Program, we were told about the program and we started working with it, but with the agreement, the Cofan people (100 families) are taking a risk, there were people who did not agree with it but we signed the agreement anyway.

We can meet the requirements of the agreement, our only fear is that we might be invaded and our territory taken away. The funds from Socio Bosque have supported several community activities especially mobilization. We not only want to have the forest but also the animals, we are working to "produce animals."

Were all the families in agreement with Socio Bosque before signing? No, but after signing we held a general assembly to demonstrate the components that must be fulfilled and the community members said "let's hope nothing happens." We have received payment for one year.

The people from the community were worried at first because the state itself might take the territory, or decide to exploit the oil for example. But after we had a thorough socialization, we held an assembly to discuss how to invest and the investment plan was presented at the assembly. Currently, we do not have any problems, we are managing based on the objectives in the plan.

Within the plan, we are financing production projects for the families and conservation through park ranger families.

Rio Cofanes

They were present at the program launching and a letter of intent was signed. Initially, we believed that the requirement of land title was not very fair because there are some communities that are within the protected areas and need the incentive just as much but they can not join in. We also think that the incentive does not meet the expectations but we think that it was about time that the state started doing something about conservation. For this reason, there was no negative impact, because from the beginning we understood how the program worked.

There is poor information, both CONFENAIE and CONAEI say that the government is going to take away the land with Socio Bosque, and that the state is buying us through Socio Bosque, this is not true and therefore we do not participate in the meetings.

We recommend that Rio Cofanes be a tourism destination. With the Socio Bosque incentive we are implementing several activities in order to achieve those activities; this is all described in the investment plan and was made freely by us, the MAE was not involved in anything, everything that is said in the agreement we were already doing but with Socio Bosque our control system has been strengthened. 130 Cofan families have joined the peasant insurance through the Socio Bosque Program (PSB), for the first time in history some families are insured.

For us, the Socio Bosque Program has been and is very important, we know that this is the beginning and the government will improve the incentive and it will continue to grow. As a federation we support the Socio Bosque Program selflessly for the socialization of the program, we have one goal: that more settler families join Socio Bosque so we can lower the level of pressure and make them part of the conservation effort. We have helped about 10 families to join the program.

It is best that the settlers join Socio Bosque so they can support conservation.

We feel that we have the capacity to manage the resources, the resources are being managed without problems.

In December we will present the first technical and financial report so that the Socio Bosque Program can see how we manage our funds. There is no pressure from MAE as to how we spend the resources and we think that is all right.

Santa Elena

The community is in Limoncocha, it is part of the Kichwa people. It was socialized for a long time by Johnson, first at the family level and then at the community level. We, for cultural reasons, have maintained our forests, we have always cared for the community aspects and in some meetings we have achieved community empowerment in regards to the program and I agree to join because:

1. The government welcomed our traditions in order to create a national program
2. There are settlers around the community boundaries that are encroaching and therefore we are working through the program so that members of the community help control our territory.
3. We want to create biological corridors with other communities: Itaya, Rio Jivino

The experiences are good and we want to continue working with this program.

What changes have occurred within the Socio Bosque Program? Positive and Negative

Positive

Rio Cofanes.- The influence of the government toward conservation, in other words, the help we receive is very important because it supports conservation. Through the agreement the government supports our conservation activities.

Being part of this program generates a positive action against mining activities that the government might want to implement, because it can not contradict itself, if the government supports Socio Bosque and then it wants to come in and take out oil or minerals, we can say that there can not come in because it is Socio Bosque.

It is necessary to talk among the partners about the positive aspects of Socio Bosque, there should be a meeting between the partners.

Negative

Cofan Dureno, Rio Cofanes and Santa Elena: At the Socio Bosque fair, that was not really achieved, we were asked during the meeting to make a presentation, the agenda was completely changed, it was completely disorganized, many people complained about the food, transportation, etc., workshops should be organized around the topics that are relevant to the provinces. A real meeting where the different communities can reach an agreement (have a common position on how to work together)

It was a meeting to deliver the paperwork: map, sworn affidavit.

The meeting was no good at all.

For you, what are the most important elements of a program such as Socio Bosque?

Information.-

Santa Elena .- We must improve the information .- The information should be more didactical, it should describe the benefits, it should present the information in a didactic way or in a format that is more appropriate for the communities such as videos, or learn about other experiences that tell us why we should say yes to Socio Bosque, they should tell us what activities they are doing and how they are working. What does someone within the program plan for- "the stakeholders should speak."

Rio Cofanes.- The socialization should describe the advantages and disadvantages (what should be strengthened), explaining the program's potential, it must be well known by the developers covering the program so that they can inform others about the benefits of joining the program. Socializing the future strengths, for example, that Socio Bosque is helping us towards the future, as a protection strategy.

Cofan Dureno.- As a community, we have not had the support of the MAE to protect some conservation efforts, the MAE must be present in any new development and be the authority. Socio Bosque constitutes a support. MAE should improve support in terms of monitoring and surveillance, it should support all of us who are working with conservation.

We need to try to socialize in the language of the community, the Socio Bosque Program should select a person from the community that can explain the program in our own language. Program developers should be from the same community.

What elements do you recommend to others in the Program? Would you like to change something about the Program?

Rio Cofanes .- This is a new government program, even Socio Bosque does not have all the rules of the game but things are all right up to now, I would not attempt to recommend what is right and what is not, I think we still lack experience.

We believe that the incentive should be much higher because if we divide the amount/ha that we receive per hectare 1.50, many people see this as negative, I think we are still in the process, we are all learning about this program.

For us, the importance of being part of Socio Bosque is that by being a conservation area it adds one more protection to the territory because we have an agreement with the MAE.

We want the communities within the protected areas to be able to join the Socio Bosque Program.

Cofan Dureno: Before signing the agreement we want a good socialization that explains how the program will be managed, our community was lacking information and socialization about the agreement because if not thoroughly socialized it becomes a concern for the community.

Santa Elena.- The timber companies insist a lot that the community should sell its forest resources. Trees are valued economically, "why waste this economic resource?" More information is needed about Socio Bosque, about the system and how it works, etc.

Rio Jivino wants to leave Socio Bosque because they say that with the resources given to them they have to prepare a geo-referenced map and that is very expensive and they do not want to do it. There is time to reconsider the issue of leaving the program.

One difficulty is the preparation of the geo-referenced map.

Best Practices for other programs "Social and Environmental Standards"

The Best Practices document includes the most relevant issues concerning the social and environmental components so that programs like Socio Bosque work the way we want. It describes how to do things at the international level.

The standard is like a certification that says that I am complying with a level of best practices or norms. This document indicates whether you have "one star or five stars", it is a standard.

COMMENTS

The program should not be a government program but a state program, in other words, it would not end when the government changes.

Principle #1.-

"Respected by whom? By the State?"

This principle is favorable for the indigenous communities, but if we talk about resources we are only talking about what is on the surface, not about what is under the soil. It should also be based on respect for the resources inside the territory.

When we talk about resources, are they considered renewable or nonrenewable?

Land rights? They should be rights and requirements in terms of the obligations that need to be fulfilled

It is unclear whether we are talking about land that is for example within Socio Bosque or about the entire territory, including what is not within the program.

The idea of including the term territory is precisely to include the ancestral aspect.

The difference between land and territory management?

We suggest that before the term 'territory' the word 'ancestral' should be used. Ancestral territories should be included to emphasize the ancestral aspect, because if we speak of land, that refers to the settlers, but they are not ancestral. The term ancestral includes our life experience and culture.

One of the criteria says "use and access" what does that mean?

Principle #2 .-

It should determine what the communities are gaining: Resources? Knowledge? Human resources? Cultural Resources?

What do I gain if I am part of the REDD Program?

It is necessary to present the costs and benefits to clarify that they are not just financial.

2.2 It says 'participatory', can we add 'community participatory'? In order to clearly include community participation. The text should clearly say that the participatory process is at the local and indigenous community levels.

"Community participatory" should perhaps be added as an explanatory note.

Principle #3 .-

What does poverty alleviation mean? We do not have money but nature provides us our livelihood, we are not poor.

This issues in seen from a Western point of view, they think we are poor and vulnerable groups, but we are not poor.