

REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards

Consultation meetings
June 29 – 3 July 2009, Nepal



Report
23 July 2009

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

Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Meeting to introduce the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards and the context for their use in Nepal	4
3. Meetings at the field sites in Makwanpur and Bara Districts.....	6
4. Workshops to develop indicators	8
5. Meeting with REDD Working Group to discuss next steps	9
Appendix 1. List of participants at meetings in Kathmandu	
Appendix 2. Draft Indicators for REDD+ Environmental & Social Standards	
Appendix 3. Updated Principles and Criteria based on comments from Nepali consultations	

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 whilst 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-Sep 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 Nepal:

- To raise awareness and discuss the role that social and environmental standards can play to support Nepal'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 Nepal'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 Nepal;
- To develop an overall plan for piloting the standards in Nepal from 2010 and get a first sense of budget implications.

Summary Agenda

29 June

- Meeting with REDD Working Group to discuss objectives and planning for the consultation meetings

30 June

- Meeting with diverse stakeholders to present the REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards and the context for their use in Nepal
- Departure to Hetauda, Makwanpur District in Central Terai for field visit

1 July

- Meeting with Rani Community Forest User Group, Makwanpur District
- Meeting with Halkhoriya Collaborative Forest, Bara District
- Return to Kathmandu

2 July

- Workshop with representatives of the Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation to comment on principles and criteria and develop indicators
- Workshop with representatives of the civil society to comment on principles and criteria and develop indicators

3 July

- Meeting with REDD working group to discuss findings from the consultation meetings and next steps

2. Meeting to introduce the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards and the context for their use in Nepal

8am – 12.30, 30 June 2009

Ministry of Forestry and Soil Conservation Training Hall, Babarmahal, Kathmandu

Approximately 38 participants¹ including members of REDD working group, REDD cell, Government Agencies, Forestry Projects, Forestry related INGOs, Forestry Networks, Forestry related NGOs, Universities and journalists.

Presentations

Dr Jagadish Baral, Dept of Forests, Chief REDD Cell	Background and objectives
Joanna Durbin, Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA)	REDD+ overview
Resham B. Dangi, Dept of Forests REDD Cell	REDD in Nepal
Dawn Robinson, ProForest	How standards work
Phil Franks, CARE International	REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards

There were opportunities for questions and comment after each presentation.

Questions and Comments Following Joanna's Presentation:

- Concern about whether Nepal will benefit from REDD and be rewarded for what has already been conserved by community forestry since the 1970s. Feeling that 'the culprits' are being rewarded by REDD. Note that REDD+ gives many more options and is intended to respond to such concerns; which have been voiced by countries that have lower deforestation rates.
- Question of whether use of standards will offer any direct financial benefit. Will there be a premium? Will they be requirements?

¹ A list of people who attended any of the meetings in Kathmandu and provided contact details is included in Appendix 1.

- Concerns regarding indigenous peoples (IP). Sense that IPs in Nepal are disproportionately affected by climate change. That IP are seeking to ensure that 5 key rights are taken into account in this work:
 - Recognition, FPIC, participation, benefit sharing, Right to say no.

Questions and Comments Following Dangi's Presentation:

- Concern about huge investment needed to prove and justify carbon capture/maintenance, which may even cost more than the benefits that the payments bring. Linked to a questioning of whether it is appropriate to use the logic of the market to address the drivers of deforestation, which are so complex. They include issues of land tenure, provision of livelihoods, and impact of policies. Should we perhaps better focus efforts on broader policy efforts?
- Concern about how IP and FPIC issues can be addressed, and also land tenure issues.
- Proposal to the group – we need to think about how best to address these issues in the context of Nepal, and how it can be made to work in Nepal [referring to REDD+ generally, not just the standards]
- IP issues and land tenure are fundamental. They should be addressed before engaging with funding mechanisms.
- We should try to answer the following:
 - How can Nepal benefit best from international REDD. Need to engage in the policy negotiations
 - What is our baseline scenario? (who is maintaining the forest? What classifications of different scenarios are there?)
- Dalit communities are particularly concerned and feel that they are being affected by climate change, but have major problems in relation to access to natural resources. Their representative wonders how IP participation can be ensured, and how NGOs such as his can be involved.
- We should not just focus on market mechanisms.
- Management interventions can have a positive impact on carbon and can qualify for payments. Eg. Silvicultural interventions such as reduced impact logging.
- The term used by UNFCCC is SMF (sustainable management of forests) which is not the same as SFM (sustainable forest management).
- We need to concentrate on who stands to benefit and who stands to gain? Consultation process is important.

Questions and Comments Following Dawn's Presentation:

- Can we not combine piloting for carbon accounting with piloting of standards for social and environmental aspects? We should be more holistic and include carbon.
- You mention conformance and sanctions for site based schemes, but what about for national programmes?
- Log frames for development use similar language (objectives, activities, indicators). Couldn't we create different terminology so as not to confuse? – both log frames and standards development have distinct purposes and language of standards presented here is widely used.
- There are various ways the standards could be used nationally eg. As guidelines or to demonstrate way of working to interested funders, but no mechanism related to conformance determined yet. It is possible for the standards to be applied 'step wise' to show how progress is being made, with a mechanism to agree to improvements over time if problems were found by independent verification.
- The standards testing or piloting phase should give an opportunity to see 'in practice' whether the standard is implementable and to feedback any problems found in order to influence the refinement of the standard.
- Suggestion to keep indicators to a minimum (otherwise it will be too costly and bureaucratic to implement).
- Important to concentrate on *national level work*.
- Suggestion to define which aspects [indicators/criteria] are non-negotiable.
- Also, need to look at how poor people can participate in the standards development and take ownership and hold people accountable to adhering to the standard.

Questions and Comments Following Phil's Presentation:

- Private sector stakeholder group comment: Nepal should try to maximise revenue and not have to wait another 7 years to be rewarded for its conservation efforts.
- Question about VCS standard and CCBA standard. Should they be used together? VCS is for verifying quantified emissions reductions and CCB is used to demonstrate high quality and help generate a better price. Note that these new standards are for a *national* accounting system and national REDD programme. The UNFCCC system is likely to cover comprehensively carbon accounting mechanisms, and therefore these Social and Environmental standards do not address carbon.
- FSC already exists on the ground and has similar P&C. Can we not build on this rather than having a new standard? Once a national system is set up, CCBA won't need to be used for projects since they will be incorporated into the national program. Also that we hope to build on what FSC has done and try to look at ways to build on that system.
- Specific comments on Criteria:
 - P4 (strong govt ownership) This could be quite misleading. Its only 1 side of the coin. There may be other stakeholders who should also strongly own it.
 - P2 (transparency and participatory process for defining equity). If Nepal uses national approach in which national government receives the money and this trickles down to the communities, then this would present one set of issues about equity. But there are also issues in relation to equity at the community level. This needs to be clarified.
- IP are not stakeholders, they are rights holders. Standard needs to address the IP specific right to say no.
- Specific comment on criteria:
 - P2 How can stakeholders and rights holders be defined for Nepal?
- Expressions of frustration with the experience of FSC where they have not been able to scale up. Everyone promoted it to begin with and encouraged it to be piloted, but now no-one wants to support it. No funds are available for annual audits for example. There are lots of principles that are similar to those of FSC. It would be better to scale that up, linking to community people and improving SFM.
- Could we work together with communities etc. otherwise we fear that they will get nothing?.
- We need to use the testing phase to try to make sure that the system is not too onerous. Remember that those who are interested in paying for this are interested in having results with regard to social and environmental aspects and are taking them very seriously. As are donors. The people with the money are interested in this.

Ghanshyam Pandey, Chair of FECOFUN made brief closing remarks, thanking all of the participants and the visitors from CCBA, Care International and ProForest and the REDD Cell for organizing such an interesting meeting. Indicated that this was a useful meeting, and that there were some organizations who were unfortunately not present. A key question for him is how can we link grass-roots community efforts to the whole? The message from the local people is clear 'No REDD No Right' – if they do not have rights there will be no REDD. A rights perspective is central.

REDD CELL Coordinator Dr Jagadish Baral made a summary of the talks and concerns raised during the meeting. He thanked the visitors and Resham Dangi for their presentations. He raised again a concern that it is important to link the carbon calculation business to the standard – that the carbon accounting should go side by side with the social and environmental co-benefits and appealed to the CCBA/CARE initiative to explore this possible amplification of its remit.

3. Meetings at the field sites in Makwanpur and Bara Districts

a. Meeting with the Regional Director of Central Region and the Makwanpur District Forest Officer

Makwanpur District is 59% forest. Of this 34% is community forest. There is also 1500 ha under the new leasehold forestry modality. If we want to increase forest cover, we need to provide continued/sustained

incentives and alternative livelihoods. 16,000 ha are under shifting cultivation by the Tamang? people (an IP group). This is now illegal but was practiced for a long time before the law was made so is still tolerated. There used to be a 2-3 year rotation and now reduced to 5-6 months only.

b. Rani Community Forest Users Group, Makwanpur District, near Hetauda.

Participants: Chair person, Secretary, Treasurer (woman), Forest Guard, Audit Committee member, 3 Committee members, ex-chair person/advisor/FECOFUN representative, advisor, teacher, representative of district forest office, 2 from Kathmandu forest department and 1 from FECOFUN secretariat in Kathmandu.

Started to protect the forest 21 years ago. It was degraded with few large trees left. Created a committee and made some rules. The official establishment of community forest user group with government approval was 17 years ago in 1993.

There are 11 members of the executive committee. A population of 4500 divided into 837 households participates in the community forestry. The forest is 151 ha. The user group includes all households in immediate area who have traditionally used the forest. Some others living further away also requested membership and this was approved at a general assembly.

An analysis of the different types of households identified:

- 5% wealthier households
- 50% medium wealth households (have land, house etc)
- 45% poorer households

Also:

- 68% Brahmin
- 15% Janjati (IPs)
- 5% Tamang (shifting cultivation IPs)
- 1.5% another IP
- 0.5% Dalit (lowest caste – socially marginalized)

Also:

- 70% literate

Membership of the CFUG is by household. Each household is represented by one man and one woman. They have equal voting rights at the general assembly.

The Executive Committee is selected every 3 years by consensus of the general assembly. All interested individuals apply to the Election Committee. They give priority to socially responsible and experienced people. There are 4 women and 7 men on the current committee. One of the women is IP but no Dalit. There is a government guideline that 1/3 of the committee should be women.

The CFUG earns 6-800,000 rupees per annum (approx \$10,000). 80% of income comes from timber and firewood. 10,000 rupees comes from membership fees. Each household pays 20 rupees per year. New members pay 1500 rupees (near roads), 1200 rupees near small roads, or 80 rupees (far from roads). They also earn 5,000 rupees per year from visitors and more from students doing research (500-2,000 rupees per student). A couple of women's subcommittees sell handicrafts and briquettes. They also sell the annual report. They also win prizes from the District (100,000 rupees this year) or the Regional Support Unit.

The budget is proposed by the executive committee and approved by the general assembly. Users identify their needs and requests to members of the budget program drafting committee.

This year they gave 30,000 rupees to the 2 women's groups to make briquettes. They also paid for rattan plantations by employing poorer households.

How would an outsider know if there was equitable sharing of benefits? They produce an annual report and also get coverage in local newspapers. All decisions are posted on a notice board. They send meeting notices with agenda to all households at least 15 days before a meeting. The audit committee produces an audit report which is also published. Another committee can provide funds for immediate relief for a family in need. AGMs take 7-8 hours once a year. There is a high level of attendance.

They have used a governance assessment tool and scored well except for forest management. The forest provides 17,000 cuft per year but the demand is higher. Poorer families pay a lower rate. They cannot supply all the demand and families must also buy firewood and construction wood on the open market.

They have heard about climate change and seen impacts such as melting glaciers and the role of forests but would like more information. They organized a climate change and forestry essay competition recently. They have heard about funding from outside but don't know how it will come down to their level. They would also like an opportunity to participate in the discussions about the role of community forestry in Kathmandu and at District and Regional level. They hope FECOFUN will facilitate this.

c. Halkhoriya Collaborative Forest, Bara District, near Simara.

Participants: District Forest Officer, Chairperson of Collaborative Forest Management Committee (CFMC), Vice Chair of CFMC who is also active in Collaborative Forest Users Association of Nepal, Representative of local government, Secretary of CFMC who is also Assistant Forest Officer of Bara District, and several other users and advisors (10 total)

There is approximately 36% forest cover in Bara District (47,182ha) of which 3,000 ha is in community forests managed by 29 Community Forest User Groups. There are 3 collaborative forests covering 1,948 ha (here at Hakhoriya), 2058 and 2500 ha.

25 Village Development Committees (VDC) are involved in the collaborative management comprising 7,108 households and a population of 76,600. There are 4 VDCs in the forest area but the collaborative forest management also includes villages from further afield who also use and rely on the forest (up to the Indian border).

The management is a collaboration between partners:

- Government forest department
- Local government
- Forest users

4. Workshops to develop indicators

Workshops were held with government representatives (2 July morning, 14 people) and combined with REDD Working Group representatives (3 July morning, 11 people) and with NGO representatives (2 July afternoon, 22 people) to comment on the draft principles and criteria and to develop a first draft set of indicators.²

The principles and criteria derive from a multi-stakeholder workshop on the development of social and environmental standards for REDD+ programs held in Copenhagen 5-7 May 2009. The workshop participants formulated principles and criteria based on the following guidelines³:

² A list of all participants in meetings for whom contact details were collected is provided in Appendix 1.

³ 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'.

- **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 and have been included.

The indicators proposed during the workshops in Nepal are presented in Appendix 2. Further indicators will be developed during similar workshops to be held in Tanzania and Ecuador in September 2009.

Many excellent suggestions were also made to improve the principles and criteria. These comments have been used to prepare a new version of the principles and criteria presented in Appendix 3.

Participants at the workshop for Government representatives held on 2 July proposed the following components that might be included in Nepal's REDD+ program.

- Sustainable forest management in government-managed forests
- Expand community and collaborative forest management
- Alternative energy for domestic fuel
- Address and strengthen property rights
- Address market leakage – shift of pressure due to market demand
 - Improved governance
- Benefit sharing
- Generating alternative employment (livelihood diversification)

5. Meeting with REDD Working Group to discuss next steps

1– 4pm, 3 July 2009

Ministry of Forestry and Soil Conservation Training Hall, Babarmahal, Kathmandu

Reflections from the field visits

- Strong participatory institutions promote good working relations between government and communities/forest users
- High awareness of elements of good governance: importance of transparency, representation for diverse groups including poor, marginalised, women etc.
- Capacity and methods for governance and well-being assessment
- Awareness of climate change impacts and 'heard of' role of forests and potential for international funds
- Request for information in Nepali
- Desire to be involved and participate in design and implementation – both forest user committees and district level of forestry department

Input received on principles, criteria and indicators

- Active participation and rich, thoughtful input by government and NGO representatives
- Suggestions to make principles more complete including adding "rights holders"
- Improvements to wording of criteria and several good suggestions to combine criteria or make them into indicators
- Now have first draft of indicators
 - **Generic** e.g. 'there are participatory/self evaluation and monitoring provisions in operational plans of all implementing entities, conducted on a regular basis'

- **Nepal specific** e.g. To assess maintenance and enhancement of critical ecosystem services – ‘number and severity of floods and disaster relief expenses in Terai’
- Good understanding of and involvement in standards among government and partners in Nepal

Suggestions for next steps – testing the standards from 2010

In Nepal

- Process to define what to assess and monitor for social and environmental impacts of Nepal’s REDD+ program. Activities may include:
 - Defining general High Conservation Values for Nepal?
 - What are the critical ecosystem services?
 - What are the key species – globally threatened or nationally/locally important?
 - Defining rights holders/stakeholders for different components of the program
 - Defining the monitoring and reporting program and roles/responsibilities
 - Other?

CCBA/CARE

- Potential methodologies/tools
 - For what aspects?
- Exchange between countries on social and environmental issues of REDD+

A key issue emerging from consultations

“Business model/plan” for Nepal’s REDD program will determine extent to which the program delivers on CC mitigation (i.e revenue), social and other environmental goals and trade-off between these

- What mix of policies and measures
- Linkage between resource allocation to different regions/districts/forest areas (sites) within Nepal and emissions reductions generated by them
- Within site-level payments for ecosystem services
 - reward based on stock (historical performance) vs flow (future performance)
 - pro-poor targeting
 - geographic coverage, include distant users/stakeholders?

How will Nepal take forward the work on REDD+SE Standards?

1. Raising awareness of the people who will be developing the strategy (awareness about the principles and criteria of the standards, why important etc.)
2. Using the standards to help inform the planning/strategy development process
 - Part of this is about interpreting the Principles & Criteria for the Nepali context i.e. developing country specific guidance
 - Exchange of information with other countries could be a useful part of this.
3. Support for the social and environmental aspects in the development of the MRV plan of REDD+ in Nepal (to take into account the Social and Environmental standards).
4. Using the standards to assess:
 - planning/strategy development process
 - plans/strategy
5. Reflection leading to adaptation of approach of using the standard.

Note that all these elements are part of testing the standards.

The REDD working group estimated the following general timeline for development and implementation of REDD in Nepal:

- Readiness preparation proposal (FCPF R-plan process) – now to Dec 2009
- Design of REDD+ program – 2010 or longer
- Implementation – pilot projects to start as soon as possible, implementation of program from 2011.

Although assessment of impact of implementation of the full REDD+ program may not be possible until 2012 and beyond, the standards can be used during the design phase and early implementation which

will be the focus of testing the use of the standards in Nepal during Phase 2 of the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards initiative from April 2010-March 2012.

Support will be needed for facilitation of the process: propose co-facilitation by REDD – Forestry and Climate Change Cell and FECOFUN., i.e. there could be a member of staff in each organization working part-time to support the initiative

Next steps:

- Report from CCBA and CARE to REDD Working Group of the comments that came from the workshops on criteria and indicators – July 2009
- Develop multi-country funding proposal in late 2009 – CCBA and CARE to take the lead and consult with REDD Cell and REDD working group.
- Nepali Government representative on the REDD+SE standards (CCBA/CARE) standards committee.
- Meeting of the standards committee Friday 4th and Saturday 5th December in Copenhagen prior UNFCCC COP 15.
- CCBA/CARE team to identify any potential buyers for pilot projects and put them in touch with Dr Baral.
- Meanwhile in the short term Nepal REDD Cell can try to use existing pilot projects in Nepal to learn lessons, raise awareness, and test carbon assessment methodologies.

Appendix 1. Nepal Meeting Participants

Name	Organization	Email
Dr. Udaya Raj Sharma	Secretary, MFSC	udaysharma@wlink.com.np
Dr. Jagadish C. Baral	Chief, REDD-Cell, MFSC	baraljc@yahoo.com
Mr. Bechu K. Yadar	REDD-Forestry & Climate Change Cell	nepali-bechu@yahoo.com
Mr. Diraj Khanal	FECOFON	dlkhanal@yahoo.com
Mr. Bholu Bhattarai	FECOFUN	bholu_fecofun@yahoo.com
Mr. Ram Ashesrar Mandal	REDD-Forestry & Climate Change Cell	ram_forester@yahoo.com
Mr. Ghanshyam Pandey	FECOFUN	Pandeygs2002@yahoo.com
Kanti Rayshandari	Himawanti Nepal	nhimawanti@wlink.com
Dr. Balaran Thapa	Care Tanzania	balaran.thapa@co.care.org
Shira S. Pandey	ANSAB	shivapandey@ansab.org
Him Lal Shrestha	KAFCOL	hishrestha@gmail.com
Deb Bahadus Kunuwor	FECOFUN	kunwordeb@yahoo.com
Babu Ram Nakarmi	National Co-operative Federation of Nepal	ncf@wlink.com.np
Jailalb Kai	Forest Action Nepal	Jailabrai@yahoo.com
Resham Dangi	Department of Forests	reshamdangi@hotmail.com
Krishna P. Aeharya	DFRS	kpacharya1@hotmail.com
Suvas C. Devkota	FECOFUN/AAFAN	suvas.devkota@gmail.com
Bharkard Singh Karty	ICIMOD, Kathmandu	bkarty@icimod.org
Rajan Kotru	SNV - Kathmandu	rkotru@snvworld.org
Marco van der Linden	SNV	marcovanderlinden@snvworld.org
Dillon Lanus		dillon@greenvenutres.co.in
Maksha R. Mahaja		maksha@carenepal.org
Kamal Rai	IIDFCC	paa_rai@yahoo.com
Sunil K. Pariyar	Dalit Alliance for Natural Resources	pariyar15@yahoo.com

Ramesh Shakya	REDD-CELL	ramesh_058@yahoo.com
Bala Ram Kandel	Department of Forests	balaramkandel@yahoo.com
Sabita Ghimire	COFSUN	-
Deepak Risal	Nepal Samarcharpatra	deepakrisal@gmail.com
Ngamindra Dahal	NTNC	ngamindra@gmail.com
Bishnu Nisthuri	ASA Nepal	bishnu.nisthuri@gmail.com
Abdullah Miys	Kantipur Daily	miyaraee@gmail.com
Munni Gautam (upadhya)	Community Forestry Div/Dof	upadhyakiran@yahoo.com
Madhuri Karki (thapa)	Department of Forests	thapa-madhuree@yahoo.com
Krishna Acharya	DPRS	kpacharya1@hotmail.com
Keshav Khanal	Department of Forests	keshav_khanal@hotmail.com
Sahas Man Shrestha	DoF Research & Survey	sahas1957@yahoo.com
Sagar Rimal	Department of Forests	rimalsagar@yahoo.com
Mohan B. Gurung	Winrock	mgurung@winrock.org.np
Ram P. Acharya	Practical Solutions	psplnepal@gmail.com
Ugan Manadhar	WWF Nepal	ugan.manandhar@wwfnepal.org
Santosh Nepal	WWF Nepal	santosh.nepal@wwfnepal.org
Rishi Bastakoti	RIMS-Nepal	rishibastakoti@hotmail.com
Chup BahadThapa	FECOFUN	chup.thape@gmail.com
Jailab Kr. Rai	ForestAction Nepal	Jailabrai@yahoo.com
Digambar S. Dahal	FECOFUN	dahaldigambar@gmail.com
Eak Rana		erana_123@yahoo.com
Sani Lama	FECON	lakshed@gmail.com
Bharat K. Pokharel	SDC Intercooperatiojn	bk_pokharel@nscfp.org.np
Indrameti Moktan	FECOFUN	indrawati.moktan@yahoo.com
Pitamber Bhandan	FECOFUN	
Suvas Chandra Devkota	FECOFUN	suvas.devkota@gmail.com
Amija Sharma	Department of Forests	amij128@gmail.com
Harisharan Luintel	ForestAction Nepal	hl@forestaction.wlink.com.np
Indra B. Prochhain	Department of Forests	iprachhain@hotmail.com
Peter Branney	LFP + REDD Working Camp	p-branney@lfp.org.np

Appendix 2. Draft Indicators for REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards⁴ Version July 9th 2009

Please send any comments to Joanna Durbin jdurbin@climate-standards.org or Phil Franks phil@ci.or.ke

The principles and criteria presented in this document derive from a multi-stakeholder workshop on the development of social and environmental standards for REDD+ programs held in Copenhagen 5-7 May 2009. The workshop participants formulated principles and criteria based on the following guidelines⁵:

- **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 and have been included here in Column A.

Additional indicators were proposed during workshops held in Nepal with government representatives (July 2nd) and combined with REDD Working Group representatives (July 3rd) presented in Column B, and with NGO representatives (July 2nd) presented in Column C. Further work developing indicators is planned in Tanzania and Ecuador in September 2009 after which the indicators will be consolidated.

P1: Rights to land, territories and resources are recognized and respected			
Criteria	Indicators		
	A. Copenhagen workshop	B. Nepal govt & REDD working group	C. Nepal NGO group
1.a The REDD+ program effectively identifies the different rights holders (statutory and customary) and their rights to land, territories and resources relevant to the program.	- 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.	-	- Policies are in place to ensure forest user's rights - Community forestry plan ensures identification of rights of all users
1.b The REDD+ program respects and recognizes customary rights to land, territory and resources	-	-	- Community forestry plan will be developed recognizing customary and statutory rights

⁴ Please refer to an accompanying fact sheet about the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards or contact Joanna Durbin jdurbin@climate-standards.org or Phil Franks phil@ci.or.ke for more information about the initiative.

⁵ 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'.

which Indigenous Peoples or local communities have traditionally owned and occupied or otherwise used or acquired ⁶ .			- The spatial boundary of all traditional activities is clearly defined on community forestry management plans
1.c The REDD+ program requires the free, prior and informed consent of rights holders for any activities affecting their rights to lands, resources and territories.	-	-	- A mechanism is developed that eases access to information
1.d 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.	-	-	- A mechanism of local/community/national mediation is formed/developed - xx cases/disputes settled under the mechanism
1.e Policies are in place that respect the customary rights to lands, territories and resources of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.	-	-	- National REDD strategy should have an appropriate clause that depicts the customary rights of Indigenous People's and local communities - Cross-cutting policy documents have the appropriate clauses (land, water, local development, fiscal policy)
1.f If the REDD+ program enables private ownership of carbon rights, they must be allocated equitably based on rights to the land, territories and resources (as identified in P1.1) that are generating the greenhouse gas emissions reductions and removals,	-	-	- Spatial mapping status of privately-owned forest - Well-defined benefit-sharing mechanism is in place

⁶ 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.

P2: The benefits of REDD and other forest carbon programs are shared equitably⁷ among all stakeholders and rights holders			
Criteria	Indicators		
	A. Copenhagen workshop	B. Nepal govt & REDD working group	C. Nepal NGO group
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 groups with respect the reference scenario ⁸	-	- Stakeholder analysis (a report) - Study report about projected costs, benefits and risk factors	-
2.b A transparent and participatory process must be established for equitable sharing of benefits of the REDD+ program taking into costs benefits and associated risks.	- Clarity over where decision-making authority lies relating to carbon crediting/sales and allocation of revenues and benefit sharing. - A review of options for the most efficient and equitable distribution mechanisms	- Legal framework (Act...Policy...) - Implementation guidelines - National level stakeholders committee to oversee benefit sharing - Annual report on benefit sharing	- There is a procedure for decision-making about benefit distribution/sharing which includes all stakeholders and rights holders using a multi-stakeholder forum. - There should be a proportionate mechanism for benefit-sharing eg. at least 80% of revenues should go to rights holders.
2.c There must be transparent and participatory monitoring of the benefits of the REDD+ program, including any revenues, and their distribution across stakeholders and rights holders.	-	- National level stakeholders committee to oversee monitoring of benefit sharing - Number of public hearings/auditing - Report on participatory monitoring	-
2.d Administrative procedures for funds management and benefits distribution are timely and cost effective.	-	- Roles and responsibilities defined - Work plan/time-bound commitment	-

⁷ Equitable needs definition especially in the context of other languages.

⁸ The 'reference scenario' is the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the implementation of the REDD+ program.

P3: The program contributes to sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation for forest- dependent⁹ peoples			
Criteria	Indicators		
	A. Copenhagen workshop	B. Nepal govt & REDD working group	C. Nepal NGO group
3.a The REDD+ program should lead to additional and long-term livelihood and poverty alleviation benefits with respect to the reference scenario and existing commitments, emphasizing poor and marginalised groups.	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification of poor and marginalised households - Accounting system at community level enables (poor and marginalised) m/reporting - Planning process focusing on pro-poor and marginalised households 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The forest user group records show significant increase in benefits - There is a well-established mechanism of benefit-sharing focusing primarily on poor and marginalised groups
3.b How REDD+ program resources are used for livelihood and poverty alleviation activities should be defined by the relevant Indigenous Peoples/local communities through an inclusive and transparent process.	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning process accountable for pro-poor and marginalised households. - Livelihood diversification for the poor and marginalised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting minutes of general assembly of community forestry user groups - REDD+ national guidelines that clearly reflect fund mobilisation according to the group's decision
3.c There should be participatory assessment of positive and negative livelihood and poverty impacts of the program including both predicted (ie social impact assessment ¹⁰) and actual impacts leading to improvement of program design and implementation.	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Independent local monitoring system (NGO/GO) for all types of forest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study report/minutes of impact assessment - Participatory self-evaluation and monitoring provision in their operational plan and make mandatory to conduct on a regular basis. - Existence of separate committee for self/participatory monitoring and evaluation.
3.d Mitigation measures are designed and implemented to address potential negative impacts on livelihoods, including alternative sources of livelihood,	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resource allocation to mitigate specific negative impacts - Sustainable adoption of uptake of mitigation measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of mitigation measures - Participation level of poor, women, marginalised increase
3.e The REDD+ program generates increased financing for sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation.	-	-	-

⁹ Forest-dependent peoples includes Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

¹⁰ Social impact assessment should include social, cultural and economic impacts.

P4: The program contributes to broader sustainable development objectives			
Criteria	Indicators		
	A. Copenhagen workshop	B. Nepal govt & REDD working group	C. Nepal NGO group
4.a The program should be coherent with national and state/provincial sustainable development policies and strategies (e.g. poverty reduction targets/strategies, national budgets, national biodiversity strategies, national climate change strategies, national adaptation plans etc.)	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poverty reduction policy mentioned in forest policies (and any new versions, explicitly referencing payment for conservation etc. and impact on poverty) - Policy and strategy documents include reference to REDD+ strategies 	-
4.b Where national and state/provincial strategies are 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"> - NB: change can't be expected quickly because REDD+ program and SE standards did not exist when policies were developed 	-
4.c There should be strong government ownership of the REDD+ program in their country.	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - REDD+ units are established under the Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation and its departments - A REDD carbon registration unit is established in the Government (Ministry of Forestry) 	-
4.d There should be effective coordination between government agencies responsible for the design, implementation and evaluation of the REDD+ program and other government agencies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A coordination body or process is established to link the REDD+ program with all relevant ministries and government agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multisectoral/multi-faceted coordination mechanism within the government at central and other appropriate levels - Regular meetings taking place between these bodies 	-
4.e Land use planning elements of REDD+ programs should be harmonised with other land use planning processes.	-	-	-

P5: Ecosystem services¹¹ and biodiversity are maintained and enhanced			
Criteria	Indicators		
	A. Copenhagen workshop	B. Nepal govt & REDD working group	C. Nepal NGO group
5.a. Ecosystem services and biodiversity are maintained and enhanced at landscape and national scale with respect to the reference scenario, with no negative impact on high conservation values. ¹²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Endangered species are protected where applicable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decrease in incidences of flood, landslides, erosion. - Water resources eg perennity of water resources (flowing water, stagnant pools), water quality, rich in aquatic life (fish, frogs etc). - The existence of a mixture of different sub-landscapes within a macro landscape - Diversified species compared to a baseline eg birds/animals, trees, shrubs/herbs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easy availability of species with cultural importance - Availability of most favorable species of firewood (less explosive, low smoke, high calorific value) - Accessibility of useful forest products, low price for fuel wood - Water bodies and water resources are well conserved - Reduced damage by floods in plains areas/Terai - Reduced human/property/infrastructure disturbance by landslides - Increased water availability in terms of volume and duration - Maintaining of soil fertility by organic manure (litter) - Numbers of wild animals – crop damage, domestic animals attacked, number of attacks by wild animals - Number of biogas users?

¹¹ 'Ecosystem services' in this context refers to services other than greenhouse gas emissions reductions or removals

¹² '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).

<p>5.b The positive and negative impacts of the REDD+ program on ecosystem services and biodiversity should be assessed, including both predicted (i.e. environmental impact assessment) and actual impacts, involving forest-dependent peoples and other stakeholders as appropriate, leading to improvement of program design and implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indicators are defined for measurement of ecosystem services and biodiversity drawing from traditional knowledge and scientific research as appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Genuine involvement/participation of local people in program design and implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of assembly/village meetings - Number of visits in forest by users - Records of visits – mental memories - Public hearings and discussions
<p>5.c The REDD+ program design addresses maintenance and enhancement of ecosystem services and biodiversity in its objectives, policies and measures, building on traditional knowledge and management practices of forest-dependent peoples and other stakeholders as appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involvement of NGOs, CBOs private organisations and government in REDD+ program development and implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inventory and identification of local and cultural value of biodiversity - Whether REDD+ program directly contributes to National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan -
<p>5.d Maintenance and enhancement of ecosystem services and biodiversity are mainstreamed into national and state/provincial REDD+ policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National REDD+ policies in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - REDD+ policy has strong component of ecosystem services and biodiversity
<p>5.e The REDD+ program generates increased financing for maintaining and enhancing ecosystem services and biodiversity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Xx payment received from carbon finance - Xx amount transacted in environmental services (eg water payments) - Xx number of visitors/tourists increased to observe species/biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest-dependent people get paid as compensation for their contribution to ecosystem conservation - More reinvestment and budget allocation for forest conservation, biodiversity, and rural development

P6: All relevant stakeholders and rights holders are able to participate fully and effectively in the design, implementation and evaluation of the program			
Criteria	Indicators		
	A. Copenhagen workshop	B. Nepal govt & REDD working group	C. Nepal NGO group
6.a The REDD+ program identifies and characterises stakeholders, including Indigenous Peoples, local communities, women and other potentially marginalised groups.	-	- Number of stakeholders by categories: Jangati, Dalit, women etc	-
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"> - Effective representation of women and other potentially marginalised groups in the stakeholder consultation/participation process. - Consultations are tailored to the local context. - Ensure inclusion of local government as well as national government. - Adequate financial support to enable participation of all relevant stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Well-being groups of community - % stakeholders by participation in design, implementation, evaluation - Number of programs adopting a participatory approach of consultation/discussion - Representation/participation from different groups of communities - 	-
6.c Stakeholders determine how they will be represented, taking account of formal and informal arrangements/institutions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The REDD+ program respects and does not undermine Indigenous Peoples' and local communities' own decision-making structures and processes, and enables them to select their own representatives to participate in decision-making. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusiveness and participatory decision making process in ? - Executive committee structure 	-
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"> - Reputation tenure (years) - Information sharing mechanism, collection of information – representatives organised meeting with locals - Issues/problems raised and decision/actions taken - Community forestry constitutional provisions are met - Timely reporting of responsibilities to those they represent 	-

6.e Stakeholders have a good understanding of the key issues related to the REDD+ program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness-raising activities ensure a good understanding of the REDD+ program, particularly among poor/marginalised groups including forest-dependent peoples. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of awareness raising programs - Number of publications/reporting - Incorporation of REDD+ in operational plans - Program specially addressing degradation - Community-driven REDD+ activities – ? forest dependent people - % of budget invested in REDD+ 	-
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"> - Establishment, allocation of responsibilities for receiving/resolving disputes - Number of cases – disaggregate data - Trend analysis with nature of disputes 	-
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"> - Indigenous knowledge documented and distributed - Number of policies and programs using indigenous technical knowledge 	-

P7: All stakeholders and rights holders have timely access to appropriate and accurate information to enable transparency, accountability and full and effective participation.			
Criteria	Indicators		
	A. Copenhagen workshop	B. Nepal govt & REDD working group	C. Nepal NGO group
7.a Stakeholders have the information that they need about the options before making a decision, including information about potential social, cultural, economic and ecological risks and opportunities, legal implications, results of monitoring and evaluation, and the global and national context.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholders and rights holders know what information is available and how to access it. - The most effective means of dissemination of information are identified and used for each stakeholder group - Indigenous peoples and local communities have the information they need in a form they understand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existence of information flow channels between the center and the grass roots level - Number of comments or issues received from the stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Material/information available in national, ethnic and simple language

7.b Stakeholder representatives have adequate resources to enable collection and dissemination of all relevant information from and to their constituencies.	- Information about stakeholder meetings is made publicly available. -	- Stakeholders have adequate resources (funds, human resources) to ensure information flow to/from constituencies	- How can we ensure 'adequate' resources?
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.	-	- Time between information release and decisions made - Information published – language/poster understandable to people – source of information	- A minimum of 60 days has been provided to comment
7.d National policies support stakeholder access to information about the REDD+ program, including information on rights to land, territories and resources.	-	- Number of policies addressing the issues. - Information dissemination process - Existence of Right to Information Act	- There is a 'right to information' policy in place and this is followed
7.e Stakeholders have access to legal advice and understand relevant legal implications and processes.	-	- Existence of legal service legislation that is free for poor and marginalized	-

P8: Compliance with applicable local¹³ and national laws and international treaties and agreements			
Criteria	Indicators		
	A. Copenhagen workshop	B. Nepal govt & REDD working group	C. Nepal NGO group
8.a The REDD+ program conforms with local law, national law and international treaties and agreements ratified or adopted by the country.	- The program identifies relevant international treaties and agreements – UNDRIP, CBD, CEDAW, rights of children etc.	- List of international treaties and agreements relevant to REDD+ - Existence of domestic law in compliance with international treaties and agreements	-
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	-	- Existence of review process to address the inconsistencies between the standards and national law	-
8.c Relevant stakeholders have the capacity to implement and monitor legal requirements	-	- Existence of support mechanisms for implementing and monitoring legal requirements	-

¹³ 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 3. Draft Principles and Criteria for REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards¹⁴

Version July 14thth 2009

Please send any comments to Joanna Durbin jdurbin@climate-standards.org or Phil Franks phil@ci.or.ke

The principles and criteria presented in this document 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 and criteria were formulated based on the following guidelines¹⁵:

- **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.

This version includes only a few indicators which come from criteria that were pitched at a level that made them more indicators than criteria. A more complete set of indicators is being developed for each criterion.

Please note that we expect to make changes to this draft of the principles and criteria over the course of the next nine months in response to feedback from the various consultation processes that will take place during this period.

P1: Rights to land, territories and resources are recognized and respected

- a. The REDD+ program¹⁶ effectively identifies the different rights holders (statutory and customary) and their rights to land, territories and resources relevant to the program.
 - i. A process must be 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.
 - ii.
- 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.¹⁷
- c. The REDD+ program requires the free, prior and informed consent of rights holders for any activities affecting their rights to lands, resources and territories.
- d. 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.
- e. Where the REDD+ program enables private ownership of carbon rights, they are allocated equitably based on rights to the land, territories and resources (as identified in P1.1) that are generating the greenhouse gas emissions reductions and removals,

Justifications for changes following comments received in Nepal 29 June to 3 July:

- The criterion requiring the existence of policies that respect customary rights has been deleted because the REDD+ program includes both policies and measures, so the requirement for supportive policies is included in 1.b and should therefore be reflected in indicators for 1b..

¹⁴ Please refer to an accompanying fact sheet about the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards or contact Joanna Durbin jdurbin@climate-standards.org or Phil Franks phil@ci.or.ke for more information about the initiative.

¹⁵ 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'.

¹⁶ The REDD+ program comprises objectives, policies and measures developed for the program and other relevant policies that support it.

¹⁷ 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.

How to address?

- *Forest-dependent peoples' claim to carbon rights in countries where carbon rights have been or will be nationalized?*

P2: The benefits of the REDD+ program are shared equitably¹⁸ among all stakeholders and rights holders

- 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 stakeholder¹⁹ groups with respect to the reference scenario.²⁰
- b. A transparent, participatory and efficient²¹ process must be established for equitable sharing of benefits of the REDD+ program taking into account costs, benefits and associated risks.
 - i. Clarity over where decision-making authority lies relating to carbon crediting/sales and allocation of revenues and benefit sharing.
 - ii. A review of options for the most efficient and equitable distribution mechanisms
 - iii. Administrative procedures for funds management and benefits distribution are timely and cost-efficient to maximize benefits for stakeholders.
 - iv.
- c. There is transparent and participatory monitoring of the benefits of the REDD+ program, including any revenues, and their distribution among stakeholders..

Justifications for changes following comments received in Nepal 29 June to 3 July:

- The criterion requiring timely and cost-effective administrative procedures has been moved to an indicator of 2.b. with the inclusion of "efficient" (which encompasses 'cost-effective') in the criterion.

P3: The REDD+ program contributes to sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation for forest- dependent²² peoples

- 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 poor and marginalised.
 - i. The REDD+ program generates increased financing to contribute to sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation.
 - ii.
- b. The relevant forest-dependent peoples define how the REDD+ program improves their livelihoods alleviates poverty through an inclusive and transparent process
- c. There is participatory assessment of positive and negative livelihood and poverty impacts of the REDD+ program including both predicted (ie social impact assessment²³) and actual impacts..
- d. The REDD+ program is adapted based on predictive and ongoing impact assessment to mitigate negative, and enhance positive, livelihood and poverty impacts.

Justifications for changes following comments received in Nepal 29 June to 3 July:

- The criterion requiring increased financing for sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation has been moved to an indicator of 3.a – but it is important to bear in mind that increased financing does not necessarily lead to improved outcomes, so this indicator is not sufficient on its own but may be useful in the design and early implementation stages of a REDD program when it is too early to assess livelihood outcomes.
- The adaptive management approach has been included in a separate criterion (3d) along with the requirement for mitigation measures.
- Options for alternative sources of livelihood as mitigation measures will be included in guidance.

How to address?

- *Promote resilience and climate change adaptation?*

¹⁸ Equitable needs definition especially in the context of other languages.

¹⁹ 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

²⁰ The 'reference scenario' is the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the implementation of the REDD+ program.

²¹ 'Efficient' is defined for the purpose of these standards as achieving the target with minimum cost, effort and time.

²² Forest-dependent peoples include Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

²³ Social impact assessment should include social, cultural and economic impacts.

P4: The REDD+ program contributes to broader sustainable development and good governance²⁴ objectives

- a. The REDD+ program is coherent with national and state/provincial sustainable development policies and strategies²⁵
 - i. Land use planning elements of the REDD+ program are consistent with other land use planning processes.
 - ii.
- b. Where the REDD+ program is not consistent with national and state/provincial sustainable development strategies, a review process is undertaken to resolve the inconsistencies.
- c. There should be strong government ownership of the REDD+ program in their country.
- d. There should be effective coordination between government agencies responsible for the design, implementation and evaluation of the REDD+ program and other relevant government agencies:
 - i. A coordination body or process is established to link the REDD+ program with all relevant ministries and government agencies.
 - ii.
- e. The REDD+ program leads to sector-wide improvements in forest governance.

Justifications for changes following comments received in Nepal 29 June to 3 July:

- Creation of a new principle was suggested requiring REDD+ programs to stimulate improved forest sector governance. While this is an important issue, we propose that this fits well with the requirement that the REDD+ program contributes to broader sustainable development. A new criterion has been proposed for this aspect.
- 4b originally required a review and plan to remove inconsistencies when national and state/provincial strategies are not consistent with the standards. However, the standards cannot evaluate the sustainable development strategies but can evaluate the REDD+ program. 4b as been modified accordingly. ,

How to address?

- *NAPAs and NAMAs?*
- *“Broader” - is there a better term?*
- *Link to MDGs – how can impact related to MDGs be assessed?*

P5: Biodiversity and ecosystem services²⁶ are maintained and enhanced

- a. Biodiversity and ecosystem services including any nationally or locally-defined high conservation values, are maintained and enhanced at landscape and national scale with respect to the reference scenario,²⁷
 - i. Endangered species are protected where applicable.
 - ii. Increased financing from REDD+ program contributes to maintaining and enhancing ecosystem services and biodiversity
 - iii.
- b. The positive and negative impacts of the REDD+ program on ecosystem services and biodiversity are assessed, including both predicted (i.e. environmental impact assessment) and actual impacts, involving forest-dependent peoples and other stakeholders as appropriate.
 - i. Indicators are defined for measurement of ecosystem services and biodiversity drawing from traditional knowledge and scientific research as appropriate.
 - ii.

²⁴ ‘good governance’ needs definition.

²⁵ e.g. poverty reduction strategies/targets, national budgets, national biodiversity strategies, national climate change strategies, national adaptation plans etc.

²⁶ ‘Ecosystem services’ in this context refers to services other than greenhouse gas emissions reductions or removals

²⁷ ‘High Conservation Values’ are defined by the High Conservation Value (HCV) Resource Network

<http://hcvnetwork.org/>

7. 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).
8. 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;
9. Threatened or rare ecosystems;
10. Areas that provide critical ecosystem services (e.g., hydrological services, erosion control, fire control);
11. 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
12. 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).

- 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 sustainable management practices of forest-dependent peoples and other stakeholders.

Justifications for changes following comments received in Nepal 29 June to 3 July:

- A requirement for no negative impact on high conservation values was found to be too demanding, so a more feasible formulation was adopted where high conservation values are maintained and enhanced. In addition, it seems overly onerous to require a full identification of all potential high conservation values in a country, so the words 'nationally or locally-defined' were included to imply that HCVs must be maintained or enhanced where they have been defined.
- Separate criteria requiring maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the REDD+ program and in policies have been combined because policies are included in the REDD+ program (5c).

How to address?

- *Require some portion of forest estate to move towards certification of sustainable forest management?*

P6: All relevant stakeholders and rights holders are able to participate fully and effectively in the design, implementation and evaluation of the REDD+ program

- a. The REDD+ program identifies and characterises stakeholders, including Indigenous Peoples, local communities, women and other potentially marginalised groups.
- b. All relevant stakeholders are involved in program design, implementation and evaluation through effective consultation or more active participation.
 - a. Effective representation of women and other potentially marginalised groups in the stakeholder consultation/participation process.
 - b. Consultations are tailored to the local context.
 - c. Ensure inclusion of local government as well as national government.
 - d. Adequate financial support to enable participation of all relevant stakeholders.
 - e.
- c. Stakeholders determine how they will be represented, taking account of formal and informal arrangements/institutions.
 - a. The REDD+ program respects and does not undermine Indigenous Peoples' and local communities' own decision-making structures and processes, and enables them to select their own representatives to participate in decision-making.
 - b.
- d. Stakeholder representatives ensure effective involvement, information sharing and accountability with/to the people they represent and assist with consensus building.
- e. Stakeholders have a good understanding of the key issues related to the REDD+ program.
 - a. Awareness-raising activities ensure a good understanding of the REDD+ program, particularly among poor/marginalised groups including forest-dependent peoples.
 - b.
- f. Mechanisms are in place to receive and resolve grievances and disputes relating to planning and implementation of the REDD+ program.
- g. Program planning and implementation builds on and supports stakeholders' knowledge, skills and management systems including those of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

Justifications for changes following comments received in Nepal 29 June to 3 July:

- Principles 6 and 7 were strengthened to include a specific mention of 'rights holders' to ensure that people with rights concerned by the REDD+ program are specifically included in addition to those stakeholders whose interests are concerned by the program.

How to address?

- *Local level planning*
- *Demonstrate that program design was influenced by local stakeholders*
- *Subsidiarity principle*
- *Self determination of stakeholders*
- *Free prior and informed consent in the context of participation*

P7: All stakeholders and rights holders have timely access to appropriate and accurate information to enable good governance of the REDD+ program.

- 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.
 - i. Stakeholders know what information is available and how to access it.
 - ii. Stakeholders have access to the results of monitoring and evaluation of the REDD+ program.
 - iii. The most effective means of dissemination of information are identified and used for each stakeholder group
 - iv. Indigenous peoples and local communities have the information they need in a form they understand.
 - v.
- b. Stakeholder representatives collect and disseminate all relevant information from and to their constituencies.
 - i. Information about stakeholder meetings is made publicly available.
 - ii. Stakeholder representatives have adequate resources to collect and disseminate information from and to their constituents.
 - iii.
- c. Information is available and disseminated in time to enable stakeholder feedback to their representatives and respecting the time needed for inclusive decision making.
- d. National policies support stakeholder access to information about the REDD+ program, including information on rights to land, territories and resources.
- e. Stakeholders have access to legal advice and understand relevant legal implications and processes.

How to address?

- *Two way flow of information to and from stakeholders*

P8: The REDD+ program complies with applicable local²⁸ and national laws and international treaties and agreements

- a. The REDD+ program complies with local law, national law and international treaties and agreements ratified or adopted by the country.
 - i. The program identifies relevant international treaties and agreements – UNDRIP, CBD, CEDAW, rights of children etc.
 - ii.
- 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.
- c. Relevant stakeholders have the capacity to implement and monitor legal requirements.

How to address?

- *Inconsistencies between national law and international law*
- *A process to assess whether laws are actually implemented.*

²⁸ 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.