



Networking for equity
in forest climate policy



Promoting and implementing REDD+ safeguards at national level in East Africa

David M. Mwayafu & James W. Kisekka
2012

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Emily Brickell for her valuable comments on the draft of this paper and presenters at the workshop in Nairobi: Mr. Robert Nabanyumya, Rahima Njaidi, Erneus Kajjage, Mary Sway, Xavier Mugumya, Emily Brickell, and all the workshop participants who gave insights on the direction of this paper.

Disclaimer

This paper is published by the REDD-net programme, supported by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD). The views and recommendations expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the funders or institutions involved in REDD-net.

ABOUT REDD-NET

REDD-net is an international knowledge forum for southern civil society organizations through which they can access information about efforts to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation, share their own experiences and help to build pro-poor REDD projects and policies. REDD-net is a partnership between Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE), the Overseas Development Institute, RECOFTC - The Center for People and Forests and Uganda Coalition for Sustainable Development. REDD-net is funded by Norad.



For information about REDD-net contact William McFarland at ODI (w.mcfarland@odi.org.uk or visit www.redd-net.org
For more information about REDD-net East Africa and this paper, contact David Mwayafu (dmwayafu@ugandacoalition.or.ug)

Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	i
1. STATE OF PLAY ON SAFEGUARDS.....	1
The World Bank’s safeguards.....	1
The United Nation Framework Convention on Climate change (UNFCCC) safeguards.....	3
The Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards.....	3
Other relevant safeguards.....	4
2. IMPLEMENTING REDD+ SAFEGUARDS IN EAST AFRICA.....	5
Existing policy framework and progress to date.....	5
Tanzania	5
Uganda	6
Kenya.....	7
3. MAKING REDD+ SAFEGUARDS WORK FOR EAST AFRICA.....	9
Insights from the Stakeholder’s Workshop on the Issues of Safeguards	9
4. CONCLUSION.....	11
References.....	12

INTRODUCTION

While REDD+¹ activities have the potential to deliver significant social and environmental co-benefits, they pose a number of potential risks to the environment and to some stakeholders, particularly the communities whose livelihoods depend on the forests. This has attracted significant discussion, particularly among local communities and civil society organisations. Consequently, the need for deliberate efforts to address the social and environment concerns associated with the REDD+ initiatives has gained attention in international, national and local initiatives focused on REDD+. For example, at the 2010 UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun, governments agreed a set of safeguards that should be promoted and supported in REDD+ programmes (UNFCCC, 2010:). Many international institutions have also adopted environmental and social “safeguard” policies to help identify and reduce the likelihood that their investments will cause harm to local people and ecosystems.

Safeguards have different meaning and purpose for different stakeholders, such as governments, donors, financiers and investors, multilateral institutions, indigenous peoples and forest dependent communities, the private sector, or the civil society (Moss et al 2011). Additionally, a number of other terms have been used to refer to safeguards. For example, principles, standards, criteria, risk mitigation measures, strategic social, environmental assessments, and precautionary measures. However, in general, the underlying objective of all of these is to prevent and mitigate undue harm to people and their environment, and to strive to develop benefits in the process.

More specifically, safeguard policies and procedures are designed to avoid, mitigate, or minimise adverse environmental and social impacts of projects and strategies, and to implement REDD+ national strategies that produce positive outcomes for people and the environment. Many REDD+ countries score high on indices of corruption (World Bank, 2011) and lack capacity to prevent and mitigate undue harm from investment or development activities (World Bank, 2005). A large infusion of REDD+ money could exacerbate these governance challenges. Yet promoting country ownership of safeguards can help to strengthen local laws and institutions leading to sustainable development. Establishing internationally recognised social and environmental standards to guide national REDD+ policy and project design is critical to achieving effective, efficient and equitable social and environmental outcomes (Jagger et al., 2012).

¹ Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries



1. STATE OF PLAY ON SAFEGUARDS

In many REDD+ countries, discussions on safeguards are in their infancy and represent only a minor component of the overall REDD+ policy dialogue. REDD+ readiness initiatives often focus heavily on aspects such as carbon monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV), paying little attention to core issues relating to safeguards (Jagger et al., 2012). A report by Kirk Herbertson of the International Rivers indicates that more than fifteen international institutions (Table 1) have undertaken safeguard reforms since 2008, and currently, at least eight are reforming old policies or developing new ones. Of all these institutions, Herbertson (2012) argues that multilateral development banks have the most sophisticated safeguards that include detailed procedures and years of staff experience. Several of these banks have, since 2008, updated their safeguards.

The World Bank's safeguards

The World Bank, which is said to have the most influential safeguards among public international institutions (Herbertson, 2012), has a set of 10 safeguard policies and an access to information policy which guide the Bank as well as the borrowing countries in identification, preparation, and implementation of the Bank-financed projects (Moss et al., 2011). Five of these policies: Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04), Forests (OP/BP 4.36), Involuntary

Table 1: Recent safeguard reforms

Institution	Status/year of reform
World Bank	in progress
African Development Bank	in progress
REDD language at UNFCCC	in progress
Green Climate Fund	in progress
Brazil National Development Bank, BNDES	in progress
UN REDD	in progress
UN Environment Management Group	in progress
Global Environment facility	in progress
International Finance Corporation	2011
Forest Carbon Partnership facility	2011
German Development Agencies	2011
Asian Development Bank	2009
Forest Investment Program	2009
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development	2008
China Export Import Bank	2008

adapted from Herbertson 2012

Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12), and Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10) are the most relevant in the discussions about social and environmental issues within REDD+ (Moss et al., 2011). See the Box 1 below for a summarised description of these safeguard policies. They apply to all the activities funded by the World Bank through the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) and the Forest Investment Programme.

However, these policies are limited in their application to the readiness planning process of REDD+ (Moss et al., 2011). Their development was oriented

towards project-based funding rather than strategic planning processes, while the REDD+ Readiness phase is programmatic in nature and is meant to support analytical and preparatory work that yields, for example, the national REDD+ strategy.

The REDD+ readiness phase requires a strategic approach for integrating social and environmental considerations. The FCPF has, therefore, adapted the application of safeguards for the readiness phase of REDD+ with the use of Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) (Moss et al., 2011). The SESA

Box 1: World Bank's FCPF: Social and Environmental safeguards

Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01) aims at preventing, minimizing, mitigating or compensating for adverse environmental impacts, but whenever feasible, preventive measures are preferred over mitigation or compensatory measures. It considers natural and social aspects of initiatives in an integrated way. It takes into account the natural environment (air, water and land); human health and safety; social aspects (involuntary resettlement, indigenous peoples and physical cultural resources) and trans-boundary and global environmental aspects.

Natural Habitats (OP 4.04) recognizes the fact that conservation of natural habitats, just like other measures that protect and enhance the environment, is important for long-term sustainable development.

Forests (OP 4.36) observes that the management, conservation and sustainable development of forest ecosystems and their associated resources are essential for lasting poverty reduction and sustainable development, whether located in countries with abundant forests or in those with depleted or naturally limited forest resources. The objective of this policy is to assist borrowers to harness the potential of forests to reduce poverty in a sustainable manner, integrate forests effectively into sustainable economic development, and protect the vital local and environmental services and values of forests. Where forest restoration and plantation development are necessary to meet these objectives, the bank assists borrowers with forest restoration activities that maintain or enhance biodiversity and ecosystem functionality. The Bank also assists borrowers with the establishment and sustainable management of environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial, and economically viable forest plantations to help meet growing demands for forest goods and services.

Involuntary Resettlement (OP 4.12) observes that involuntary resettlement may cause severe long-term hardship, impoverishment, and environmental damage unless appropriate measures are carefully planned and carried out.

Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10) is aimed at contributing to World Bank's mission of poverty reduction and sustainable development by ensuring that the development process fully respects the dignity, human rights, economies, and cultures of Indigenous Peoples. This policy calls for free, prior and informed consent that should result in broad community support to the project by the affected indigenous peoples. This policy also emphasizes that World Bank financed projects be designed in such a way as to ensure that the Indigenous Peoples receive social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate and gender and inter-generationally inclusive.

combines analytical and participatory approaches in an iterative fashion throughout the preparation of the R-PP and R-Package (Moss et al., 2011). A specific output of the SESA is the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which is a framework to avoid and/or mitigate and manage potential risks of the REDD+ strategy options. The ESMF has to be consistent with the applicable World Bank safeguard policies and the ESMF is expected to contain sections addressing the requirements of applicable policies.

The United Nation Framework Convention on Climate change (UNFCCC) safeguards

Safeguard discussions are also taking place as part of the negotiations at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (Herbertson, 2011). The UNFCCC text calls on countries to support and promote a set of safeguards, including those addressing social issues of forest governance, respect for the rights of indigenous and local communities, stakeholder participation and enhancement of social benefits (box 2); and for countries participating in REDD+ to develop a system for providing information

on the safeguards they have in place (UNFCCC, 2010:). A further decision under the UNFCCC in 2011 agreed that all REDD+ activities need to be consistent with the safeguards regardless of the source or type of financing (UNFCCC, 2011). However, there is as yet no agreement on the relative priority of carbon versus non-carbon values of forests and the appropriate level of safeguard standardisation (McDermott et al 2012). There has also not been any agreement on what constitutes an adequate safeguard or how countries will be held accountable if safeguards are not implemented.

The Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards

The Climate, Community and Biodiversity (CCB) standards require that projects must generate net positive impacts on the social and economic well-being of communities, going beyond 'do no harm.' CCB Standards recognise the need for effective local participation in project design and implementation. The CCB standards require an evaluation of the current biodiversity and conservation values in the project area. Free, prior and informed consent as well as equitable benefit sharing is also required. Box 2

Box 2: Safeguards for REDD+ under the UNFCCC

The UNFCCC, in the Cancun Agreement, articulated seven social and environmental safeguards for REDD+ (UNFCCC, 2010). These are:

1. That actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements
2. Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty
3. Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities, by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws, and noting that the United Nations General Assembly has adopted the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
4. The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities, in the actions referred to in paragraphs 70 and 72 of this decision
5. That actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that actions referred to in paragraph 70 of this decision are not used for the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivise the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits
6. Actions to address the risk of reversals
7. Actions to reduce the displacement of emissions.

Box 3: Making REDD + Work for Communities and Forest Conservation: a case of TFCG in Tanzania

The project's goal is to reduce GHG emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in ways that provide direct and equitable incentives to rural communities to conserve and manage forests sustainably. The project aims to pilot a mechanism whereby REDD+ finance can bring about additional reductions in greenhouse gas emissions by channelling incentives as directly as possible to communities with forests on their land. In the absence of a compliance market for REDD+ or a fund-based mechanism, the project aims to assist communities to access finance from the voluntary carbon market.

According to Campesse (2011), the project aims to be consistent with a number of international and national safeguards. At national level, the project will be consistent with the country's legal framework. Further, the project will be validated according to the Voluntary Carbon Standards (VCS) and Climate, Community and Biodiversity (CCB) standards.

The project has secured the consent of the 36 participating villages. The project put in place an equitable and transparent system of decision making regarding distribution of REDD+ revenues to make sure that all adult members of the community are involved in decision making of the REDD+ revenue distribution mechanism and to ensure that the system enables all community members to have access to the benefits of REDD+. According to MJUMITA and Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG), two NGOs developing the project, they have worked with women and men from each individual village to identify appropriate strategies to address deforestation and carried out participatory social impact assessments at village and site level. They are also working with the communities to implement the plans. At the same time they have been doing the more technical MRV-oriented activities in order to develop the project design documents (PDD) for the VCS and for the CCB standard. Carbon assessments have been done with the participation of local communities. The results of forest change analyses have been integrated into the participatory land use planning and forest management planning. Biodiversity monitoring in the project areas has been put in place.

provides an example of a project in Tanzania that is working towards the CCB standards.

Other relevant safeguards

The REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES) initiative, led by the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA, who established the CCB project standards) and CARE International, brings civil society together with the private sector and government agencies to develop country-specific indicators to guide government-led REDD+ programmes in complying with the initiative's Principles and Criteria (CCBA & CARE, 2010).

The UN-REDD programme has developed a set of "social and environmental principles and criteria" using the UN's human rights based approach to development (UN REDD programme, 2011). A

shortcoming of these principles and criteria is the failure to make specific reference to land tenure yet this is a key issue in developing countries (Herbertson, 2011). In addition, and in contrast to the World Bank's FCPF, the UN-REDD programme has no formal mechanism of accountability. The difference in the approaches of the UN and World Bank has been observed to create confusion in countries where both programmes operate (Baastel and Nordeco, 2011).

The Green Climate Fund, which is meant to become the mechanism for financing the global response to climate change, including REDD+ (Ballesteros, 2011), was established in 2010 by UN negotiators, and was officially launched in Durban, South Africa in 2011. The World Bank was selected as the interim trustee for the fund and negotiations continue on the design of the Fund's safeguards (Moss et al., 2011).



2. IMPLEMENTING REDD+ SAFEGUARDS IN EAST AFRICA

Existing policy framework and progress to date

In terms of REDD+ developments, Tanzania is generally considered to be ahead of Uganda and Kenya. Kenya and Uganda have submitted their R-PPs to the World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (GoK, 2010; GoU, 2011), while Tanzania has also developed a second draft National REDD+ strategy (URT, 2012). The R-PP presents an assessment of major land use trends, direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors, and major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues. It documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD+. The assessment sets the stage for development of the country's REDD+ strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.

Tanzania

Tanzania's national REDD+ strategy recognises that an enabling policy environment and legal framework are important for the implementation of REDD+. The Second draft National Strategy for REDD+ in Tanzania (URT, 2012) takes cognisance

of a number of relevant policies and laws that are relevant to ensure that both livelihoods and environmental concerns are clearly addressed. The strategy states that Tanzania plans to establish clear National REDD+ Safeguards by December 2012 (URT, 2012). Efforts are on-going to build capacities for conducting SESA at both national and local levels, and to implement measures that address disincentives of REDD+ schemes.

The national REDD+ strategy outlines the intention to ensure that the country's biodiversity values and forest ecosystems are conserved and enhanced and that the benefits, goods and services realised from such resources are shared equitably by all stakeholders for adaptation, mitigation and adoption of a low carbon development pathway under all processes as required by the UNFCCC (URT, 2012). The strategy identifies the risks - both external and internal - that may face the country as it implements the National REDD+ strategy. Consequently, the need for such risks to be constantly monitored and mitigated is recognised. According to URT (2012), these risks include the lack of affordable alternative sources of energy to wood biomass in the short term, the possibility of shifting

deforestation from one place to another, denying local communities access to forests for small-scale farming or fuel without compensation because such communities do not own the forests, low community participation in MRV of REDD+ schemes due to unresolved carbon methodological issues, and elites seizing land from the rural poor whose customary ownership of the same is hard to prove legally.

As a measure to address such risks, it is indicated, for example, that the REDD+ initiatives will be in line with the objectives of National Forest Programmes, not infringe on the rights of forest-dependent communities or indigenous peoples given that Tanzania is a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and involve full and active participation of the relevant stakeholders. In addition, commitment is shown that the strategy will be subject to a SESA in accordance with, among others, the current environmental policies and regulations and the World Bank's Safeguards.

There are a number of policies and laws that are relevant to REDD+ interventions in Tanzania. These include the National Vision of development to 2025, the National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction (MKUKUTA), the National Environmental Policy (1997), the Forest Policy (1998) and the Land Policy (1995). These policies aim to ensure that forest resources are conserved or sustainably used to achieve sustainable poverty reduction especially of the communities living adjacent to forests. Others policies that will affect REDD+ interventions are the Energy Policy and the National Agriculture and Livestock Policy (1997).

Uganda

Uganda has submitted its R-PP to the World Bank FCPF, and is yet to develop a National REDD+ strategy. The main focus of Uganda's safeguards development for REDD+ is currently on the SESA. The government aims to ensure that all REDD+ initiatives will have to comply with the prevailing laws and policies. There are a number of aspects from existing legislation that are applicable to the planned SESA for REDD+. For

example, the formulation of the National Forestry policy (2001) was guided by the following general principles building on the government's national development priorities of poverty eradication and good governance:

- i. **National Objectives:** the Forestry Policy is consistent with the general principles guiding sustainable development found in the Constitution and Vision 2025.
- ii. **Conservation and sustainable development:** Uganda's forests should be managed to meet the needs of the current generation without compromising the rights of future generations.
- iii. **Livelihoods and poverty:** the improvement of people's livelihoods should be a major goal in all the strategies and actions for the development of the forest sector, so as to contribute to poverty eradication.
- iv. **Biodiversity and environmental services:** the forest sector's development should safeguard the nation's forest biodiversity and environmental services through effective conservation strategies.
- v. **Partnerships in governance:** new institutional relationships should enhance efficiency, transparency, accountability and professionalism, and build confidence in all forest stakeholders.
- vi. **Gender and equity:** to ensure the active participation of all people and affirmative action of all women, young people, the elderly, vulnerable or disadvantaged groups in the sector's development.
- vii. **Cultural and traditional institutions:** forest sector development should take into consideration cultural and traditional attributes and institutions.
- viii. **International Obligations:** legislation should be developed to support the implementation of current and future international commitments that affect the forest sector.
- ix. **Forestry valuation:** environmental and social values should be used in cost/benefit valuations when assessing strategies to implement the Forestry Policy.

Box 4: Institutional failures and lack of capacity- a constraint to implementation of safeguards: drawing lessons from Uganda's energy sector

Uganda has a number of laws and policies intended to protect people and the environment from harm. These include, for example, laws on access to information, worker safety, pollution prevention, and respect for cultural heritage. While these laws and policies exist on paper, they are often poorly implemented and enforced (Herbertson, 2012). As a result of construction and development of hydro-electricity power dams, environmental and social concerns have previously been raised by civil society organizations. Now concerns are emerging in relation to the oil sector.

The 2006 discovery of oil in Uganda has attracted a number of self-financed international investors all of which compete to gain access to the oil deposits. Over 60 wells have so far been drilled, and a study by Henry Mugisha Bazira of the Water Governance Institute revealed that this development is largely not guided by appropriate safeguard policies (Bazira, 2012). The study revealed that only one company, Tullow Oil, has committed to use the International Finance Corporation's Performance Standards. Key environmental and social concerns should be addressed by appropriate national institutions and legislations. However, these are either weak, poorly implemented or not in place. The Government of Uganda is currently developing the laws and institutions necessary to govern the country's oil sector, but corruption and institutional failures are affecting the process (Bazira, 2012).

Often, negotiations between the government and oil companies are held behind closed doors to both the public and policy makers. The developments are taking place in the Albertine Graben; a region designated as a biodiversity hotspot, but the government is reluctant to disclose EIAs for such projects. The local communities in the areas have not been informed of plans for the area and reports of community land grabbing have been made. According to Bazira (2012), the discovery of oil has sparked mixed feelings among Ugandans. On one hand, economic growth is anticipated while on the other hand challenges are imminent for which the country's governance system has inadequate measures of action with the risk that the developments will result in social, economic and environmental deterioration.

Further, Section 38 of the National Forestry and Tree Planting Act (2003) requires any person intending to undertake a project or activity, which may, or is likely to have, a significant impact on the environment to undertake an environmental impact assessment (EIA). The EIA is done in accordance with provisions of the National Environment Act (NEA, 1995). Schedule 3 of the NEA clearly explains the projects for which EIA is required and these include REDD+ related initiatives such as reforestation and afforestation projects.

Kenya

Like Uganda, Kenya is yet to develop its National REDD+ strategy. However, the need to put safeguard measures in place in order to prevent or control

adverse impacts on stakeholders resulting from REDD+ activities is recognised in the R-PP. The procedures for the SESA are included in the R-PP and the consultations included in the SESA process are to be integrated into the overall consultation process for the R-PP. The potential environmental and social risks and impacts of the proposed initiatives are intended to be assessed through stakeholder engagement, and opportunities for addressing them identified.

During formulation of the R-PP, more than 200 individuals, representing the main stakeholder groups including community groups from forest areas and groups of indigenous peoples, were involved at more than one stage in the process. During consultations with the various stakeholders, social

and environmental issues were discussed as well as stakeholders' expectations, roles and responsibilities in developing the National REDD+ strategy. Among the reported outcomes of these consultations is the forest-dependent communities' call for assurance that REDD+ will not deprive them of their land and that they will not be denied access to forests and forest products (GoK, 2010)

A Strategic Environment Assessment of Kenya's Forest policy was carried out in 2005 and the findings are expected to be the basis for the social and environment assessment of REDD+ initiatives. Further, REDD+ initiatives will have to comply with the country's environment legislation which recognises modern environmental principles and concepts like public participation, international cooperation, the precautionary principle, and cultural and social principles traditionally applied by any community in Kenya for the management of natural resources.

There are policies and laws that are in line with social and environmental safeguards for REDD+. For example, Kenya's "Vision 2030" includes a significant component related to changing and improving forest landscapes. The Environmental Management and Co-ordination Act (EMCA, 1999) aims at harmonising the various sector specific legislations that impact on environment to ensure greater protection of the physical and social environment. The EMCA provides a framework for integrating environmental considerations into the country's overall economic and social development.

Kenya has criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management that are expected to provide a comprehensive set of social and environment safeguards for planning and implementing REDD+ activities.



Participants at the workshop in Nairobi © Adrian Paul Nel

3. MAKING REDD+ SAFEGUARDS WORK FOR EAST AFRICA

Insights from the Stakeholder's Workshop on the Issues of Safeguards

For safeguards to work they need to be localised, and this calls for having appropriate local level institutions in place. Locally specific and relevant safeguards should be developed to augment international safeguards. Therefore, site specific approaches are necessary. Village-level committees could be a way to start.

Civil society has a big role to play in driving the process of safeguards because they are attached to the communities. For example, MJUMITA in Tanzania, Uganda Network of Community Forest Associations (UNETCOFA) and National Alliance of Community Forest Associations of Kenya, should play central role. What is needed is empowerment, not just participation.

Communications has to be an integral part of safeguards. Communities need to know, and development partners also need to know community needs for REDD+ to succeed. Awareness on REDD+ safeguards should come from practitioners who

are both conversant with REDD+ and how to communicate it.

MRV on safeguards should not just be about reporting to the donors, but to the communities and other stakeholders. Community participation in both implementing and providing information on safeguards is important and feasible provided there is communication and awareness.

It was also observed that corruption will affect the implementation of REDD+ and that civil society - and other REDD+ actors - should take this seriously. The need for appropriate approaches to address this vice was emphasised. Therefore, safeguards alone will not serve unless platforms for discussing and addressing the causes of corruption are put in place.

Countries in East Africa may need to harmonise their safeguards to ensure good governance and accountability. It was observed that harmonising safeguards is possible if East Africa chooses so, but champions are needed who could be civil society organisations.

A concern was raised that, instead of implementing the East African Community climate change policy that is already in place and developing unified strategies and actions plans, the East African countries are developing national strategies that do not necessarily take into account this regional policy - moving away from integration.

Effective implementation of safeguards carries costs and, therefore, there is a need to cover up front costs, for example, for communities.

REDD+ will always receive attention commensurate with the way politicians perceive it. There is, therefore, a need for political will to implement the safeguards.

REDD+ safeguards should be operationalised through local structures but these are in some cases non-existent. The first step should be institutional development.

In looking at the rights of communities over resources, there is a need to be mindful of the illegalities like encroachment.

Safeguards should not be simply abstract sentences but what can work for people in reality. They should not be for the UN but for local people. It should not be about framing but implementation.

The importance of looking at laws and policies already in place should not be overlooked. Pilot projects are also important to learn from. The concern with policies should not be just about defining a policy/approach but more importantly about implementation and ensuring lessons are really learned.



4. CONCLUSION

An analysis of the existing policy and legal framework suggests that REDD+ social and environmental safeguards are not an entirely new issue in East Africa. However, some key gaps exist, as well as weaknesses in implementation, which need to be addressed.

REDD+ safeguards should be integrated into national processes as this allows the countries' flexibility to define safeguards based on national issues or based on existing national safeguards systems. It should be ensured, however, that the national level safeguards fit into the global standards.

Corruption and the political environment will greatly affect the implementation of safeguards. Civil society organisations and the private sector should be at the fore front of implementing safeguards. Community forest associations and environmental

organisations should be empowered to play this key role.

Community participation and consultation is important. Communities need to be adequately sensitised about REDD+ and its modalities if they are to effectively participate.

REDD+ safeguards should not be about satisfying donor requirements or demonstrating commitments to international obligations, but ensuring community and environmental wellbeing and effective delivery of REDD+.

There is a need for the political leadership to show commitment and a will to implement the policies and legislations to avoid safeguards simply being on paper.

References

- Baastel and Nordeco (2011) First Program Evaluation for the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, Prepared for the FCPF Participants Committee. Available at: http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/sites/forestcarbonpartnership.org/files/Documents/PDF/Jun2011/5.%20Final%20FCPEVALUATIONREPORT_June%2013th.pdf
- Ballesteros, A. (2011) The Road to the Green Climate Fund. World Resources Institute. Available at: <http://www.wri.org/stories/2011/02/road-green-climate-fund>.
- Bazira H. M. (2012) Uganda's Civil Society Perspectives on International Reforms of Environmental and Social Safeguards for Development Finance. Water Governance Institute.
- Bonfante, T.M., Voivodic, M. & Meneses Filho, L. (2010) Developing social and environmental safeguards for REDD+: A guide for a bottom-up approach http://www.imaflora.org/upload/repositorio/guiaREDD_ingles_digital2.pdf
- Campese, J. (2011) Integrating REDD+ Social and Environmental Safeguards and Standards in Tanzania . TFCG Technical Report 32. Pp 1 – 65. Dar es Salaam.
- CCBA and CARE (2010) REDD+ social & environmental standards. Version 1. Jun 2010. Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance and Care International, Washington, DC and Nairobi, Kenya. Available at: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/for/wscbredd-afr-01/other/wscbredd-afr-01-socenv-en.pdf>.
- Danielsen et al (2011) At the heart of REDD+: a role for local people in monitoring forests? Conservation Letters 00 (2011) 1-10 http://unfccc.int/files/methods_science/redd/application/pdf/redd_heart_paper_2011.pdf
- Dkamela, G.P. (2011) The context of REDD+ in Cameroon: drivers, agents and institutions. Occasional paper 57. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia. 63p.
- GoK (2010) Revised REDD Readiness Preparation Proposal for Kenya. Submitted to the Forest Carbon and Partnership Facility. Government of Kenya.
- GoU (2011) REDD Readiness Preparation Proposal for Uganda. Submitted to the Forest Carbon and Partnership Facility. Government of Uganda.
- Herbertson K. (2012) Will Safeguards Survive the Next Generation of Development Finance? International Rivers.
- Jagger, P., Lawlor, K., Brockhaus, M., Gebara, M. F., Sonwa, D. J. and Resosudarmo, I. A. P. (2012) REDD+ safeguards in national policy discourse and pilot projects. In: Angelsen, A., Brockhaus, M., Sunderlin, W.D. and Verchot, L.V. (Eds) Analysing REDD+: Challenges and choices. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.
- May, P.H., Millikan, B. and Gebara, M.F. (2011) The context of REDD+ in Brazil: drivers, agents, and institutions. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia. 69p.
- McDermott, C.L., Coad, L., Helfgott, A., Schroeder, H. (2012) Operationalising social safeguards in REDD+: actors, interests and ideas. Environmental science and policy 21: 63 – 72
- Moss, N., Nussbaum, R., Muchemi, J. and Halverson, E. (2011) A Review of Three REDD+ Safeguard Initiatives. A study commissioned by the UN-REDD programme and the Forest and Carbon Partnership Facility.
- Murphy, D. (2011) Safeguards and multiple benefits in a REDD+ mechanism. International Institute for Sustainable Development, Winnipeg, Canada. 37p.
- UNFCCC (2010) The Cancun Agreements 1/CP.16. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.
- UNFCCC (2011) Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention. 2/CP.17. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
- UN-REDD Programme (2011) UN-REDD Programme Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria. Version 3 - draft for consultation. September 2011. The United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries. Available at: <http://www.un-redd.org/MultipleBenefitSEPC/tabid/54130/Default.aspx>.
- URT (2012), National Strategy For Reduced Emissions From Deforestation And Forest Degradation (REDD+) June, 2012. United Republic of Tanzania.
- World Bank (2011) Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Fund Common Approach to Environmental and Social Safeguards for Multiple Delivery Partners.