

**From:** Eknes, Moira Kristin <moira.eknes@care.no>  
**Sent:** 31. august 2017 11:41  
**To:** Maisto, Juliana Sporsheim  
**Cc:** Dale, Kjersti  
**Subject:** revised final report GLO-0608 QZA-13/0544  
**Attachments:** Final report 2013-2015 REDD+ SES Initiative Revised Aug 2017.docx;  
Annex 5 Timelines\_3.30.16.pdf

Dear Juliana,

With reference to your mail received on July 7<sup>th</sup> regarding the final report for Norad's grant GLO-0608 QZA-13/0544 please find in attachment a new version of the report, where we have tried to address your comments. The reports contains now a completely rewritten section 2.4.b that presents descriptions of achievements as they correspond to the specific outcomes and indicators for this grant in table form with additional narrative per outcome. We would like to emphasize that this project has been building on previous phases of REDD + SES, and we have in addition included in a new annex (5) a timeline showing the development of the outcomes related to participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in each country included in the grant.

We hope we have responded to your satisfaction. It has been an interesting project for CARE, and the collaboration with CCBA and the REDD+SES secretariat, has been very positive and constructive. We would like again to than NORAD for the collaboration on this project. Should you have any queries, please do not hesitate in contacting us.

Best regards,  
Moira Eknes

**Moira K. Eknes** | CARE Norway | Senior Advisor, Program  
Universitetsgata 12, 0164 Oslo, Norway | [www.care.no](http://www.care.no)  
o: +4722992600/11 | c: +47 99302022 |  
email: [moira.eknes@care.no](mailto:moira.eknes@care.no) | skype: moira.eknes  
Follow us: [Facebook](#) @carenorge | [Twitter](#) @carenorway | [Instagram](#) @carenorge



## Template for report and accounts for organisations under the Climate and Forest Initiative funding scheme for civil society

2013-2015

### 1. General Project Information:

- 1.1 Name of recipient organisation: CARE
- 1.2 Reporting year: 1 March 2013 to 30 June 2016
- 1.3 Agreement Number: GLO-0608 QZA-13/0544
- 1.4 Name of project: REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards: supporting countries to develop REDD+ safeguard information systems
- 1.5 Country and region in the(se) country if applicable: Indonesia (Central and East Kalimantan), Brazil (Acre and Mato Grosso), DRC (Mai Ndombe), Ecuador, Peru (San Martin), Mexico (Yucatan Peninsula)
- 1.6 Financial support to the project from Norad for last calendar year 2015: NOK 5 000 000,-
- 1.7 Thematic area: Analysis, concept and methodology development that contribute to sustainable planning and implementation of REDD+, and also contributing to Creating global consensus on REDD+.

### 2 Please describe the project's progress for the whole grant period

- 2.1 Please repeat the **project's target group(s)** and the baseline for the target group at the start of the project (from the approved project document).

#### National level:

- Host country governments and in particular agencies mandated to lead on REDD+
- Indigenous Peoples and other civil society actors with a high stake in REDD+, ensuring effective representation of women and other marginalised groups

#### International level:

- Investors in REDD+: entities that are financing REDD+ to achieve emissions reductions
- Parties to UNFCCC and other actors who shape UNFCCC policy and guidance
- Multilateral programs supporting countries to develop safeguard information systems (e.g. FCPF and UN-REDD) – not in the project proposal but have become significant since

**Theory of Change:** Based on the experience of the REDD+ SES Initiative over the past 5 years, and experience of other REDD+ safeguards initiatives at both international and national levels, the establishment of an effective country-led SIS will require the following changes in four key domains:

- **Understanding**
  - A. Widely shared understanding across the range of government and civil society actors at national and international levels of what is meant by a REDD+ safeguards information system (SIS), the processes to develop it, and the contribution of different inputs from national and international levels.

- **Government engagement**
  - B. Political support from key government actors, for using a safeguards information system to strengthen their REDD programme as well as to report to UNFCCC, and for a high level of transparency and stakeholder participation in this process
  - C. Development and application of appropriate policies, laws and regulations that underpin and institutionalise the safeguards information system
- **Civil society engagement**
  - D. Key civil society actors, including Indigenous People, women and other marginalised groups, are effectively engaging in the development and implementation of REDD+ safeguards information systems, notably in:
    - i. Governance of the system
    - ii. Development of country-specific indicators
    - iii. Performance assessment and its quality assurance
    - iv. Calling for, and supporting, changes in policy and practice to improve performance
- **Trust between key actors**
  - E. Increased trust between government, civil society and private sector actors reflected in a willingness to work together, and acceptance of an incremental approach to improving the social and environmental performance of REDD+

2.2 Please repeat the project's **desired impact** (from the approved project document).

**Overall impact goal (by 2020):** *Effective social and environmental safeguards for REDD+ programs make a substantial contribution to human rights, poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation goals while avoiding social or environmental harm.* In supporting the development and implementation of an effective SIS for REDD+ this project also has an important role to play in enhancing the viability and sustainability of REDD+ itself.

2.3 Is the project still relevant for the desired impact? (Yes/No) If No, please give a short explanation.

Yes, this project is still very relevant for the desired impact.

2.4 **Main outcome(s).**

- a) Please repeat the project's planned outcome(s) (effect on project's target group(s), beneficiary (-ies)) (from the approved project document).

**Outcome 1: Developing and institutionalising SIS building on REDD+ SES:** Six countries have developed and institutionalised multi-stakeholder safeguards information systems building on REDD+SES to monitor and thereby enhance the social and environmental performance of their REDD+ programs.

**Outcome 2: Unifying framework and guidance for SIS:** Clear guidance based on a unifying conceptual framework improves understanding of the development of safeguard information systems, making effective use of international safeguards mechanisms including REDD+ SES.

**Outcome 3: Methods and tools for monitoring performance:** Practical methods and tools for effective and efficient monitoring of social, governance and environmental performance of REDD+ programmes developed, disseminated and widely used.

**Outcome 4: Sharing learning on SIS and REDD+ SES:** Six countries have shared learning with each other and a wider REDD+ safeguard information systems community of practice, to strengthen their safeguards information systems and the REDD+SES initiative as a whole.

**Outcome 5: Longer term institutional arrangements for REDD+ SES:** Longer term institutional arrangements for the REDD+SES Initiative at global level developed and operationalised to provide ongoing support for countries developing and implementing safeguards information systems.

b) Please report on all outcomes from the project document:

From April to December 2015 the secretariat of the REDD+ SES Initiative conducted an **outcomes evaluation** to understand the contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative and other factors to the progress and early results related to adopting a participatory, transparent and comprehensive (PTC) country safeguards approach (CSA) in ten countries.<sup>1</sup> These countries included those that benefitted from technical support under this Norad grant and others (Chile, Guatemala, Nepal and Tanzania) that benefitted from the tools and guidance documents and the exchange and learning opportunities provided under this Norad grant. The full results of the outcome evaluation and details of the 139 outcomes collected are included in the report *Progress Towards and Results of a Participatory, Transparent and Comprehensive Approach to REDD+ Safeguards*, and in individual country reports (available in English and in the respective national language) that contain tables with a detailed description<sup>2</sup> of each outcome. These reports and an executive summary are available on the REDD+ SES Initiative website [here](#). This final report to Norad makes substantial reference to the findings in these reports as they relate to the specific outcomes of this project.

### Outcome 1: Developing and institutionalising SIS building on REDD+ SES

Outcome	Indicators	Achievements
Six countries have developed and institutionalised multi-stakeholder safeguards information systems building on REDD+SES to monitor and thereby enhance the social and environmental performance of their REDD+ programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At least 8 national/sub-national REDD+ programs have developed and are implementing country-led, multi-stakeholder SIS and have each produced at least one performance assessment report</li> <li>▪ At least 5 national/sub-national REDD+ programs have developed necessary policies and institutions to institutionalise and sustain their SIS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 7 national/subnational programs have made substantial progress developing country-led multi-stakeholder SIS (Acre, Mato Grosso, Yucatan Peninsula, Ecuador, DRC, East Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan) and 2 of these have implemented their SIS and published a performance assessment report (Acre, East Kalimantan)</li> <li>▪ 5 national/sub-national REDD+ programs have developed necessary policies and institutions to institutionalise and sustain their SIS (Acre, Mato Grosso, Yucatan Peninsula, Ecuador, East Kalimantan)</li> </ul>

An explanation of these achievements and the contribution of the REDD+ SES initiative based on the findings of the outcome evaluation is provided below for each of the participating countries, and Annex 5 provides a timeline of the relevant outcomes and identifies the type of contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative. Further details are available in the individual country reports at <http://www.redd-standards.org/what-is-new/151-new-reports-progress-towards-and-results-of-a-participatory-transparent-and-comprehensive-approach-to-redd-safeguards>

#### State of Acre, Brazil

Acre adopted the state law for the System of Incentives for Environmental Services (SISA) in 2010. The ISA Carbon Program under the SISA aims to reduce emissions from deforestation and degradation – REDD – and provide social and environmental benefits from actions that promote conservation, preservation and restoration of forests and their services. Acre used the REDD+ SES

<sup>1</sup> The term 'country' in this report refers to national and sub-national jurisdictions.

<sup>2</sup> Including its significance, factors contributing to the outcome and the contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative, the sources of information and evidence for the outcome and for its substantiation.

guidance and tools from 2010 as a means of monitoring the performance of the ISA Carbon Program with respect to these standards and the principles established by the SISA law. The Institute for Climate Change (IMC), as the government regulatory authority of SISA, is responsible for monitoring the emissions reductions of the SISA program and for ensuring and monitoring compliance with social and environmental safeguards governing the SISA. During 2010 to 2012, the facilitation team for the use of the REDD+ SES guidance and tools was composed of IMC and CARE Brazil, which provided technical assistance to IMC. Subsequently IMC has done the facilitation alone. To ensure public participation in the policy of incentives for environmental services the State Commission for Validation and Monitoring (CEVA) was created under SISA, and was established in 2012. The Commission is composed of four representatives of the Government and four civil society members. The civil society members are elected by three State Councils that provide a joint civil society and government platform to oversee the development of environmental policies in Acre and CEVA reports to the Councils. An Indigenous Working Group was created in 2012 as a subgroup of CEVA and a Gender Working Group was created from 2015. Acre used the REDD+ SES guidance and tools to develop country specific indicators through an inclusive multi-stakeholder process from 2010 to 2012, develop a monitoring manual with roles, responsibilities and procedures for assessing progress with respect to the indicators in 2012 and 2013, and develop a self-assessment report against the indicators in 2013. The self-assessment report was reviewed by stakeholders and approved by CEVA in 2014, and published in 2015.

The willingness of the Government of Acre to adopt a participatory, transparent and multi-stakeholder approach to safeguards has arguably provided the most important contribution to these outcomes. There is a long history of stakeholder participation in development of government policies in Acre which was applied to REDD+ and safeguards. The outcomes show that this willingness was strengthened and supported through the development of a country safeguards approach in Acre. The REDD+ SES Initiative provided a clear set of guidelines and a framework for indicators that were available at a critical time when Acre was starting to design and implement the SISA program from 2010 which helped to guide and support the process, encouraging and reinforcing the political will and stakeholder engagement. The REDD+ SES Guidelines for a multi-stakeholder process contributed to a large proportion of the outcomes (20 out of 29). The multi-stakeholder process was crucial in developing capacity of different stakeholder groups and in facilitating their deeper involvement and shared ownership. In contrast, the principles, criteria and indicator (PCI) framework helped to support only 5 outcomes, including the adoption of a more comprehensive approach that was appreciated by the donors (7, 10) and support for the development of regulations for projects (23)<sup>3</sup>. The comprehensive REDD+ SES PCI framework also assisted the Indigenous Working Group with the development of a charter of indigenous principles that would be applied for all activities including those within SISA (and REDD+) and beyond (18). In addition, the REDD+ SES Initiative was able to provide some funding that facilitated key steps in the process (2, 4, 5, 9, 20, 29, 28, 29). Exchanges with other countries facilitated by the REDD+ SES Initiative helped to encourage IMC staff (3) and the members of CEVA (24,25), giving them an opportunity to reflect on and share their experiences, and also to learn from experiences in other countries.

### **State of Mato Grosso, Brazil**

In January 2013, the Mato Grosso State Assembly passed a REDD+ Law that provides the framework for developing and implementing REDD+ activities in the State, including safeguards. The Secretary of Environment (SEMA) has been leading the development of REDD+ safeguards with support from the local NGO Centre for Life Institute (ICV), working together as a facilitation team. To ensure participation of relevant stakeholders, the facilitation team initiated an awareness raising process on REDD+ safeguards in 2012 with the Mato Grosso Climate Change Forum (FMCC), a forum of civil society and government representatives that provides inputs to SEMA on policies related to climate change. A

---

<sup>3</sup> The outcome numbers in parentheses cross reference to the outcome numbers in the outcome evaluation individual country reports and in the timelines in Annex 3 of this report.

Standards Committee with representatives from government and civil society was created in 2014 to oversee the process of identification and application of REDD+ safeguards. Between 2014 and 2015, the Standards Committee developed country-specific indicators adapted to the context of Mato Grosso. The State of Mato Grosso has been participating in the REDD+ SES Initiative since 2012 and has been using the REDD+ SES tools and guidance to support development of state-specific indicators to address REDD+ safeguards and for providing information on how safeguards are addressed and respected.

The Government of Mato Grosso, and specifically SEMA, demonstrated their interest and commitment to a participatory and transparent approach from 2009 when it created the Climate Change Forum to enable stakeholder participation in the development of climate change policies (2). All the other outcomes flow from this. It followed logically that the Climate Change Forum would participate in the development of the REDD+ law from 2010 (5) and the effective participation of stakeholders meant that their interests in strong safeguards were reflected in the law. Once Mato Grosso started to participate in the REDD+ SES Initiative from 2013, the REDD+ SES process guidelines helped to strengthen the participatory processes, and contributed to 8 of the 12 outcomes. The guidelines also helped to strengthen outcomes that had started prior to engagement with the REDD+ SES, such as strengthening stakeholder participation in development of public policies through the Climate Change Forum. As in other countries, the REDD+ SES principle, criteria and indicator framework contributed to fewer outcomes, (4 out of 12), but made an important contribution to helping to address a comprehensive range of issues through REDD+ safeguards (11). Small grants from the REDD+ SES Initiative contributed to a few outcomes, including: ICV staff time to collaborate with SEMA on the facilitation team (6) and to develop a draft proposal on safeguards monitoring (with support of Imaflores) (7); support the Committee to develop draft indicators (11); enabling the Standards Committee to develop materials that explain safeguards to local stakeholders (12).

### **Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico**

From 2010, the Governments and partners of the States of the Yucatan Peninsula (Campeche, Quintana Roo and Yucatan) started to develop early REDD+ activities. At COP16 in Cancun in December 2010, the States presented their common REDD+ Strategy that defines the framework for REDD+ early action activities, and is closely aligned with the national REDD+ Strategy for Mexico led by the National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR). The States of the Yucatan Peninsula have been participating in the REDD+ SES Initiative since 2013, using the tools and guidance to support addressing REDD+ safeguards in their REDD+ Strategy through the REDD+ SES pilot in 2014 supported and funded by the Mexico REDD Alliance (M-REDD). In order to ensure strong stakeholder participation in the safeguards process, a multi-stakeholder Safeguards Committee was created for the peninsula in April 2014 through a call for proposals from CONAFOR jointly with the three States of the Yucatan Peninsula Environment Secretaries. It is composed of 21 members from governmental and non-governmental stakeholders from the three Yucatan States, ensuring a balanced representation between the three States and between sectors (civil society, government representatives, producers, academia, REDD+ Consultative Technical Councils (CTCs)). In 2014, the Safeguards Committee developed indicators that were adapted to the context of the Yucatan Peninsula based on the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicator framework. In addition, the committee provided technical support to state governments and local organizations in matters relating to social and environmental safeguards for REDD+. The experience of the States of the Yucatan Peninsula in developing REDD+ safeguards is feeding into the national safeguards process through participation of representatives of the States in the national discussions and by them providing technical inputs on the national country approach to safeguards.

All of the outcomes identified by informants related to development of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in the Yucatan Peninsula were influenced in some way by participation in the REDD+ SES Initiative. The safeguards activities and use of REDD+ SES guidance and tools were supported by Mexico REDD+ Alliance (M-REDD), an initiative supporting development of

REDD+ in Mexico led by The Nature Conservancy, Rainforest Alliance and Woods Hole Research Center with finance from USAID. The availability of funds from M-REDD, and technical support from the M-REDD partners as well as the national NGOs Ithaca and Centre for Mexican Environmental Law (CEMDA), was critical for the progress and outcomes. The REDD+ SES process guidelines helped to strengthen participatory and multi-stakeholder processes in ten out of the twelve outcomes, in particular with guidance on creation of the Safeguards Committee (11) which was instrumental for a number of other outcomes. Participation of members of CONAFOR and State level actors in REDD+ SES exchange and learning workshops helped to encourage three out of the 13 outcomes. The REDD+ SES principle, criteria and indicator framework contributed to a relatively high proportion of outcomes (9 out of 13), compared with other countries, because this framework was used as a basis for the adaptation of safeguards indicators to the context (12), which helped to build capacity and ensure a more comprehensive range of issues were addressed through the safeguards. Technical assistance from the REDD+ SES Secretariat supported two outcomes, including the inclusion of a gender expert in the Safeguards Committee and addressing gender in safeguards indicators (13).

### **Ecuador**

The Ministry of Environment, UN-REDD program and Conservation International worked as a facilitation team to prepare a draft SIS based on their experience piloting REDD+ SES indicators on the Socio Bosque program in 2012. From 2013, the Ministry decided to start over again developing new indicators based on Cancun safeguards and UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria, building on their experiences with REDD+ SES. In February 2017, the Ministry of Environment published the country's first summary of information on how the UNFCCC Cancun safeguards had been addressed and respected throughout the development of Ecuador's National REDD+ Action Plan during the period January 2013 to December 2015.

The REDD+ SES Initiative supported capacity building and exchange with other countries to enrich the development of the safeguards information system in Ecuador, however there was less support from the Ministry of Environment for a detailed and participatory approach to safeguards and the REDD+ SES Secretariat was not requested to provide any further in-country support from 2014.

### **Peru and the Region of San Martin**

From 2008, several REDD+ projects have been developed in the Region of San Martin to promote conservation of forests. Four projects are currently being implemented by civil society organizations, in protected areas, national parks and conservation concessions. In parallel, the Regional Government of San Martin (GORESAM) initiated a process to develop a coordinated approach to REDD+ in 2008, made official through the Mesa REDD+ San Martin in 2009. This roundtable composed of public institutions and civil society stakeholders has developed tools to support the implementation of REDD+ activities. The Regional Environmental Authority (ARA) of GORESAM is the government authority responsible for the design and implementation of REDD+ activities in the region. In 2012, the Region of San Martin in Peru started to develop its approach to safeguards for REDD+ and started to participate in the REDD+ SES Initiative, using the REDD+ SES tools and guidance as good practice guidance. Between 2012 and 2015, a facilitation team composed of the ARA and Conservation International (CI) Peru started to engage relevant stakeholders including regional government, civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples, small producers and chambers of commerce in the development of REDD+ safeguards through awareness raising and capacity building workshops. In 2013, a Technical Advisory Group composed of civil society organizations, the Centre for Conservation, Research and Management of Natural Areas (CIMA), the Center for Indigenous Peoples Cultures of Peru (CHIRAPAQ) and the Peruvian Environmental Law Society (SPDA) was established to provide technical support and guidance to GORESAM in the development of San Martin's safeguards approach and the involvement of relevant stakeholders. In December 2014, GORESAM established by regional decree a multistakeholder REDD+ safeguards committee composed of government, civil society and Indigenous Peoples to support the development of REDD+ safeguards in the region. In 2015, GORESAM

with the support of the facilitation team and of the Advisory Group conducted a participatory consultation process on the regulations that will operationalize the decree and started to formally establish the safeguards committee through the approval of regulations for the operation of the committee in December 2015.

The safeguards process of the region of San Martin is providing inputs into the national safeguards process. At national level, the Ministry of Environment (MINAM) is the entity in charge of the development and implementation of REDD+ and for providing information on how safeguards are being addressed and respected, including the development of the safeguards information system (SIS). In 2013, MINAM with support from various sources (Betty & Gordon Moore Foundation, KfW, targeted support from the UN-REDD Programme, CI, USAID through FCMC, GIZ) developed a roadmap for developing the SIS and started to engage relevant stakeholders in awareness-raising activities. MINAM started to participate in the REDD+ SES Initiative from 2013.

GORESAM and MINAM have been open and willing to take progressive steps towards developing and institutionalizing a more participatory approach to safeguards as part of the development of the REDD+ process, and other key stakeholders have progressively started to participate more actively. This process has been encouraged by several contributing factors including support from CI Peru to the Region of San Martin to develop REDD+ activities and by the participation of San Martin and Peru in the REDD+ SES Initiative (differently at regional and national level). The first changes by CI Peru and GORESAM in 2012 (1, 12) that initiated the process were influenced by all aspects of REDD+ SES, including the principles, criteria and indicators, the process guidelines promoting a participatory multi-stakeholder approach, technical support from the secretariat, participation in exchange and learning workshops with other countries, and funding for staff time and meetings to facilitate the process. Informants in Peru identified participation in the REDD+ SES exchange and learning workshops, and thereby understanding progress and experiences in other countries, as a key factor influencing 9 out of the 14 outcomes, in particular for all 4 of the changes by MINAM. The REDD+ SES process guidelines partially encouraged several key procedural outcomes in San Martin such as including Indigenous Peoples (3), creation of the multistakeholder safeguards committee (9) and the inclusion of other key stakeholder such as regional NGOs (13). In other cases, the technical support from the REDD+ SES secretariat made a more significant contribution than the process guidelines. The provision of small grants from the REDD+ SES Initiative for staff time, meetings and production of materials also helped to support the changes. The identified outcomes are significant changes in behavior related to adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards, and are not just outputs of the REDD+ SES initiative activities and funding. The exchange and learning opportunities provided through REDD+SES were more important contributions to the outcomes in Peru and San Martin than the REDD + SES PCI (since initial changes in 2012) or the REDD +SES process guidelines.

### **Demcratic Republic of Congo**

The Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), its partners and stakeholders have been planning development of a national REDD+ strategy since 2008. DRC has been one of the first countries to reach each stage, with approval of DRC's Readiness Preparation Plan by the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) in 2011, and inclusion in the pipeline of the FCPF Carbon Fund in April 2014 for an emissions reductions program in Mai Ndombe province. The National REDD Coordination (CN-REDD), under the Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation and Sustainable Development, is leading the development and implementation of the national REDD+ strategy and actions, and the development of the country approach to safeguards, with technical and financial support from the UN-REDD Programme and FCPF. From 2011, DRC civil society organizations, under coordination of the REDD+ Working Group (GTCR), developed national social and environmental standards. These have since been adopted by the government as minimum requirements for any REDD+ program or project. In addition, during 2012 to 2014 DRC completed a strategic social and environmental assessment



(SESA) and produced an Environmental and Social Management Framework to ensure conformity with World Bank operational policies on safeguards. DRC civil society used the REDD+ SES guidance and tools for input to the development of the national standards and representatives from civil society and government have participated in REDD+ SES exchange and learning workshops since 2011. From 2013, the REDD+ SES secretariat provided technical support to CN-REDD and a multi-stakeholder working group (GT5) for the development of the approach to safeguards including a safeguards information system for the Mai Ndombe Emissions Reductions Program (ERP) under preparation for the FCPF Carbon Fund. The REDD+ SES Initiative has been partnering with CN-REDD, WWF DRC and GTCR to provide this support. By December 2015, GT5 had developed safeguards indicators for Mai Ndombe ERP adapted from the national standards after consultations with local stakeholders. In May 2016, with funding from European Forestry Institute, REDD+ SES Initiative facilitated development of simplified indicators, reporting protocols and institutional arrangements for the Mai Ndombe SIS, including clarification of safeguards requirements for project listing on the national REDD+ registry.

The major donors supporting DRC's development of a REDD+ strategy have been very influential in promoting development of a robust approach to safeguards in DRC. In particular, the UN-REDD Programme through UNDP supported the strategic environmental and social assessment (SESA) which contributed to many of the outcomes (including 1, 2, 9, 11, 12). The UNREDD Programme through UNEP supported civil society to develop the national social and environmental standards for REDD+ (10). The World Bank has been influential through development of the guidance for SESA and the Environmental and Social Management Framework, and has been a major donor for the National REDD Coordination since the UN-REDD Programme support ended in 2013. The FCPF Carbon Fund methodological framework requirements for a credible approach to safeguards including a system to provide information on safeguards and non-carbon benefits has been particularly influential for the development of a safeguards approach for the Mai Ndombe ER Program (3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19). The informants judged that the REDD+ SES Initiative has contributed to 12 of the 19 identified outcomes. This has primarily been through technical support of the REDD+ SES Secretariat. The REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicator framework provided some input to the development of the national standards in 2011 (10), but thereafter, it was not used since DRC has its own indicator framework in the form of national standards. The process guidelines helped to support development of multi-stakeholder working group (3) and were particularly influential by providing guidance for a multi-stakeholder approach to consultations on the safeguards indicators for Mai Ndombe that led to several outcomes (4, 7, 8, 16, 17, 18, 19). These outcomes were also influenced by small grants that REDD+ SES provided to hold the influential local workshops and GT5 meetings in 2014 and 2015 (4, 6, 7, 8, 16). This funding leveraged other funding for these important local workshops, initially from WWF and then in October 2015 from WWF and also the CN-REDD. Participation in the REDD+ SES exchange and learning workshops helped to encourage the government agency GEEC to participate in the safeguards process (2).

### **Province of Central Kalimantan, Indonesia**

In Central Kalimantan, a Provincial REDD Task Force chaired by the University of Palangkaraya developed the provincial REDD strategy and facilitating the development of SIS and use of REDD+ SES. An institutional plan was developed as part of the Provincial REDD strategy, with SIS integrated in the Provincial Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) unit. In 2014, a social and environmental performance assessment was conducted at KFCP field site based on the REDD+SES indicators and monitoring plan that had been developed in 2013. A draft assessment report for this site was presented to local stakeholders. Further progress including collection of information from other sites was hampered by changes in leadership in the REDD+ process in country.

### **Province of East Kalimantan, Indonesia**

The Government of East Kalimantan and civil society groups active in forestry and land use in the province started to work together on preparing for REDD+ following the UNFCCC COP in Bali in 2007 where the concept of REDD+ was first agreed. A multi-stakeholder REDD+ Working Group was created in 2008 and the Provincial REDD+ Strategy and Action Plan was published in 2012. East Kalimantan started to use REDD+ SES guidance and tools in 2012 to develop a set of principles, criteria and indicators that would be used to assess the social and environmental performance of the Provincial REDD+ Strategy as a means to strengthen this performance and to support the implementation of REDD+ activities in East Kalimantan. In January 2015, the REDD+ Working Group finalized the first assessment of performance against the province-specific REDD+ SES indicators.

The East Kalimantan REDD+ Working Group started to address safeguards in 2012 (10). This resulted from a number of factors including the safeguards processes at national level such as the development of the Ministry of Forestry safeguards information system (SIS) and the development of principles, criteria and indicators (PRISAI) led by the REDD+ Task Force, both of which had initiated in 2011. In addition, a neighboring province, Central Kalimantan, had been using the REDD+ SES guidelines from 2010, facilitated by Clinton Climate Initiative (CCI) and Indonesian Ecolabelling Institute (LEI). LEI and CCI organized a workshop in East Kalimantan to share the Central Kalimantan experiences and to raise awareness about the REDD+ SES approach and guidelines in 2012. This led directly to the REDD+ working group's creation of a safeguards team, composed of government and civil society, to facilitate the safeguards process (10) and contributed significantly to the adoption of the participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards that influenced most of the subsequent outcomes. Indeed, the REDD+ SES process guidelines that lay out steps and good practices for the approach to safeguards influenced all the outcomes from 2012 onwards, except the inclusion of development of a safeguards information system in the Provincial REDD+ Strategy which happened prior to the REDD+ SES safeguards workshop. The East Kalimantan safeguards team used the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicator framework to guide their work. This comprehensive treatment of safeguards issues helped to encourage the civil society organizations that had been suspicious about REDD+ to engage in the REDD+ design process (9) and helped to build the capacity of NGOs which increased government respect and requests for their support. The broad coverage of safeguards also helped to convince the Provincial Forestry Agency to create the information system section in 2013 (5), including for safeguards information, and contributed to the inclusion of more information about safeguards in the current revision of the Provincial REDD+ Strategy and Action Plan (8). The prioritization of respect for land rights and requirements for transparency and participatory process in the decree for the new land use permit process issued in April 2015 is a particularly significant outcome (7), since it has led to a legal change that it likely to be sustainable and have an impact in the longer term. This outcome was influenced by many factors, including the identification of key safeguards issues and increased awareness of the importance of these safeguards issues, because of the participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards. This was influenced by the REDD+ SES guidelines, the REDD+ SES indicator framework and the funding from the REDD+ SES Initiative<sup>4</sup> that enabled the development and publication of the analysis of safeguards issues in 2013 and the subsequent publication of the safeguards assessment against the province-specific indicators in January 2015.

#### **Other countries:**

While this grant mainly provided technical support to the countries listed above, REDD+ SES also contributed to some significant advances in other countries, including development of safeguards indicators based on REDD+ SES in Tanzania, capacity building of government and civil society for the implementation of integrated use of REDD+ SES with FCPF Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) in Chile, finalisation of indicators and a safeguards assessment report based on

---

<sup>4</sup> Initially from CARE via CCI and LEI, and then from CARE via Conservation International from late 2014

REDD+ SES in Nepal, and revision of proposed existing indicators to provide information on safeguards in Costa Rica.

**Outcome 2: Unifying framework and guidance for SIS**

Outcome	Indicators	Achievements
<p>Clear guidance based on a unifying conceptual framework improves understanding of the development of safeguard information systems, making effective use of international safeguards mechanisms including REDD+ SES</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number of REDD+ readiness packages that reference SIS guidance developed by this project in collaboration with UN-REDD and FCPF</li> <li>▪ SIS guidance developed by this project in collaboration with UN-REDD and FCPF is being used in the 6 target countries</li> <li>▪ Number of other countries where SIS guidance developed by this project is being used</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No readiness packages reference SIS guidance developed by this project. Note that R-Packages are summary documents and are unlikely to reference all materials that have influenced the readiness process in the country. In addition, R-Packages have so far only been published in a few countries, and are only relevant for countries participating in FCPF.</li> <li>▪ SIS guidance developed by this project is being used in all six target countries (Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, Mexico, DRC and Indonesia)</li> <li>▪ SIS guidance developed by this project is also being used in Nepal, Chile, Tanzania and Vietnam.</li> </ul>

REDD+ SES initiative led the development of a conceptual framework for a country safeguards approach in collaboration with UN-REDD and with input from FCPF that has helped governments and civil society from many countries to understand better the role of SIS with respect to other safeguards elements like the legal framework and grievance mechanism. This framework also helps to explain the different roles of FCPF and UN-REDD tools compared with REDD+ SES that focuses on SIS. See 1.2 Development of country safeguards approaches pp. 18-19 in [Progress Towards and Results of a Participatory, Transparent and Comprehensive Approach to REDD+ Safeguards](#).

The framework was used by Vietnam as the basis for their safeguards road map. It has been adopted, in modified form, into a policy brief on safeguards published by UN-REDD and has also influenced the frameworks presented in REDD+ safeguards publications by World Resources Institute and by SNV and Climate Law and Policy. UN-REDD, USAID and FCPF have used it at capacity building events. Acre government said that they found the slides and discussion of options to increase credibility for collecting and assessing safeguards information very useful in developing the operational manual for their SIS.

All countries participating in the REDD+ SES Initiative have said that the ten-step process in the REDD+ SES Guidelines, as well as the information note and/or presentations on managing multi-stakeholder processes have been of particular value in developing their SIS. The Guidelines for the Use of REDD+ SES at Country Level made a contribution to nearly 70% by contributing to 95 out of the 139 reported outcomes, including outcomes in each of the ten countries. The REDD+ SES process guidelines provide guidance on good practices for a ten-step, multi-stakeholder process to build stakeholder capacity, define governance arrangements, develop country-specific indicators and conduct a self-assessment of performance of the REDD+ strategy against the indicators. Additional guidance on managing multistakeholder processes and on a gender-sensitive approach have also provided support for the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards. The process guidelines contributed most frequently to outcomes related to managing multi-stakeholder processes and developing or strengthening of multi-stakeholder governance structures, which generally meant involving different groups of stakeholders in the development and implementation of the country safeguards approach. It is notable that the majority of sustainable outcomes categorized as *Institutionalize* (29 out of 42 outcomes) and *Result from* (6 out of 9

outcomes) were influenced by the process guidelines. This means that the process guidelines frequently contributed to changes that are likely to be sustained beyond the CSA development phase. See 4.6 Contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative p. 110 in [Progress Towards and Results of a Participatory, Transparent and Comprehensive Approach to REDD+ Safeguards](#).

### Outcome 3: Methods and tools for monitoring performance

Outcome	Indicators	Achievements
Practical methods and tools for effective and efficient monitoring of social, governance and environmental performance of REDD+ programmes developed, disseminated and widely used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Methods and tools for social, governance and environmental assessment promoted by this project are being used in the 6 target countries</li> <li>▪ Number of other countries where methods, tools and guidance developed by this project is being used</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The methods and tools for social and governance assessment developed by this project have supported outcomes in 5 of the target countries (Brazil, Ecuador, DRC, Mexico, Peru)</li> <li>▪ Additionally, methods and tools developed by this project being used in at least 5 other countries (Tanzania, Colombia, Republic of Congo, Madagascar, and Guatemala)</li> </ul>

REDD+SES and WEDO (Women’s Environment and Development Organisation) did action research (see [gender action research](#)) on gender and REDD+, and developed tools ([checklist](#)) to strengthen gender sensitivity and advance gender equality in national REDD+ programs. Following this Tanzania included the gender dimension in their National REDD+ strategy (March 2013) and Acre Women’s Political Secretariat started to participate in environmental issues and REDD+ design and implementation.

Also, women’s groups were included in REDD+ consultations in Acre and Ecuador, where they had not been formally recognised as key stakeholder groups before. In DRC, WWF and the government national REDD+ coordination developed materials to build local community capacity on safeguards including on gender. The collaboration between REDD+ SES and WEDO spurred further action research in collaboration with IIED and IUCN in Mexico and Peru (see link to briefing paper [equity](#)). This led to the safeguards Committee in the Yucatan Peninsula including a gender expert and addressing gender in safeguards indicators. WWF used the REDD+ SES gender checklist for capacity building in Colombia and in Peru. A practical, step-by-step training of facilitators [capacity building kit](#) for training facilitators on REDD+ safeguards developed by the REDD+ SES Secretariat has been used in Guatemala, Republic of Congo, Madagascar and Peru. Following capacity building, the national multi-sectoral committee in Guatemala included gender and indigenous peoples’ issues in their safeguards approach.

### Outcome 4: Sharing learning on SIS and REDD+ SES

Outcome	Indicators	Achievements
Six countries have shared learning with each other and a wider REDD+ safeguard information systems community of practice, to strengthen their safeguards information systems and the REDD+SES initiative as a whole	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Documentation of the SIS development process from each of the 6 target countries identifies key learning from other countries that has strengthened their SIS</li> <li>▪ Materials developed by the global REDD+ SES initiative document learning and how this is influencing SIS policy and practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The REDD+ SES exchange and learning opportunities contributed to 19 outcomes in all six target countries. This is documented in outcome evaluation reports for each country at <a href="http://www.redd-standards.org/what-is-new/151-new-reports-progress-towards-and-results-of-a-participatory-transparent-and-">http://www.redd-standards.org/what-is-new/151-new-reports-progress-towards-and-results-of-a-participatory-transparent-and-</a></li> </ul>

		<p><a href="#">comprehensive-approach-to-redd-safeguards</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The same outcome reports indicate that materials developed by the global REDD+ SES initiative based on learning across countries contributed to 95 out of the 139 reported outcomes, including outcomes in each of the ten countries (Acre, Mato Grosso, Yucatan, San Martin, DRC, East Kalimantan, Chile, Guatemala, Nepal, Tanzania)</li> </ul>
--	--	---

The REDD+ SES exchange and learning workshops contributed to 15% of outcomes (19 out of 139 outcomes). Since 2009, the REDD+ SES Initiative has organized eight global exchange and learning workshops and three regional exchange workshops on various relevant topics for government and civil society teams facilitating development of a country safeguards approach. The REDD+ SES exchange and learning opportunities contributed to outcomes in nine of the ten countries/jurisdictions, except in Chile because no one from that country had participated in any of the global REDD+ SES exchange workshops. The exchange opportunities made a particular contribution in Peru, by contributing to over 60% of the outcomes probably because representatives from national government, regional government and national civil society participated in most of the REDD+ SES exchange events, and these people were influential in facilitating the development of CSA in the Region of San Martin and at national level. See 4.6 Contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative pp. 1-9-114 in [Progress Towards and Results of a Participatory, Transparent and Comprehensive Approach to REDD+ Safeguards](#).

#### Outcome 5: Longer term institutional arrangements for REDD+ SES

Outcome	Indicators	Achievements
Longer term institutional arrangements for the REDD+SES Initiative at global level developed and operationalised to provide ongoing support for countries developing and implementing safeguards information systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ REDD+ SES secretariat effectively operating from its long term institutional home</li> <li>▪ REDD+ SES International Steering Committee with revised membership is effectively performing its oversight and governance functions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Throughout the project the REDD+ SES secretariat effectively functioned from its institutional home in Conservation International</li> <li>▪ The REDD+ SES International Steering Committee revised its membership during the project period (11 joined and 10 left out of 21 members) and held one in-person meeting and several remote email and phone exchanges annually to effectively perform its oversight and governance functions</li> </ul>

The International Steering Committee of the REDD+ SES Initiative has ensured a diverse stakeholder influence on the strategic direction of the Initiative and helps to build shared ownership across many groups and organisations. The fact that the majority of the committee are from REDD+ implementing countries, including government together with civil society, and that both CARE and

CCBA share a facilitation role avoiding strong institutional branding, has helped to encourage adoption of the REDD+ SES approach and increase its influence on policies. Turnover of committee members each year has helped to strengthen the initiative, bringing in new perspectives and creating new supporters. Due to lack of perceived need and funding for the REDD+ SES Initiative from 2016, it was decided to maintain the REDD+ SES secretariat at Conservation International, the convener of the CCBA.

2.5 Are there any internal and/ or external factors that have affected the project in any significant way?

Risks occurred	Risk avoidance/mitigation strategies and deviations from plans
<b>Generic Risks (affecting more than one country)</b>	
<p>Tropical forest country governments have started to lose interest and reduce the priority given to REDD+ as the perceived potential for finance has diminished, which has led to reduced effort on safeguards and development of safeguards information systems, including the use of REDD+ SES guidance and tools. The REDD+ SES PCI framework and guidelines started to be perceived to be too complex and comprehensive, requiring significant resources for adequate information collection for a full set of indicators, at a time when significant results-based finance for REDD+ finance is far from certain.</p>	<p>Reduced interest in REDD+ and an accompanying reduction in attention to detail on safeguards have been significant risks that would be hard to mitigate through this one initiative. The REDD+ SES Initiative helped to build interest in REDD+ and facilitate finance by sharing country experiences of the benefits of developing and implementing a REDD+ strategy and action plan, including a participatory and comprehensive approach to safeguards. For example, KfW’s decisions to provide 25 million EUR to the State of Acre for REDD+ activities in 2012 and 2013 were facilitated, in part, by Acre’s PTC approach to safeguards using REDD+ SES guidance (<a href="#">Acre outcomes 7 and 10</a>). The California Air Resources Board, at a consultation workshop in May 2016, indicated that using REDD+ SES guidance would help partner jurisdictions to provide sufficient information on REDD+ safeguards to facilitate inclusion in California’s cap and trade scheme.</p> <p>However, against a general backdrop of reduced interest in providing detailed information on REDD+ safeguards, the REDD+ SES Initiative evolved considerably from the initial promotion of voluntary standards for REDD+ to providing a flexible toolbox of good practices and capacity building to strengthen country-led approaches to REDD+ safeguards. Rather than promoting the use of the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicators, greater emphasis was placed from 2014 on adoption of good practices for a transparent, multi-stakeholder process at country-level as defined in the Guidelines for the Use of REDD+ SES at Country Level. The Initiative also gave greater emphasis to providing a dynamic exchange and learning platform to support South-South exchanges among government and civil society organizations for the identification and dissemination of good practices for safeguards, for multi-stakeholder approaches and for development and implementation for CSAs.</p>
<p>Key actors in participating countries have been confused about multiple safeguards initiatives coming from different sources (FCPF, UNREDD, other NGO-led initiatives). The approach and information on safeguards required for reporting to the UNFCCC and for results-based finance for REDD+ are unclear and seem to vary according to the different sources of finance. This has slowed the development of CSAs including safeguards information systems while countries wait to see what will be required.</p>	<p>The REDD+ SES Initiative collaborated with the UN-REDD Programme, World Resources Institute, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), and Climate Law &amp; Policy working with the Netherlands Development Organization (SNV) from 2012 to develop a conceptual framework for CSAs that has been further developed and used in slightly different formats by each initiative. This promotion of CSAs has helped to reduce confusion on safeguards by supporting the country actors with identifying and implementing the countries’ own safeguards that address the specific risks and opportunities of the country’s REDD+ strategy through a country-led and -owned approach, building on and strengthening the country’s existing legal and institutional frameworks and information systems. However, the slowing of development of safeguards information systems meant that only three countries supported by the REDD+ SES Initiative completed a report assessing progress on respecting and addressing safeguards during the project period (Acre, East Kalimantan and Nepal).</p>

<p>In response to the lack of clarity on what safeguards systems and information are required to access finance, there has been a tendency for countries to adopt a minimalistic interpretation of UNFCCC safeguards requirements and to develop a SIS just to report to UNFCCC and satisfy specific donor conditionalities. For example, Brazil, the first country to submit a summary of information to the UNFCCC in 2015, set a precedent by providing only a cursory analysis to demonstrate that existing policies, laws and regulations are sufficient to address safeguards and that existing information systems provide sufficient information on how they are being respected.</p>	<p>By promoting a PTC CSA, the REDD+ SES Initiative has been building government and civil society capacity and interest in safeguards information systems as an important mechanism to improve REDD+ design and implementation and to strengthen stakeholder support. The REDD+ SES Initiative conducted an outcomes evaluation in 2015 to provide evidence of the broader benefits of a more PTC approach to safeguards. 51 outcomes were collected in ten countries outcomes that represented a contribution to addressing and respecting the UNFCCC Cancun safeguards, such as ensuring transparent and effective forest governance structures, ensuring the full and effective participation of relevant communities, respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and protection of biodiversity and ecosystem services. 19 of these outcomes strengthen safeguards for activities beyond REDD+. In addition, 4 outcomes directly strengthen REDD+ strategies and activities to deliver greater emissions reductions and non-carbon benefits, and 2 outcomes helped to scale up finance for REDD+. The country stakeholders who identified these outcomes recognise the value of a more detailed safeguards approach, particularly to increase participation in REDD+ and to deliver more benefits more equitably to local stakeholders.</p>
<p>In part due the lack of finance and activity on REDD+, civil society organisations have reduced their focus on REDD+. Since most funding for REDD+ is channelled to governments, civil society organisations often have inadequate resources to engage effectively. In addition, countries have started to focus on analysis of existing policies, laws and regulations to demonstrate that safeguards are addressed and their SIS is based on existing systems to assess the extent to which these laws are implemented (and the safeguards are respected) which leads to business as usual. Civil society is not able to participate actively in the largely technical legal analysis, so there is less opportunity for civil society to call for action to address gaps. In some cases, there has been a move by governments to reduce the level of civil society participation (eg. in Ecuador and Mexico). In several cases, the civil society role is limited to consultation, without providing adequate time and capacity building for effective civil society engagement.</p>	<p>The REDD+ SES Initiative promotes and provides clear guidelines on an inclusive multi-stakeholder process that gives civil society actors a determining role in reviewing and approving all aspects of safeguards assessment, including review of existing policies, laws and regulations and their implementation. In order to strengthen civil society engagement, the Initiative has been sharing case studies and emphasising the benefits of more significant participation. We also focused on building capacity of civil society organisations and networks to help them understand the technical and legal aspects of safeguards. This approach helped civil society to demand more participation and to make more effective inputs in the opportunities that they were given for participation. In addition, the REDD+ SES Initiative provided a series of small grants to civil society organisations to enable them to facilitate and engage in participatory processes related to safeguards. The REDD+ SES Initiative filled an important niche in strengthening civil society participation in REDD+ and safeguards processes, in contrast to UN-REDD, FCPF and other initiatives that tend to provide safeguards support to mainly to governments.</p>
<p><b>Country-specific Risks</b></p>	
<p><b>Indonesia</b> – The competition and lack of clarity between the Ministry of Forestry and the REDD+ Agency over which agency had overall authority for REDD+ until the REDD+ Agency was dissolved in 2015 resulted in two national level SIS initiatives that were being developed in parallel. The resulting confusion undermined efforts of provincial governments to push ahead with developing a functional system for providing information on safeguards and delayed constructive discussions about how REDD+ SES Initiative and Province level</p>	<p>The REDD+SES Initiative’s work at provincial level placed strong emphasis on the practical aspects of safeguards information systems and how REDD+SES guidance and tools could be used by actors at all levels within the provinces to improve social and environmental performance. The Initiative maintained a constant dialogue with the people leading the PRISAI work in the REDD+ Agency and SIS in the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. In 2015, we conducted a joint mission to East Kalimantan to discuss how lessons learned from using REDD+ SES at provincial level could help to strengthen the national SIS, particularly focusing on the multi-stakeholder process to assess progress and gaps and to provide feedback and capacity building to district level. We developed a joint work plan and provided coordinated support to East Kalimantan through 2015 with the GIZ Forclime project that has been supporting the Ministry</p>



<p>experiences could support the national safeguards process.</p>	<p>of Environment and Forestry on SIS. During 2015, the REDD+ SES Initiative conducted an international review of East Kalimantan’s development of a safeguards assessment report with a multi-disciplinary team including a former PRISAI proponent from the REDD Agency. This helped to bring the national safeguards initiatives together. Less progress was made in Central Kalimantan due to lack of progress in the development of the Provincial REDD+ Strategy.</p>
<p><b>Brazil</b> – The Federal Government’s approach to safeguards and REDD+ strategy has not taken into consideration the initiatives pioneered by the States, which has caused frustration at State level. The change in government at all levels after elections in November 2014 slowed down progress on REDD+ safeguards, particularly in Amazonas.</p>	<p>The REDD+ SES Initiative focused on supporting the development of a practical approach and making progress with implementation in States that were already moving forward with implementing a REDD+ program. This process started in Acre in 2010, acknowledged to be furthest ahead in development of a functioning REDD+ program, followed by Amazonas from 2012 and Mato Grosso from 2013, although no further progress was made in Amazonas in preparation for and after the change of government in November 2014. Acre completed a safeguards assessment report in 2014 and the REDD+ SES Initiative organised an international review that assessed the PTC approach they had followed. With respect to the Federal Government, the State governments have felt empowered to engage constructively with the federal government on REDD+ and safeguards in part because of their experience developing a safeguards approach following the guidelines of the REDD+ SES Initiative (<a href="#">outcome 3 reported by Mato Grosso government</a>). In addition, we provided support for civil society groups at national level to organise themselves under the Climate Observatory to engage with the federal government on REDD+ and to advocate for an effective approach to safeguards that strengthens existing laws related to safeguards where needed and ensures their implementation.</p>
<p><b>DRC</b> – REDD+ SES was perceived as adding complication and confusion to development of the SIS that also needed to be built on SESA/ESMF of FCPF and the social and environmental standards for REDD+ developed by DRC civil society.</p>	<p>After discussion with CN-REDD and civil society about the best way to support their work on safeguards, the REDD+ SES Initiative focused on capacity building for the government and civil society in DRC who are involved in developing a SIS for REDD+. Instead of promoting the use of the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicators, we focused on capacity building on a participatory and transparent approach to safeguards using the national standards and the World Bank instruments. We provided opportunities for exchange to learn from experiences of other countries and to learn about best practices developed through the REDD+ SES initiative. This approach aimed to avoid duplication and confusion, by strengthening the existing approach in DRC rather than proposing full application of REDD+ SES. In particular, we worked with the safeguards working group for the development of Mai Ndombe ER Program to help them develop a system for providing information on safeguards and non-carbon benefits, to help to operationalize the DRC safeguards approach.</p>
<p><b>Peru</b> – Different Regions develop different approaches to SIS, for example using REDD+ SES guidance, but developing different country-specific indicators and processes makes it hard to unify the information into a national system.</p>	<p>When the REDD+ SES Initiative started to engage in Peru from 2010, the Government of Peru planned to develop their national system for REDD+ by learning and building from the experiences at the sub-national level. REDD+ SES guidelines helped to build capacity and develop a strong multi-stakeholder approach in San Martin and this was initially used as a model to support development of national safeguards institutional arrangements. Since 2014, Peru has transitioned to developing its approach to REDD+ and safeguards at the national level, while ensuring strong participation and learning from the sub-national level, particularly from San Martin which is the region that is furthest ahead on REDD+ including on safeguards. The REDD+ SES Initiative started to engage with and provide capacity building at national level, while also facilitating dialogue between sub-national and national level. As in other countries, we continued to promote the adoption of the strong multi-stakeholder process outlined in the REDD+ SES Guidelines, linking this with nationally</p>



	determined indicators rather than promoting the use of the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicators.
<b>Mexico</b> – Different States develop different approaches to safeguards information systems, in some cases using REDD+ SES, but developing different country-specific indicators and processes, which makes it hard to unify the information into a national system.	In 2012 when REDD+ SES first engaged in Mexico, the government originally planned to develop the national safeguards approach based on State experiences. However, a change in leadership at CONAFOR led to a more top-down, centralized approach and less stakeholder involvement. The States of the Yucatan Peninsula started using REDD+ SES tools and guidance from 2013 to develop a set of indicators through a multi-stakeholder process involving governments and other key local stakeholders from the three States of the Peninsula. The State governments and civil society are proud of the progress and see many benefits of this approach (see the <a href="#">Yucatan outcomes</a> ). They used this experience to advocate for greater participation and State level adaptation as part of the national approach. From 2014, CONAFOR started to adopt a more inclusive approach. The stakeholders, including State governments, of the Yucatan Peninsula felt that their positive experiences using REDD+ SES guidance and tools were starting to be recognised by CONAFOR helping to strengthen the national approach and felt empowered to engage constructively with the federal government on REDD+ ( <a href="#">Yucatan outcomes 2, 5, 6</a> ).
<b>Ecuador</b> – After UN-REDD started supporting the Ecuador REDD strategy development in 2013, the UN-REDD approach to safeguards was perceived as not compatible with the progress already made using REDD+ SES guidance and tools. This led to Ecuador restarting the safeguards work, resulting in duplication of effort and frustration on the part of many stakeholders. The UN-REDD support coincided with changes in leadership in the Ministry of Environment and an overall reduction in Government commitment to participation and transparency. Then negotiations with REDD Early Movers from 2014 questioned the cost and effort that Ecuador had invested so far in creating a PTC approach to safeguards. This led to reduced political will on safeguards and no further development of the safeguards information system.	During 2010-2012, the Ministry of Environment used REDD+ SES guidance and tools to develop a strong multi-stakeholder process and adapt indicators to their context. When UN-REDD support started in 2013, a new process was started, dissolving the multi-stakeholder committee in favour of a consultative platform, and developing a new set of indicators. This slowed things down, created tensions and led to disengagement of civil society, and did not simplify the safeguards framework (as intended). While REDD+ SES continued to work very collaboratively with UN-REDD and MAE and to provide exchange of experiences to build support for a more participatory and comprehensive approach to safeguards, the people involved in those exchanges were not able to provide leadership in the face of the overall changes in government. The REDD+ SES Initiative support was redesigned to be very complementary with the UN-REDD approach, providing capacity building and exchange rather than focusing on using the REDD+ SES principles criteria and indicators. However, these mitigation efforts were overwhelmed by the change in political so no further activities were conducted in Ecuador in 2015.

2.6 **Cross cutting concerns.** Please report on whether the project has had any effect (positive or negative) on ;

**a) Outcomes related to enhanced transparency as a means to combat corruption.<sup>5</sup>**

The REDD+ SES Initiative put a strong emphasis on improving governance, in particular on participation, transparency and accountability of institutions involved in REDD+ activities. A total of 13 of the 97 **Demonstrate** and **Institutionalize** outcomes represented some advance in transparency related to the CSA, and therefore helped to reduce the potential for corruption related to the REDD+ strategy and more broadly. The contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative to each of these outcomes is explained in the country reports available [here](#).

<sup>5</sup> Please also refer to [Annex 2](#), for different ways in which increased transparency in CSA was evident.

In terms of increasing transparency the most frequent type of outcome was the strengthening of REDD+ strategies and plans with respect to provisions for sharing information with stakeholders. This has happened in Acre (as part of their safeguards monitoring manual), in East Kalimantan (as part of the provincial REDD+ strategy) and in Nepal (as part of the national REDD+ strategy).

Three countries have already conducted a safeguards performance assessment – Acre, East Kalimantan and Nepal. The draft assessment reports were disseminated and workshops were held for stakeholder review. The multi-stakeholder committee or group ensured that comments were addressed in the final versions of the report in Acre and East Kalimantan and this process is underway in Nepal. Many of the other countries plan to use a similar approach, i.e. a very high level of transparency in the performance assessment, but have not yet reached this stage.

Two of the countries are establishing web-based SIS to compile safeguards information and make it publically available. In East Kalimantan, the system is linked to the national web-based SIS which is already operating on a pilot basis. In Nepal, the system is still under development. While these systems have an important role to play as a database, other measures are needed to proactively disseminate information. In both East Kalimantan and Nepal, the respective governments are producing written reports; both summaries of performance at the level of principles (Cancun safeguards and/or REDD+ SES principles) and more detailed reports (e.g. based on criteria). A full report with results by indicator as well as a summary by principle has already been disseminated in Acre and in East Kalimantan.

#### **b) Outcomes related to gender equality**

The REDD+ SES Initiative put a strong emphasis on building capacity and providing guidance on gender considerations of REDD+, particularly through the CSA. In 2013, the Initiative did action research on gender and REDD+ safeguards in Acre, Brazil, in Tanzania and in Nepal which led to the publication of a guide [From Research to Action: Getting Gender Right in the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards](#), which includes action steps for national REDD+ programs. In 2015, the Initiative developed a gender module for a [REDD+ Safeguards and REDD+ SES Training Kit](#) that provides a practical manual, presentations, activities and summaries to help the facilitation teams in the countries to explain key concepts and build capacity of national and local stakeholders so that they can engage effectively on REDD+ and safeguards. More specific information can be found in the country reports available [here](#).

#### **c) Outcomes related to respect for human rights**

The REDD+ SES Initiative encouraged a comprehensive approach to considering all social and environmental aspects of the REDD+ strategy and actions, including with respect to human rights. Outcomes related to strengthening human rights were reported by local actors as significant changes of behaviour resulting from adopting a more PTC approach to safeguards. The contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative to each of these outcomes is explained in the country reports available [here](#).

### **2.9 Lessons learned<sup>6</sup>.**

The outcomes evaluation mentioned in 2.4 b) aimed to generate evidence and learning on adoption of a PTC approach to REDD+ safeguards at country level in order to assist countries to strengthen their REDD+ CSA and encourage wider adoption of a more PTC approach to safeguards for REDD+ and related low-emissions land use. The evaluation looked for outcomes (changes in behavior) within both the government agencies that are generally leading the development of REDD+ and civil society actors that are actively engaged in the country safeguards process.

---

<sup>6</sup> Please refer to [Annex 3](#) for an edifying description on the evolution of the general context of REDD+ as a backdrop for this evaluation and the lessons learned.

Our evaluation revealed that particular progress has been made with respect to participation; 62% of all the outcomes relate to some advance in **demonstrating or institutionalizing** a more participatory CSA. This emphasis on more participation is probably due, in part, to the early stage of development of safeguards approaches in all countries and recognition of the importance of ensuring participation of relevant stakeholders in design. It is notable that 80% of the **institutionalization** outcomes are related to more participation, mostly in the establishment of multi-stakeholder governance structures, so many of the early advances in participation seem likely to be sustainable. Furthermore, all the outcomes that contributed to several other outcomes were related to more participation and more than half of these involved the establishment of a multi-stakeholder governance structure. In contrast, there were fewer outcomes related to transparency as much of the focus of transparency relates to the assessment of performance versus safeguards and sharing of this information, and few countries have reached this stage.

In terms of the scope of issues that will be addressed by safeguards, we have seen much debate on whether indicators are necessary or useful for an effective safeguards information system. Our broad conclusion is that under current realities of REDD+ financing, earlier aspirations to develop a very comprehensive set of indicators were too ambitious. However, indicators are a fundamental element of any monitoring system and if the safeguards information system (SIS) aims to provide information about implementation of safeguards then indicators are likely to be a helpful concept to identify and structure relevant information even though UNFCCC policy avoids the term monitoring.

All the countries included in the study, except Peru, are developing indicators for their safeguards information system. When it comes to conducting a performance assessment, many only use a subset of the full indicator set for a particular assessment (those most relevant at that point in time). As mentioned previously, the outcome evaluation highlighted that indicators have played an important role in helping to clarify and unpack the broad principles of the Cancun safeguards into constituent elements. In some cases, the increased participation facilitated by the adoption of a comprehensive approach to safeguards has led to benefits beyond the REDD+ strategy.

Most of the outcomes contributed to strengthening respect for the Cancun safeguards, i.e. strengthening their implementation, rather than strengthening policies, laws and regulations to address safeguards. It is notable that the process of developing and implementing a CSA has actually contributed to stronger respect for safeguards.

The fact that the adoption of a PTCA to safeguards happen in an intertwined manner over time (p.5) has important implications for the process of developing CSAs, suggesting that their development needs to be supported in a country-specific way, through a process led by country actors building on existing frameworks and arrangements rather than following a standard process. The REDD+ SES Initiative was a contributing factor in the great majority of outcomes, particularly in outcomes linked to stronger multi-stakeholder processes and enhancing comprehensiveness of the range of issues covered by the CSA. Whilst the significance of these contributions would require a different type of evaluation, it seems clear from the wide-ranging outcomes and geographical spread of outcomes influenced by the Initiative that it played an important role at various stages in each country/jurisdiction.

Where next for CSAs? We believe that the outcome evaluation provides some strong evidence for the value of investing in more PTC CSAs. That said, it is clear that countries remain under pressure to simplify their approach to safeguards and thus that a balance must be struck. There is some concern that from the high aspirations for strong and effective safeguards of the period around the Cancun COP the pendulum may have swung a bit too far in the other direction towards a minimalistic interpretation of UNFCCC policy of safeguards.

We hope that the evaluation, providing evidence as the legacy of the REDD+ SES Initiative, helps to sustain commitment to an effective approach to safeguards, and to make the case for some additional investment in a more PTC approach to safeguards. That said, we must recognize that the evolution of REDD+ policies continues, in particular recognizing the need to fully integrate REDD+ strategies and activities within broader approaches to low-emissions development and green growth. This presents challenges for work on REDD+ safeguards as the performance-based financing which is contingent on addressing and respecting safeguards will increasingly become just one element of a broader basket of funding. Although from some angles this may look like a threat, now that development and implementation of country approaches to safeguards are recognized to be very much country-led processes, and where country actors are recognizing the benefits of such PTC approaches, there is clearly also an opportunity to leverage CSAs to help strengthen the equity and effectiveness of broader low-emissions land use and green growth efforts. The authors hope that the knowledge, learning and evidence of progress collected and evaluated in this report serve as a useful resource for this purpose. In terms of lessons learned through this initiative for countries developing a safeguards approach, the following points have been identified through the multiple exchange and learning workshops organized by the REDD+ SES Initiative:

- It is key for countries to conduct a country-specific interpretation of REDD+ safeguards based on the risks and opportunities of the REDD+ strategy and action plan. This enables countries to break down REDD+ safeguards in specific elements adapted to the country context.
- The development of REDD+ safeguards and SIS through a multi-stakeholder process helps to involve stakeholder groups that may have been marginalized or lacked trust in the government into the REDD+ process and to ensure political support for the effective implementation of safeguards.
- In order to manage stakeholder's expectations, countries have found it helpful to discuss and publish plans for the design and implementation of the SIS so that stakeholders know when and how they can participate.
- The approach for developing SIS should be tailored to each country. While some countries have strong existing information systems for monitoring biodiversity, forest governance and other aspects which they use for their SIS, other countries do not have systems in place or functioning and thus may need to develop new systems in order to provide information on how safeguards are addressed and respected.
- Indicators can perform an important role in further specifying the information that should be collected, particularly where safeguards have not yet been incorporated into legal and policy frameworks, e.g. indicators based on voluntary standards.
- Developing an assessment checklist or guide helps to demonstrate how each safeguard is being addressed and respected, providing information for each important aspect of the safeguard or for each indicator.
- Countries have found it useful to prioritize a sub-set of specific information or indicators for each assessment that are most relevant to that phase of REDD+ and in line with the financial and human resources available at the time of assessment.
- Sharing safeguards information with stakeholders encourages their participation in identifying legal as well as implementation gaps, the underlying causes of these gaps and the design and implementation of measures to address the gaps.
- Facilitating exchange and learning between countries has been key to share good practices and helped to start discussions around common challenges that countries are facing in the development of SIS. It also helped to create a network of practitioners that shared progress and learning on REDD+ safeguards and on other related issues.
- Articulation between national and sub-national level is a challenge, in particular in countries where sub-national jurisdictions are developing their own REDD+ programs. While REDD+ safeguards need to be reported at national level, they must be applied at sub-national level where

REDD+ activities are implemented, requiring close coordination between sub-national and national level government.

- Countries have found it very important to build on existing platforms to engage stakeholders in order to maintain a robust and coherent approach for the development of REDD+ in a coordinated manner. Where some stakeholder groups had not been involved, countries have created working groups or councils to ensure their participation.

### 3 Case/success story

There is one case from each key country. One is selected for the report. The others are in [Annex 4](#).

#### **HEADLINE: Multi-stakeholder safeguard process enhanced local participation in DRC**

**INTRODUCTION:** The National REDD Coordination (CN-REDD) of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) led a multi-stakeholder process to develop a SIS for the Mai Ndombe Emissions Reduction Program (ERP) with support of the REDD+ SES Initiative that facilitated participation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, as well as other key stakeholders, who had previously been marginalized from the program's design, implementation and monitoring.

**WHY: Although representatives of Indigenous Peoples, local communities and other local stakeholders had been identified for the Mai Ndombe ERP, they were not yet participating due to lack of capacity and organization, and there was no clear plan on how to monitor and provide information on safeguards.** Civil society organizations had participated effectively in defining social and environmental standards for REDD+ in DRC in 2010-2012 but no protocol existed for implementing them. CN-REDD was keen to include representatives of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the design, implementation and monitoring of the Mai Ndombe ERP, and also wanted to develop a practical way to ensure that safeguards are being addressed and respected through the development of a SIS at program level. Representatives had been identified from Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the Mai Ndombe region in 2014, but were not yet participating.

**WHAT: The safeguards working group (GT5) of the Mai Ndombe ERP conducted a participatory process to develop a safeguards information system that facilitated effective participation of Indigenous Peoples, local communities and provincial and local government in the design, implementation and monitoring of the ERP.** The REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards (SES) Initiative implemented by CARE and the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) aims to support countries to develop and implement effective social and environmental safeguards for government-led REDD+ strategies and action plans to make a substantial contribution to human rights, poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation goals while avoiding social and environmental harm. This project aims to reach this goal by encouraging governments to establish a system to provide safeguards information to national and local stakeholders as well as to UNFCCC and international stakeholders, to embrace a high level of participation and transparency in the CSA and to use the safeguards information to strengthen legal and institutional frameworks to address and respect safeguards. The project also aims to empower civil society actors to engage with government in defining the CSA, to call for change to strengthen safeguards, and to define and secure broad support for strong and comprehensive safeguards including considerations of gender, Indigenous Peoples and equity. In DRC, the REDD+ SES Initiative provided capacity building and technical support, guidance on managing multi-stakeholder process, small grants and facilitation for workshops, and exchanges with other countries to help the Mai Ndombe ERP safeguards working group (GT5) to develop a SIS through a multi-stakeholder process that facilitated effective participation of local stakeholders in safeguards and more broadly in the ERP design, implementation and monitoring.

**HOW MUCH:** Approximately 1,875,000 NOK from 2013-2015, including 100,000 NOK in small grants for workshops.

**RESULTS: 32 Indigenous Peoples and local community representatives, and also provincial government, local territory and sector officials, started to participate effectively in meetings about the design, implementation and monitoring of the Mai Ndombe ERP through their engagement in workshops about REDD+ safeguards.** In 2014, CN-REDD started to develop a participatory safeguards approach for the Mai-Ndombe ERP creating a multi-stakeholder working group on safeguards (GT5). Through the safeguards workshops organized at regional level by GT5, the GT1 on participation and communication started to collaborate closely with GT5 which has strengthened the outreach component of ER Program development. This collaboration and requests from stakeholders at the workshops led WWF and CN-REDD to collaborate to develop visual materials on REDD+ and

safeguards in 2015, including gender aspects. These materials are important for outreach in an area where many stakeholders are illiterate. Also in 2015, the Provincial Government started to participate actively in meetings and consultations on safeguards organized in Mai Ndombe region by GT5, which is important to ensure effective implementation of the safeguards approach because of the Province’s leadership role in the ER Program implementation. The success of the ER Program relies heavily on effective participation of the local communities in Mai Ndombe region, and they started to engage actively on REDD+ and on safeguards with the active participation of 32 local representatives in two workshops on safeguards organised by GT5 in 2015. This participation on safeguards has helped to build understanding and trust, and to create some ownership of the ER program by those who will be most affected. Local territory and sector officials also started to participate actively in these meetings, which has helped to build capacity of another key set of implementing agents for the ER Program.

**Contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative:** The REDD+ SES process guidelines and technical support helped to support development of multi-stakeholder working group GT5 to provide guidance for a multi-stakeholder approach to consultations on the safeguards indicators for Mai Ndombe that led to the other outcomes. REDD+ SES Initiative provided small grants to hold the influential local workshops and GT5 meetings in 2014 and 2015. This funding leveraged other funding for these important local workshops, initially from WWF and then also the CN-REDD. Participation in the REDD+ SES exchange and learning workshops helped to encourage government agencies and civil society organizations to collaborate in a multi-stakeholder safeguards process.

**LESSONS LEARNED:** consultations on safeguards indicators helped to convince local stakeholders that their concerns about REDD+ would be addressed which built trust and willingness to engage in a government-led process; conducting the workshops in the local language (Lingala) with separate working groups for Indigenous Peoples and women helped to facilitate their participation; workshops about safeguards created an opportunity to build capacity and solicit input on the design and implementation of the ERP in general; the multi-stakeholder process enabled the government to provide leadership while also sharing ownership with other key stakeholders that facilitated trust and participation



**PARTNERS:** National REDD+ Coordination, Provincial Government of Mai Ndombe, WWF, REDD+ Working Group (GTCR), members of the Mai Ndombe ERP safeguards working group (GT5).

**GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION:** DR Congo, Mai Ndombe Province

**SOURCES:** Julien Kabalako of GTCR, Jolly Sassa Kiuka of WWF and Alain Binibangili of CN-REDD in workshop April 2015, and also in interviews with the same people and Rigobert Mola of GTCR, Raphael Kasongo of CN-REDD and Felix Mbumba of Government Environmental Assessment Agency (GEEC) in September-October 2015. See [REDD+ SES report](#) on Progress Towards and Results of a PTC Approach to Safeguards forthcoming March 2015.



**PHOTO:** Indigenous Peoples’ representatives participating in safeguards workshop Mai Ndombe DRC © Joanna Durbin and local produce and transport Mai Ndombe DRC © Joanna Durbin.

## 4 Project's accounts for last year:

4.1 The accounts must relate to the approved budget for the year in question. All deviations (positive and/ or negative) must be clearly shown and explained.

The audited accounts and the financial report for 1.1- 2015 to 30.06.2016, are attached in separate documents. The financial report explains deviations against the 2015 budget. The project was granted a no cost extension till June 30th 2016, to allow the CCBA secretariat participate in the Oslo REDD exchange 2016. Unspent funds of NOK 154 600,- will be returned to Norad promptly.

As requested in Norad's feedback on the annual report for 2014 we have added an overview of budget, expenditures and deviations split partner, outcome and countries. (Annex 1) These overviews cover the three-year period. Please note that these refer to the original budget in the application. There have been budget revisions approved underway, so this overview is just an image of where we ended in comparison to where we expected in the beginning.

1/9/2016



Gry Larsen  
National Director  
CARE Norge

Attachments:

- QZA-13/0544 Expenditure report 2015/2016
- QZA-13/0544 Letter from the auditor



## LIST OF ACRONYMS

CCBA - Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance

CSA - Country Safeguards Approach

DRC – Democratic Republic of Congo

ERP – Emission Reduction Program (in Mai Ndombe)

FCPF – Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

GORESAM - Regional Government of San Martin

PCI - Principle, Criteria & Indicator (Framework)

PTC – Participatory, Transparent & Comprehensive

SES – Social and Environmental Safeguards

SIS – Safeguards Information System

UNFCCC - United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change



## ANNEXES

### ANNEX 1.

These tables show budget, expenditure and deviations in different splits, covering the period from 1.3/2013-30.06.2016;

By partner:

Budget Total 3 years				
CARE	CCBA	Proforest	National partners	Total
6 809 104	4 883 173	723 823	2 583 900	15 000 000
Expenditures Total 3 years				
CARE	CCBA	Proforest	National partners	Total
5 843 866	6 181 898	704 297	2 115 341	14 845 401
Deviations Total 3 years				
CARE	CCBA	Proforest	National partners	Total
965 239	-1 298 725	19 526	468 559	154 599

By Country:

Budget Total 3 years								
	Brazil	Indonesia	DRC	Peru	Ecuador	Mexico	Global	Total
<b>Year 1</b>	977 635	977 635	325 878	325 878	325 878	325 878	1 718 689	4 977 473
<b>Year 2</b>	1 024 842	1 024 842	341 614	341 614	341 614	341 614	1 651 134	5 067 274
<b>Year 3</b>	1 020 236	1 020 236	340 079	340 079	340 079	340 079	1 554 465	4 955 253
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 022 713</b>	<b>3 022 713</b>	<b>1 007 571</b>	<b>1 007 571</b>	<b>1 007 571</b>	<b>1 007 571</b>	<b>4 924 289</b>	<b>15 000 000</b>
<b>%</b>	20 %	20 %	7 %	7 %	7 %	7 %	33 %	
Expenditures Total 3 years								
	Brazil	Indonesia	DRC	Peru	Ecuador	Mexico	Global	Total
<b>Year 1</b>	537 660	646 836	286 775	179 220	170 297	161 374	1 355 034	<b>3 337 196</b>
<b>Year 2</b>	1 175 955	987 915	379 995	280 730	257 479	234 228	1 817 077	<b>5 133 380</b>
<b>Year 3</b>	1 278 655	1 199 858	511 017	356 324	327 746	299 168	2 402 057	<b>6 374 825</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 992 269</b>	<b>2 834 610</b>	<b>1 177 787</b>	<b>816 274</b>	<b>755 522</b>	<b>694 770</b>	<b>5 574 167</b>	<b>14 845 401</b>
<b>%</b>	20 %	19 %	8 %	5 %	5 %	5 %	38 %	
Deviations Total 3 years								
	Brazil	Indonesia	DRC	Peru	Ecuador	Mexico	Global	Total
<b>Year 1</b>	439 976	330 799	39 104	146 659	155 581	164 504	363 655	<b>1 640 277</b>
<b>Year 2</b>	-151 113	36 927	-38 381	60 884	84 135	107 386	-165 943	<b>(66 106)</b>
<b>Year 3</b>	-258 418	-179 622	-170 939	-16 246	12 333	40 911	-847 591	<b>(1 419 572)</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>30 444</b>	<b>188 104</b>	<b>-170 216</b>	<b>191 297</b>	<b>252 049</b>	<b>312 801</b>	<b>-649 879</b>	<b>154 599</b>
<b>%</b>	0 %	1 %	-1 %	1 %	2 %	2 %	-4 %	

By Outcome:

Budget Total 3 years							
#	Line Item	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Outcome 5	Total
1	Personnel	1 280 740	632 717	632 717	1 280 740	632 717	4 459 632
2	Consultants	4 003 740	45 240	499 761	348 961	250 361	5 148 063
3	Travel	408 900	120 713	120 713	433 913	120 713	1 204 950
4	Workshops	0	0	108 460	1 061 400	826 500	1 996 360
5	Publication	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Office, program support	276 009	196 326	196 326	276 009	196 326	1 140 995
	<b>Sub-total direct costs</b>	<b>5 969 389</b>	<b>994 996</b>	<b>1 557 976</b>	<b>3 401 022</b>	<b>2 026 616</b>	<b>13 950 000</b>
	Indirect costs 7% to CARE Norway	449 309	74 892	117 267	255 991	152 541	1 050 000
	<b>TOTAL in NOK</b>	<b>6 418 698</b>	<b>1 069 888</b>	<b>1 675 243</b>	<b>3 657 013</b>	<b>2 179 157</b>	<b>15 000 000</b>

Expenditure total 3 years							
	Line Item	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Outcome 5	Total
1	Personnel	1 615 247	818 555	870 035	1 615 247	818 555	5 737 639
2	Consultants	2 314 113	48 496	450 457	334 724	276 802	3 424 592
3	Travel	381 578	140 035	140 035	235 910	140 035	1 037 592
4	Workshops	0	0	14 707	1 401 933	730 834	2 147 474
5	Publication	1 388	1 388	1 388	1 388	1 388	6 938
6	Office, program support	361 059	243 378	244 512	359 665	243 375	1 451 989
	<b>Sub-total direct costs</b>	<b>4 673 385</b>	<b>1 251 851</b>	<b>1 721 133</b>	<b>3 948 866</b>	<b>2 210 988</b>	<b>13 806 223</b>
	Indirect costs 7% to CARE Norway	351 760	94 225	129 548	297 226	166 418	1 039 178
	<b>TOTAL in NOK</b>	<b>5 025 145</b>	<b>1 346 076</b>	<b>1 850 680</b>	<b>4 246 093</b>	<b>2 377 406</b>	<b>14 845 401</b>

Deviations Total 3 years							
	Line Item	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Outcome 5	Total
1	Personnel	-334 507	-185 838	-237 318	-334 507	-185 838	-1 278 007
2	Consultants	1 689 627	-3 256	49 304	14 237	-26 441	1 723 471
3	Travel	27 322	-19 322	-19 322	198 003	-19 322	167 358
4	Workshops	0	0	93 753	-340 533	95 666	-151 114
5	Publication	-1 388	-1 388	-1 388	-1 388	-1 388	-6 938
6	Office, program support	-85 051	-47 052	-48 186	-83 656	-47 049	-310 994
	<b>Sub-total direct costs</b>	<b>1 296 004</b>	<b>-256 855</b>	<b>-163 156</b>	<b>-547 844</b>	<b>-184 371</b>	<b>143 777</b>
	Indirect costs 7% to CARE Norway	97 549	-19 333	-12 281	-41 236	-13 877	10 822
	<b>TOTAL in NOK</b>	<b>1 393 553</b>	<b>-276 189</b>	<b>-175 437</b>	<b>-589 080</b>	<b>-198 249</b>	<b>154 599</b>

## ANNEX 2

### Analysis of Institutionalize outcomes.

Table: Types of outcome related to an advance in transparency

Type of change by government and/or civil society organizations	Number of outcomes	Examples
i. Make an explicit commitment to developing and using a transparent CSA	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government of Acre commits to testing and institutionalization of REDD+ SES (Acre 4)<sup>7</sup></li> </ul>
ii. Organize or participate in specific actions that increase transparency	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CEVA reports on its activities and results on safeguards to the councils (Acre 27)</li> </ul>
iii. Contribute to strategies and plans that indicate an intention to increase transparency. These may be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. in draft form</li> <li>b. finalized</li> </ul>	a. 1 b. 5 Subtotal 6	a. CSOs engage strongly in Tanzania's safeguards indicator development (Tanzania 9) b. IMC partners with Imaflorea to design safeguards monitoring process (Acre 11)
iv. Establish or participate in a process, system and/or structures that enhance transparency. These may be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Under development</li> <li>b. Live and actively helping to share information</li> </ul>	a. 1 b. 2 Subtotal 3	a. RIC starts to develop operational plans for SIS (Nepal 8) b. Brazilian government creates a REDD+ National Council with representative from Mato Grosso (Mato Grosso 3)
TOTAL	13	

The *Institutionalize* outcomes in this table are listed in a general order of increasing potential risk to sustainability, i. to v., although the actual risks will vary depending on the country context. The outcomes that are backed by policies, laws or regulations (i) are most likely to be sustainable but there may still be some risk that key provisions will not be implemented. Strategies and action plans (ii) tend to be time limited but since they have official backing, they are likely to be implemented and to have sustainable impacts. Changes to establish more participatory governance structures (iii), even if not backed by a policy/law, are often likely to be sustainable since it can be hard for a government to reduce stakeholder participation since they are usually keen to maintain political support from key stakeholders. The outcomes included in (iv) were all changes that informants said they expected would lead to ongoing participation of the relevant groups. Although the allocation of a government budget for the safeguards approach was seen as very significant by the informants (v), budget allocations are decided annually so this is perhaps the least sustainable of the institutionalization outcomes.

<sup>7</sup> Number in parenthesis refers to outcome reference number to enable reader to find detailed information in the specific Country Outcome reports.

## **ANNEX 3**

### **Evolution of context for REDD +**

Over the seven years that the REDD+ SES Initiative has been working with some of the countries (starting May 2009) the general context of REDD+ has markedly changed. In 2009-2010, a highly polarized situation existed with many governments and some civil society actors pro-REDD+ while many other civil society actors and some governments were critical based on a variety of concerns including the potential for negative social impacts on the rights and well-being of forest-dependent peoples. The remarkable progress on safeguards at the Cancun COP in 2010 helped to reassure the critics by establishing that REDD+ would only be developed and implemented with agreed safeguards which addressed most of the concerns of many of the critics. The safeguards were further strengthened in subsequent COP decisions, notably in Warsaw in 2013, by requiring countries to provide a summary of information on how safeguards have been addressed and respected before receiving results-based payments for REDD+ activities. While these decisions are important, there have been concerns that these international requirements will not, in themselves, ensure effective safeguards given the lack of clarity in the UNFCCC decisions on the level of detail to be included and the process for assessment of the required safeguards information summaries.

The adoption of safeguards as part of the international architecture for REDD+ spurred the development of CSAs evident in these outcomes. However, it soon became clear that funding commitments for REDD+ readiness and early implementation were falling short of earlier expectations. Despite the acknowledged importance of safeguards, there has been a move to simplify the safeguards approach and the provision of safeguards information not only because of reduced finance but also to reduce the burden of effort needed for safeguards. Brazil, the first country to submit a summary of information to the UNFCCC in 2015, set a precedent by providing only a cursory analysis to demonstrate that existing policies, laws and regulations are sufficient to address safeguards and that existing information systems provide sufficient information on how they are being respected. In general, we have seen many governments quite understandably looking for ways to simplify their CSAs and better integrate it with existing systems of safeguards and forest related monitoring, and many civil society organizations have also reduced their emphasis on REDD+.

Despite the funding constraints and related pressures to simplify CSAs, governments and civil society actors in a number of countries have continued to invest in, and advocate for, a more PTC approach to safeguards.

This is a backdrop for the outcome evaluation undertaken as part of this project.

## ANNEX 4

### ADDITIONAL CASE/SUCCESS STORIES

#### **HEADLINE: Multi-stakeholder safeguards process strengthened land rights in East Kalimantan, Indonesia**

**INTRODUCTION:** With support from the REDD + SES Initiative, a government and civil society team under the REDD+ Working Group in East Kalimantan conducted a PTC process to ensure that safeguards are addressed and respected in the provincial REDD+ Strategy. This raised awareness of safeguards issues and led to a new Provincial Government decree in April 2015 changing the process for issuing land use permits (including for oil palm, plantations and mining) that strengthens land rights, protection of high conservation value forests, transparency, and participation of local stakeholders.

**WHY: Lack of respect for customary land rights in land use permitting decisions raised concerns about REDD+ in East Kalimantan, Indonesia.** The provincial government created a multi-stakeholder REDD+ Working Group in 2008 to develop a provincial REDD+ strategy and this group was keen to ensure that safeguards are effectively addressed and respected. Civil society organizations have been critical of the lack of respect for customary land rights and of ineffective participation in land use permitting decisions so they were concerned that the REDD+ strategy would also not respect customary rights and areas of high ecosystem service and biodiversity value.

**WHAT: A joint government and civil society team led a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to REDD+ safeguards to raise awareness and change practices on land tenure, participation and other safeguards issues.** The REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards (SES) Initiative implemented by CARE and the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) aims to support countries to develop and implement effective social and environmental safeguards for government-led REDD+ strategies and action plans to make a substantial contribution to human rights, poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation goals while avoiding social and environmental harm. This project aims to reach this goal by encouraging governments to establish a system to provide safeguards information to national and local stakeholders, as well as to UNFCCC and international stakeholders, to embrace high level of participation and transparency in the CSA and to use the safeguards information to strengthen legal and institutional frameworks to address and respect safeguards. The project also aims to empower civil society actors to engage with government in defining the CSA, to call for change to strengthen safeguards, and to define and secure broad support for strong and comprehensive safeguards including considerations of gender, Indigenous Peoples and equity. In East Kalimantan, the REDD+ SES Initiative provided capacity building, guidance on managing a multi-stakeholder process, a principle, criteria and indicator framework, small grants for workshops and publications, and exchanges with other countries to help the safeguards team develop an analysis of safeguards issues, prepare a comprehensive province-specific set of safeguards indicators and to assess of progress against the indicators in four districts through a participatory and transparent process.

**HOW MUCH:** Approximately 1,875,000 NOK from 2013-2015, including 212,500 NOK in small grants for workshops and publications.

**RESULTS: Government strengthens safeguards including respect for land rights in new land use permit process.** In April 2015, the Provincial Government issued a decree changing the process for issuing land use permits (including for oil palm, plantation and mining) ensuring that land tenure, and high conservation value forests are more effectively addressed through a more transparent process with participation of local stakeholders. Land tenure and rights have become a primary consideration for the Provincial Government, in large part because they were highlighted through the participatory process to address safeguards for REDD+ from 2012 when the REDD+ Working Group decided to work on safeguards and created a multi-stakeholder team to facilitate the process including people from government, academia and NGOs. Some organizations that had been suspicious of REDD+ such as BIOMA and JATAM (Mining Advocacy Network) decided that they would engage because the government started taking the key safeguards issues they were concerned about seriously. The Forestry Agency created a new Forestry Information System section in 2013 that will manage the REDD+ safeguards information system in the long term and the government approved a budget for the REDD+ Working Group of 340,000 USD to use in 2016 including 23,000 USD for safeguards activities. The increased recognition of the importance of safeguards is also reflected in the decision to expand the information about safeguards and increased their prominence in the current revision of the Provincial REDD+ Strategy and Action Plan in 2015.

**Contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative:** The REDD+ SES process guidelines that lay out steps and good practices for the approach to safeguards influenced all these outcomes as they were used by the East Kalimantan safeguards team to guide their safeguards process. The team also used the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicator framework to develop safeguards indicators. The comprehensive treatment of safeguards issues helped to encourage the anti-REDD civil society organizations to engage in the REDD+ design process and helped to build the capacity of NGOs, which increased government respect and requests for their support. The prioritization of respect for land rights and requirements for transparency and participatory process in the decree for the new land use permit process issued in April 2015 was influenced by many factors. Among these were the identification of key safeguards issues and increased awareness of the importance of these, as a result of the PTC approach to safeguards. The REDD+ SES guidelines, the REDD+ SES indicator framework and the funding from the REDD+ SES Initiative<sup>8</sup> enabled the development and publication of the analysis of safeguards issues in 2013 and the subsequent publication of the safeguards assessment against the province-specific indicators in January 2015. All this contributed to the result.

**LESSONS LEARNED:** Importance of including both government and civil society on a team facilitating development of the approach to safeguards to demonstrate government commitment and increase civil society participation; importance of ensuring that safeguards are comprehensive to provide assurances to stakeholders on issues they will address; importance of participation of diverse stakeholders through consultation workshops to raise awareness about importance of safeguards issues and create shared ownership.

**PARTNERS:** East Kalimantan REDD Working Group, Indonesian Eco-Labeling Institute (LEI), Clinton Climate Initiative (CCI).

**GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION:** East Kalimantan, Indonesia

**SOURCES:** Governor's Decree # 15 2015 and # 17 2015; Perda APBD - Regional Regulation on Regional Budget Plan December 2015; Provincial REDD+ Strategy and Action Plan 2012; safeguards team members interview 10 June 2015 (Fadjar Pambudhi, Alfian Subekti, Akhmad Wijaya, Muhammad Fadli, Wilma Kania Febrina, Setiawati, Rahmina). [Identification of the need for adaptation of safeguards REDD+ SES Development of principles, criteria and indicators for social and environmental safeguards in East Kalimantan document](#). See [REDD+ SES report on Progress Towards and Results of a PTC Approach to Safeguards](#) forthcoming March 2015.



**PHOTO:** women participating in REDD+ safeguards consultations in Berau, East Kalimantan © Andrea Quesada; Orangutan in Kalimantan © Andrea Quesada

<sup>8</sup> Initially from CARE via CCI and LEI, and then from CARE via Conservation International from late 2014

## **HEADLINE: Inclusion in formal committee enhanced civil society participation in San Martin, Peru**

**INTRODUCTION:** The Region of San Martin in Peru conducted a PTC process to ensure that safeguards are addressed and respected in REDD+ activities with support from the REDD+ SES Initiative which led the regional government to create a multi-stakeholder safeguards committee and organize a participatory consultation process to ensure that all relevant groups, including those that have been marginalized, can fully participate in the REDD+ safeguards process.

**WHY: Lack of clear governance structures and ad-hoc consultations were marginalizing Indigenous Peoples and other key stakeholders from the REDD+ safeguards process in San Martin, Peru.** Indigenous Peoples and civil society organizations have their own dialogue platform to discuss REDD+ related issues but no formal group existed to engage and participate effectively in the development of a PTC approach to REDD+ safeguards in San Martin. The lack of clear governance structure meant that these groups participated in the safeguards process in an ad hoc basis and that other relevant stakeholders such as producers associations (coffee growers for example) had not been included. The government of San Martin committed to a participatory approach to safeguards and wanted to ensure that all stakeholder groups could participate for effective and transparent governance of REDD+ and the safeguards process.

**WHAT: Creation of a multi-stakeholder safeguards committee through a participatory process.** The REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards (SES) Initiative implemented by CARE and the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) aims to support countries to develop and implement effective social and environmental safeguards for government-led REDD+ strategies and action plans to make a substantial contribution to human rights, poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation goals while avoiding social and environmental harm. This project aims to reach this goal by encouraging governments to establish a system to provide safeguards information to national and local stakeholders as well as to UNFCCC and international stakeholders, to embrace a high level of participation and transparency in the CSA and to use the safeguards information to strengthen legal and institutional frameworks to address and respect safeguards. The project also aims to empower civil society actors to engage with government in defining the CSA, to call for change to strengthen safeguards, and to define and secure broad support for strong and comprehensive safeguards including considerations of gender, Indigenous Peoples and equity. In the Region of San Martin, the REDD+ SES Initiative provided capacity building and technical support, guidance on managing multi-stakeholder process, small grants for workshops and publications, and exchanges with other countries to help the safeguards team to develop the composition, rules of work and consultation process for establishing the multi-stakeholder committee.

**HOW MUCH:** Approximately 1,875,000 NOK from 2013-2015, including 212,500 NOK in small grants for workshops and publications.

**RESULTS: The Regional Government of San Martin officially created a multi-stakeholder safeguards committee including representation of all key stakeholder groups through a participatory process that built capacity and trust and established effective participation, including of previously marginalized groups, in the REDD+ and safeguards process.** The Regional Government of San Martin released a regional decree creating the regional safeguards committee in December 2014 and led a consultation process with stakeholders in 2015 to define the rules of work for the committee that were officialised through regional regulations in December 2015. The safeguards committee is composed of eleven members representing the public sector (3 levels of government), Indigenous Peoples, grassroots organisations, academia, the private sector and producers associations. The committee is in charge of identifying how Cancun safeguards will be addressed and respected taking into account the regional legal framework and will support the development of the safeguards information system for REDD+. Its members will also contribute to raising awareness on safeguards and support the regional government to ensure the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders in the development of safeguards and safeguards information system. The consultation process on the rules of work of the committee conducted in 2015 allowed each stakeholder group represented in the committee to ensure that their interests and preoccupations were included in the rules of works to enable them to participate fully and effectively in the safeguards process. The institutionalization of the committee and its rules of work by regional decree and regulation helped to give confidence to stakeholders that the governance structure will enable them to consistently support the interpretation of safeguards and development of SIS. Strengthening



regional stakeholders' capacities to fully and effectively participate in a safeguards multi-stakeholder committee was a key outcome from the REDD+ safeguards process in San Martin.

**Contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative:** Conservation International Peru, collaborating with the government of San Martin on the safeguards facilitation team, has played a critical role in promoting a more participatory approach to safeguards, for example through the promotion of an inclusive, participatory and rights-based approach to safeguards for REDD+ in San Martin from 2012. The regional government of San Martin created the multi-stakeholder committee in part because the REDD+ SES guidelines promote clear governance structures with a balance of interested or affected stakeholders on the committee that oversees the safeguards adaptation and development of SIS, including vulnerable and marginalised groups such as indigenous peoples. The REDD+ SES guidelines and exchange and learning workshops helped to provide guidance and examples from other countries of the process for establishing multi-stakeholder committees and their rules of work.

**LESSONS LEARNED:** Key success factors included: importance of government commitment to PTC approach to safeguards to build trust with stakeholders previously marginalised; stakeholder mapping to identify key stakeholders potentially affected or interested by REDD+; capacity building on REDD+ safeguards over 2 to 3 years with specific awareness raising materials to enable effective participation; separate consultation workshop with each stakeholder groups represented on the committee and in particular with Indigenous Peoples with sufficient resources to bring representatives from three ethnic groups in San Martin; involve all levels of government and strengthen capacities to ensure continuity and a coherent and robust process; ensure transparency of all meetings and publish reports.

**PARTNERS:** Regional Government of San Martin, Conservation International Peru.

**GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION:** Peru, San Martin.

**SOURCES:** Lucas Dourojeanni, Ministry of Environment of Peru; Milagros Sandoval, Conservation International Peru; Patricia Porras, Regional government of San Martin, Environmental Authority in interviews in September 2015; Publication: Sandoval M, Porras P, Schneider C. (2015) *Progress with development of REDD+ safeguards in the region of San Martin*, Lima, Peru (in Spanish). See [REDD+ SES report](#) on Progress Towards and Results of a Participatory, Transparent and Comprehensive Approach to Safeguards forthcoming March 2015.



**PHOTOS:** Native community of Shampuyacu, San Martin, Peru © Conservation International/photo by Freddy Guillen



## **HEADLINE: Participation of Indigenous Peoples strengthened rights & benefits – Acre, Brazil**

**INTRODUCTION:** The State of Acre in Brazil conducted a PTC process to ensure that safeguards are addressed and respected in their System for Incentives for Environmental Services (SISA) with support from the REDD+ SES Initiative that facilitated participation of Indigenous Peoples and led to strengthened respect for their rights and enhanced delivery of benefits to indigenous communities.

**WHY: Indigenous Peoples marginalized from land use policies that affect them in Acre, Brazil.** Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent communities, including rubber tappers and small producers, in the State of Acre, Brazil, were concerned that their rights would not be respected and they would not receive equitable benefits from the new SISA/REDD+ policy adopted in 2010. While Acre embraces a participatory approach to development of public policies through consultation and approval of joint government and civil society councils, Indigenous Peoples had not participated in these councils and other consultations on SISA due to mistrust. Acre government included respect for comprehensive safeguards principles in the SISA law, and wanted to ensure and demonstrate their effective implementation with a robust monitoring system.

**WHAT: Inclusion of indigenous peoples and other key stakeholders in development of participatory, transparent and comprehensive safeguards approach.** The REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards (SES) Initiative implemented by CARE and the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) aims to support countries to develop and implement effective social and environmental safeguards for government-led REDD+ strategies and action plans to make a substantial contribution to human rights, poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation goals while avoiding social and environmental harm. This project aims to reach this goal by encouraging governments to establish a system to provide safeguards information to national and local stakeholders as well as to UNFCCC and international stakeholders, to embrace a high level of participation and transparency in the CSA and to use the safeguards information to strengthen legal and institutional frameworks to address and respect safeguards. The project also aims to empower civil society actors to engage with government in defining the CSA, to call for change to strengthen safeguards, and to define and secure broad support for strong and comprehensive safeguards including considerations of gender, Indigenous Peoples and equity. In Acre, the REDD+ SES Initiative provided capacity building, guidance on managing a multi-stakeholder process, a principle, criteria and indicator framework, small grants for workshops, in-country technical support and publications, and exchanges with other countries to help IMC and CEVA develop a comprehensive State-specific set of safeguards indicators and to assess of progress against the indicators through a participatory and transparent process, and to develop a manual and institutional arrangements for ongoing safeguards monitoring.

**HOW MUCH:** Approximately 1,875,000 NOK from 2013-2015, including 255,000 NOK in small grants for workshops, in-country technical support and publications.

**RESULTS: The Indigenous Working Group in Acre advocated for their rights through a Charter of Indigenous Environmental Principles, which led to funding and implementation of Indigenous Agroforestry Agents through SISA/REDD+ to diversify livelihoods and address food security.** At the beginning of 2014, the Indigenous Working Group elaborated a Charter of Environmental Principles to guide all activities in indigenous territories for SISA and for any other activities that may affect them. The increased collaboration between Indigenous Peoples and the State Government led to allocation of 1.8 million BRL (~ 460,000 USD) of SISA funds to projects in indigenous areas in April 2014. The collaboration also led to training of Indigenous Agroforestry Agents to support Indigenous Peoples to diversify livelihoods, in particular addressing food security, while sustainably managing and protecting the forest. The Charter of Environmental Principles clarified Indigenous Peoples' principles to be respected by the Government of Acre and other actors, and helped to build trust and partnership, not only for SISA, but for many other potential activities. The SISA funds and activities demonstrated political commitment to include Indigenous Peoples in SISA and demonstrated how safeguards are being implemented under the SISA program to improve people's livelihoods.

**Contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative:** The multi-stakeholder committee overseeing development of the safeguards approach for SISA (CEVA) created the Indigenous Working Group in part because the REDD+ SES guidelines promoting a balance of interested or affected stakeholders on the committee that oversees the safeguards adaptation and monitoring, including vulnerable and marginalised groups such as indigenous peoples. The REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicator framework was used to guide the elaboration of the charter. In 2011, prior to Norad support, the REDD+ SES Initiative had supported consultation workshops with Indigenous Peoples on safeguards indicators that led to their increased interest in safeguards and REDD+ and their frustration at not being represented in the councils or on CEVA. Building trust between the Government of Acre and Indigenous Peoples' organisations was a key outcome from the REDD+ safeguards process in Acre.

**LESSONS LEARNED:** Key success factors included: stakeholder mapping to identify key stakeholders potentially affected by REDD+; separate consultation workshops with Indigenous Peoples with sufficient resources to bring representatives from all territories; capacity building as part of consultations to enable effective participation; comprehensive safeguards indicators helped Indigenous Peoples to understand that the government was interested and willing to address issues of concern to them; a separate sub-group in the safeguards oversight committee for key stakeholder groups where there may be mistrust if only one or two people represent them; transparency of all meetings and reports published; importance of government commitment to PTC approach to safeguards to build trust with stakeholders previously marginalized.

**PARTNERS:** Institute of Climate Change (IMC), State Commission for Validation and Monitoring (CEVA), CARE Brasil

**GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION:** Brazil, Acre.

**SOURCES:** Ayri Saraiva Rando, [ayrirando@gmail.com](mailto:ayrirando@gmail.com) CARE Brazil staff supporting IMC 2011-2013; Resolution establishing the indigenous working group. Monica de los Rios in meeting with the International Review team, May 2, 2014; Joci Aguiar, head of CEVA; Pavel Jezek of IMC & Ricardo Melho of WWF and CEVA during the exchange workshop in April 2015 in Nepal – agreed with outcome, significance and contribution; Alberto Tavares (Dande), CEO of CDSA, Interview April 2014. See [REDD+ SES report](#) on Progress Towards and Results of a Participatory, Transparent and Comprehensive Approach to Safeguards forthcoming March 2015.



**PHOTOS:** consultation workshops with Indigenous Peoples on safeguards indicators in Acre, Brazil © Ayri Saraiva Rando

## Timeline of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Acre

### Key Actor that changes behaviour:

- government
- civil society
- joint government and civil society

### What the change represents:

- 1** = enabling
- 2** = demonstration
- 3** = institutionalization
- 4** = result from - adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards

### Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative:

- P = process guidelines
- I = principles, criteria, indicators
- \$ = funding
- A = technical advice
- X = exchange

<b>2010</b>	1 - Acre state assembly adopts SISA including comprehensive safeguards principles	<b>3</b> I A
	2 - IMC works with CARE to serve as executive secretariat of CEVA	<b>2</b> P \$
	3 - IMC begins to present Acre safeguards approach at international meetings	<b>1</b> X
	4 - Government of Acre commits to testing and institutionalisation of REDD+ SES	<b>2</b> \$
	5 - SEMA creates partners with CARE to develop indicators for monitoring SISA	<b>2</b> P \$
<b>2011</b>	20 - IMC, CEVA and others develop Acre-specific indicators for participatory monitoring of SISA	<b>2</b> P I \$
	6 - IMC develops a certain technical and financial dependence for monitoring SISA	<b>1</b> \$
	15 - Indigenous organizations express frustration with lack of involvement in SISA	<b>1</b> P
	16 - Civil society members of councils elect 4 CSO representatives to CEVA	<b>3</b> P
	21 - Different stakeholders appropriate application of safeguards to SISA	<b>2</b> P
	22 - CEVA creates an Indigenous Working Group to advise on SISA	<b>3</b> P
<b>2012</b>	7 - KfW approves EUR 16 million for SISA	<b>4</b> P I
	8 - Government of Acre appoints its representatives to CEVA	<b>3</b> P
	23 - CEVA makes recommendations for development of regulations for carbon projects	<b>2</b> I
	24 - The 8 members of CEVA increase and deepen involvement in SISA and safeguards	<b>3</b> P X
	25 - CEVA shares experience with civil society and government from other countries on safeguards	<b>1</b> P X
<b>2013</b>	17 - Indigenous Working Group broadens advice to IMC beyond safeguards for SISA	<b>4</b> P
	26 - CEVA approves SISA monitoring manual including role of Indigenous Working Group	<b>3</b> P
	9 - Government of Acre publishes SISA monitoring manual	<b>3</b> P \$
	10 - KfW approves additional EUR 9 million for SISA	<b>4</b> P I A
	27 - CEVA reports on its activities and results on safeguards to the councils	<b>3</b> \$
<b>2014</b>	28 - CEVA reports on its activities and results beyond safeguards to the councils	<b>4</b> \$
	11 - IMC partners with Imaflora to design safeguards monitoring process	<b>2</b> P \$
	12 - Government of Acre provides \$R1.8 million for indigenous areas, \$R9 million for extractive reserves and \$R15 million for small farmers from KfW funds	<b>4</b>
	13 - At COP 20, IMC organizes an event with indigenous peoples on SISA	<b>1</b>
<b>2015</b>	14 - IMC implements safeguards policies through indigenous agroforestry agents	<b>4</b>
	18 - Indigenous Working Group develops a charter of indigenous principles	<b>4</b> P I
	29 - CEVA begins creating a gender working group	<b>2</b> P \$ A
	19 - WWF supports IMC facilitation team to develop action plan to strengthen safeguards	<b>1</b> P



## Timeline and status of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in the Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico

### Key Actor that changes behaviour:

- government
- civil society
- joint government and civil society

### What the change represents:

- 1 = enabling
- 2 = demonstration
- 3 = institutionalization
- 4 = result from - adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards

### Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative:

- P = process guidelines
- I = principles, criteria, indicators
- \$ = funding
- A = technical advice
- X = exchange

## 2013

- |   |              |
|---|--------------|
| 8 - Safeguards Committee members share progress and lessons learned at international meetings | <b>1</b> X   |
| 9 - Safeguards Committee members share progress and lessons learned at national meetings      | <b>1</b> P I |

## 2014

- |   |                |
|---|----------------|
| 1 - CONAFOR starts to participate in the safeguards process of the Yucatan Peninsula                    | <b>1</b> X     |
| 2 - CONAFOR invites the Safeguards Committee to contribute to the national safeguards process           | <b>1</b> P A X |
| 10 - Local stakeholders start to participate actively in safeguards discussions and meetings            | <b>3</b> P I   |
| 11 - Governmental and non governmental Stakeholders establish a multi-stakeholder Safeguards Committee  | <b>3</b> P     |
| 12 - Safeguards Committee interprets safeguards indicators and provides technical support on safeguards | <b>2</b> P I   |
| 13 - Safeguards Committee includes gender expert and addresses gender in safeguards indicators          | <b>3</b> P I A |

## 2015

- |   |              |
|---|--------------|
| 3 - Yucatan Peninsula States commit to include safeguards in their REDD+ and Climate Change Strategies and Investment Plans | <b>1</b> P I |
| 4 - Municipalities commit to work on REDD+ safeguards and support the State governments                                     | <b>2</b> P   |
| 5 - CONAFOR opens call for pilot to test REDD+ safeguards in Yucatan Peninsula  | <b>2</b> P I |
| 6 - CONAFOR allocates resources for the functioning of the Safeguards Committee   | <b>3</b> P I |
| 7 - ECOSUR proposes a project to implement safeguards at a local scale  | <b>2</b> P I |

## Timeline and status of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Chile

### Key Actor that changes behaviour:

- government
- civil society
- joint government and civil society

### What the change represents:

- 1 = enabling
- 2 = demonstration
- 3 = institutionalization
- 4 = result from - adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards

### Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative:

- P = process guidelines
- I = principles, criteria, indicators
- \$ = funding
- A = technical advice
- X = exchange

## 2013

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1 - CONAF starts conducting capacity building on safeguards with regional staff                              | <span style="color: orange;">1</span> A |
| 2 - CONAF organizes workshops with stakeholders for inputs on social and environmental aspects of the ENCCRV | <span style="color: red;">2</span> P    |
| 6 - Civil society and regional CONAF agents begin to participate in developing the ENCCRV                    | <span style="color: red;">2</span>      |

## 2014

## 2015

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 3 - CONAF establishes a National Expert team on Social & Environmental Safeguards                     | <span style="color: red;">2</span> P A    |
| 4 - CONAF establishes a civil society expert group to advise on development of ENCCRV                 | <span style="color: orange;">1</span> P A |
| 5 - The Expert Committee on Social & Environmental safeguards begins developing safeguards indicators | <span style="color: red;">2</span> P I    |

## Timeline and status of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Guatemala

### Key Actor that changes behaviour:

- government
- civil society
- joint government and civil society

### What the change represents:

- 1 = enabling
- 2 = demonstration
- 3 = institutionalization
- 4 = result from - adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards

### Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative:

- P = process guidelines
- I = principles, criteria, indicators
- \$ = funding
- A = technical advice
- X = exchange

<b>2012</b>	1 - Government establishes a multi-stakeholder National Safeguards Committee for REDD+	<b>3</b> P \$ A
	2 - Inter-agency coordination ensures draft National REDD+ Strategy and ER-PIN include safeguards	<b>2</b> P A
	5 - Non-governmental stakeholders participate actively in the safeguards process	<b>3</b> P \$ A
	7 - Government, NGOs and donors form a facilitation team for the safeguards process	<b>2</b> P A
	8 - National Safeguards Committee members participate actively in developing safeguards approach	<b>3</b> P I A
<b>2013</b>	3 - Inter-agency coordination includes respect for safeguards in climate change law	<b>3</b> P A
<b>2014</b>	4 - Government finance, gender and Indigenous Peoples agencies participate in national safeguards approach	<b>2</b> P
	6 - Indigenous groups from different regions participate actively in the safeguards process	<b>3</b> P
	9 - National Climate Change Council establishes a team to work on REDD+ safeguards	<b>3</b> P \$ A
<b>2015</b>	10 - Government and civil society transition to a National Multi-sectoral Committee on REDD+ Safeguards	<b>3</b> P
	11 - Forest governance platforms develop first draft of National Safeguard Approach	<b>2</b> I
	12 - National Multi-sectoral Committee and facilitation team involve PINPEP beneficiaries network in safeguards process	<b>3</b> X
	13 - National Multi-sectoral Committee includes gender and Indigenous Peoples issues in safeguards approach	<b>2</b> P I X



## Timeline and status of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Peru

### Key Actor that changes behaviour:

- government
- civil society
- joint government and civil society

### What the change represents:

- 1 = enabling
- 2 = demonstration
- 3 = institutionalization
- 4 = result from - adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards

### Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative:

- P = process guidelines
- I = principles, criteria, indicators
- \$ = funding
- A = technical advice
- X = exchange

<b>2012</b>	12 - CI Peru starts to promote participation of stakeholders in the safeguards process in San Martin	<b>2</b> P I \$ A X
	1 - GORESAM initiates a safeguards process with stakeholder participation	<b>2</b> P I \$ A X
<b>2013</b>	2 - MINAM creates a roadmap to involve stakeholders in the safeguards process	<b>2</b> X
	3 - GORESAM starts to involve Indigenous Peoples in the REDD+ and safeguards process	<b>3</b> P \$
	4 - MINAM began to communicate their approach to safeguards in international fora	<b>1</b> X
	5 - GORESAM starts to present regional safeguards process in national and international events	<b>1</b> X
	6 - GORESAM creates a Technical Advisory Group	<b>3</b> \$ A
	7 - MINAM and GORESAM collaborate with CI Peru develop information materials	<b>1</b> \$ A
<b>2014</b>	11 - GORESAM starts to coordinate its actions on REDD+ and safeguards with the MINAM	<b>2</b> A X
	8 - MINAM starts to involve regional governments in the national safeguards process	<b>3</b> X
	9 - GORESAM officially creates a safeguards committee	<b>3</b> P \$
<b>2015</b>	13 - Regional NGOs participate in safeguards meetings	<b>3</b> P \$
	10 - GORESAM provides stronger facilitation of the safeguards process	<b>3</b> A X

## Timeline and status of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in DRC

### Key Actor that changes behaviour:

- government
- civil society
- joint government and civil society

### What the change represents:

- 1 = enabling
- 2 = demonstration
- 3 = institutionalization
- 4 = result from - adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards

### Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative:

- P = process guidelines
- I = principles, criteria, indicators
- \$ = funding
- A = technical advice
- X = exchange

<b>2010</b>	9 - GTCR creates a SESA Commission	<b>2</b>
	10 - GTCR develops national social and environmental standards for REDD+	<b>2</b> I A
<b>2011</b>	11 - GTCR creates a gender commission that starts to participate in REDD+ and safeguards	<b>2</b>
<b>2012</b>	12 - REPALF starts to participate actively on SESA and REDD+ safeguards	<b>2</b>
	1 - CN-REDD creates a safeguards position	<b>2</b>
<b>2013</b>	2 - GEEC participates actively in REDD+ and safeguards	<b>2</b> X
<b>2014</b>	3 - CN-REDD creates a working group on safeguards (GT5) for Mai Ndombe	<b>2</b> P A
	13 - WWF creates a position to work on REDD+ safeguards	<b>1</b> P A
	14 - GTCR Gender Commission creates a new women's NGO	<b>1</b>
	17 - CN-REDD, WWF, ERA/WWC and GTCR start working together more effectively on safeguards	<b>1</b> P A
<b>2015</b>	4 - CN-REDD starts to actively coordinate GT5	<b>2</b> P \$ A
	5 - FIP creates a safeguards position	<b>1</b>
	6 - Provincial environment ministry participates actively in REDD+ safeguards	<b>3</b> P \$ A
	7 - Local territory & sector officials in Mai Ndombe participate actively in REDD+ safeguards	<b>2</b> P \$ A
	8 - Provincial REDD+ focal point ensures participation of indigenous peoples and local communities	<b>2</b> P \$ A
	15 - GTCR Youth Commission creates a new youth NGO	<b>1</b>
	16 - 32 indigenous and local representatives start to engage on REDD+ and safeguards in Mai Ndombe	<b>2</b> P \$ A
	18 - WWF and CN-REDD develop visual information materials on safeguards including gender	<b>1</b> P A
	19 - GT5 and GT1 participation and communication working group start to collaborate and coordinate	<b>1</b> P A



## Timeline and status of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in East Kalimantan

### Key Actor that changes behaviour:

- government
- civil society
- joint government and civil society

### What the change represents:

- 1 = enabling
- 2 = demonstration
- 3 = institutionalization
- 4 = result from - adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards

### Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative:

- P = process guidelines
- I = principles, criteria, indicators
- \$ = funding
- A = technical advice
- X = exchange

<b>2008</b>	1 - Provincial Government creates multi-stakeholder REDD+ Working Group	<b>3</b>
<b>2009</b>	2 - Government starts to request technical support from NGOs on safeguards	<b>2</b> P I
<b>2010</b>		
<b>2011</b>		
<b>2012</b>	3 - Government publishes a provincial REDD+ Strategy that includes SIS	<b>3</b>
	10 - REDD+ Working Group starts safeguards work and creates a safeguards team	<b>3</b> P \$
	9 - Anti-REDD civil society organisations start to participate more in REDD+	<b>2</b> P I
<b>2013</b>	4 - Government start to seek NGO input for REDD+ planning	<b>1</b> P
	5 - Provincial Forestry Agency creates information system section including for SIS	<b>3</b> P I
<b>2014</b>		
<b>2015</b>	6 - Government decides to provide budget for REDD+ safeguards activities	<b>3</b> P
	7 - Government strengthens safeguards and land rights in new permit process	<b>4</b> P I \$
	8 - Safeguards are being expanded in revision of Provincial REDD+ strategy	<b>2</b> P I

## Timeline and status of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Mato Grosso, Brazil

### Key Actor that changes behaviour:

- government
- civil society
- joint government and civil society

### What the change represents:

- 1 = enabling
- 2 = demonstration
- 3 = institutionalization
- 4 = result from - adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards

### Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative:

- P = process guidelines
- I = principles, criteria, indicators
- \$ = funding
- A = technical advice
- X = exchange

<b>2009</b>	1 - SEMA starts to strengthen existing partnerships and create new ones that support strong safeguards through the FMMC	<b>1</b> P I A
	4 - Organizations that had been antagonistic start to engage constructively on REDD+	<b>2</b> P
<b>2010</b>	2 - SEMA internalizes the process of participation in the elaboration of policies	<b>3</b> P
	5 - Climate Change Forum participates in development of a REDD+ law	<b>3</b>
<b>2011</b>		
<b>2012</b>		
<b>2013</b>	6 - SEMA and ICV create a facilitation team for the safeguards process	<b>2</b> P \$
<b>2014</b>	7 - SEMA and ICV draft a proposal for SIS with support from Imaflora	<b>2</b> \$ A
	8 - Climate Change Forum creates a social and environmental Standards Committee	<b>3</b> P \$ A
	9 - The Standards Committee recognizes failure to engage Indigenous Peoples in construction of indicators	<b>2</b> P I X
	10 - Both government and civil society organizations are participating actively in the safeguards process	<b>3</b> P
	11 - The Standards Committee develops safeguards indicators	<b>2</b> P I
<b>2015</b>	12 - The Standards Committee develops materials to explain safeguards to local stakeholders	<b>1</b> \$
	3 - Brazilian government creates a REDD+ National Council with representative from Mato Grosso	<b>2</b> P I

## Timeline and status of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Nepal

### Key Actor that changes behaviour:

- government
- civil society
- joint government and civil society

### What the change represents:

- 1** = enabling
- 2** = demonstration
- 3** = institutionalization
- 4** = result from - adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards

### Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative:

- P = process guidelines
- I = principles, criteria, indicators
- \$ = funding
- A = technical advice
- X = exchange

<b>2009</b>	9 - CSOs create an informal network to engage on REDD+	<b>1</b> P
<b>2010</b>	1 - RIC decides to develop Nepal-specific indicators for safeguards	<b>2</b> P I \$ A
<b>2011</b>	2 - RWG endorses creation of multi-stakeholder Technical Working Group	<b>3</b> P
	10 - Marginalized groups start to participate actively in REDD+ safeguards process	<b>2</b> P
<b>2012</b>	3 - RIC starts the SESA process	<b>2</b>
	11 - FECOFUN, NEFIN and HIMAWANTI develop materials on REDD+ safeguards	<b>1</b> P
	12 - Local communities start to claim their rights for REDD+	<b>4</b> P
<b>2013</b>	13 - CSOs expand their informal REDD+ network	<b>1</b> P
	14 - FECOFUN establishes Climate Change unit and includes REDD+ in workplan	<b>1</b> P I \$
<b>2014</b>	4 - RIC starts to emphasize safeguards in key REDD+ policy documents	<b>3</b> P
	5 - RIC conducts consultations including on safeguards for National REDD+ Strategy	<b>2</b> P
<b>2015</b>	6 - RIC decides to conduct an assessment of safeguards performance	<b>2</b> P I
	7 - RIC presents Nepal-specific safeguards indicators to RWG	<b>2</b> P I
	8 - RIC starts to develop operational plans for SIS	<b>2</b> P I



## Timeline and status of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Tanzania

### Key Actor that changes behaviour:

- government
- civil society
- joint government and civil society

### What the change represents:

- 1 = enabling
- 2 = demonstration
- 3 = institutionalization
- 4 = result from - adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards

### Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative:

- P = process guidelines
- I = principles, criteria, indicators
- \$ = funding
- A = technical advice
- X = exchange

<b>2010</b>	8 - CSOs demonstrate practical application of safeguards	<b>3</b> I
<b>2011</b>	1 - Government staff take a leading role in facilitating CSA/SIS development	<b>1</b> X
	2 - Government becomes increasingly willing to publically commit to CSA/SIS development	<b>1</b> P I
<b>2012</b>	3 - Government commits to start developing CSA/SIS	<b>2</b> P I
	4 - Government creates a working group on legal, governance and safeguards	<b>3</b>
	5 - Government includes civil society in REDD+ Task Force	<b>3</b> P
	9 - CSOs engage strongly in Tanzania's PCI development	<b>2</b> P I
<b>2013</b>	6 - Zanzibar Government delegates authority for key REDD+ activities to civil society	<b>3</b>
	7 - Key politicians engage in PCI development	<b>2</b> P
	10 - Government and civil society agree on development of a grievance mechanism for REDD+	<b>3</b> P I