

**Indigenous Peoples' Perspectives and Activities in Monitoring,
Reporting, and Indicators Development for REDD+ and A Review of
the MRV Concepts, Tools and Instruments**

Stanley Riamit and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz

Table of contents

List of Abbreviation

1.	INTRODUCTION	6
2.	Indigenous Peoples' Partnership on Forests and Climate Change	6
3.	Engagement with Climate Change Negotiating Processes and National Formations on REDD+	8
4.	Partnership Workshops on MRV and IIFB/Tebebbba Work on Indicators	10
5.	Observations	11
6.	Indicators Development for the Convention on Biological Diversity and for Monitoring and Reporting of REDD+	12
7.	Conclusion	13

SECTION 11: REVIEW OF MRV CONCEPTS, TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS

1.	Introduction	15
2.	Objectives of Study	17
3.	The Place of Forests in Climate Change Mitigation	18
4.	Monitoring / (Measurement), Reporting and Verification (MRVs): The Concepts	20
•	The IPCC Good Practice Guidelines (GPG): MRVs on Mitigation Actions	22
•	REDD+ and Non-Carbon MRV: Social, Environmental and Economic Safeguards	24
3.	Factors Driving the REDD+ MRVs & Safeguards Debate	26
4.	MRV Tools/Standards Reviewed: A Synopsis	30
•	Other Mechanisms with Possible Lessons for REDD+ MRV on Social and Environmental Safeguards	38
•	Summary of Review Outcomes	38

- **Safeguards in REDD+: the UNFCCC, Cancun Agreements_____ 40**
- **Gaps in Current MRVs instruments with regards to Indigenous Peoples and Gender
Concerns_____ 41**

- 5. Components of an Indigenous Peoples and Gender-Sensitive MRV System/Tool_____ 44**

- 6. Conclusions and Recommendation_____ 46**

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATION

BAP	Bali Action plan
COP	Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC
CO2	Carbon Dioxide
CCBS	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard Climate,
CCBA	Community and Biodiversity Alliance,
CFS	CarbonFix Standard
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emissions Reduction
ETS	Emission Trading Scheme
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility of the World Bank
FIP	Forest Investment Program
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent/Consultation
IIPFCC	International Indigenous Peoples' Forum on Climate Change
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPCC-GPG	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change-Good Practice Guidelines
LULUCF	Land use, Land use Change and Forestry
MRR	Monitoring, Reporting, and Reviewing
MRV	Monitoring, Reporting, and Verification
NAMAs	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation

REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD), as well as sustainable management of forests, forest conservation and the enhancement of forest carbon stocks ('+')
PES	Payment for Ecosystem services
R-PP	Readiness Preparation Proposal
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
UN-REDD Programme	United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries
VCS	Voluntary Carbon Standard
VCUs	Voluntary carbon units
VERs	Voluntary Emission Reductions

SECTION 1: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' PARTNERSHIP ON FORESTS AND CLIMATE CHANGE WORK ON REDD+ AND MRV OF REDD+

1. Introduction

The implementation of participatory community monitoring and evaluation of programmes and projects brought into indigenous peoples' communities is a crucial element for ensuring success of such development interventions. As far as the monitoring and evaluation of REDD+ is concerned, at the very outset, indigenous peoples who have been taking part in the climate change negotiations already started discussions on what needs to be done to ensure that measuring, reporting and verification (MRV) will be included as an essential component of REDD+ decisions. It is within this context that Tebtebba, together with its partners in the Indigenous Peoples' Partnership on Forests and Climate Change, decided to undertake some activities around MRV.

This report will present what the Partnership has done so far and ideas on how to move forward in this area of work. The first part of the report will provide the background of the Partnership and its activities related to MRV. The second part will dwell on the results of the examination and analysis done on existing proposals for MRV. The first section is written by Victoria Tauli-Corpuz and the second section by Stanley Riamit.

2. Indigenous Peoples' Partnership on Forests and Climate Change

In 2009 Tebtebba managed to get funding support from the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) to do work on forests and indigenous peoples, particularly on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD). The project consists of education, training and awareness raising and communications; research and documentation; policy advocacy at national and global levels; and piloting of REDD+ activities at the community level. For all these to be done, we decided that we will enter into partnerships with credible indigenous peoples' organizations and federations in several countries. NORAD specifically required that these countries should be those which are considered REDD countries. In 2010 we also received another grant from Climate Land Use Alliance, through ClimateWorks, which allowed us to add two more partners from Latin America.

We invited a few indigenous peoples' organizations and networks whom we have been working with for more than two decades to be our partners and we named this as the Indigenous Peoples' Partnership on Forests and Climate Change. The members are the following;

- Indonesia:
 - a) AMAN (Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara – Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago) around 1,500 community organizations are members of this federation
 - b) ID (Institut Dayakologi) – Research and education institute is based in West Kalimantan

- c) Tanjung, Ketapang District – community in West Kalimantan which is the pilot area.
- Nepal :
 - a) NEFIN (Nepal Federation of Nationalities) – national federation of 59 indigenous peoples in Nepal
 - b) Khasur Village in Lamjung District as the pilot area
- Viet Nam:
 - a) CERDA (Centre of Research and Development in Upland Areas)
 - b) Binh Long Commune, Vo Nhai District – pilot area
- Philippines:
 - a) MRDC (Montanosa Resource and Development Center), Cordillera Administrative Region
 - b) Tinoc Municipality, Ifugao Province – Pilot Area
 - c) SILDAP – SE (Silangang Dapit sa Sidlakang Amihang Mindanao: SILDAP Community Learning Center- South Eastern Mindanao)
 - d) Barangay Manipongol, Maco Municipality, Compostela Valley, South Eastern Mindanao
- Bangladesh;
 - a) Maleya – an indigenous peoples’ NGO working in the Chittagong Hill Tracts.
- Nicaragua:
 - a) CADPI (Centro para la Autonomia y Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indigenas – Center for Indigenous Peoples’ Autonomy and Development)
 - b) Tasba Pri, North Atlantic Autonomous Region (RAAN) pilot area
- Peru:
 - a) CHIRAPAQ (Centro de Culturas Indígenas el Perú)
 - b) FECONAYA (Federacion de Comunidades Nativas de Yanesha)
 - c) Reserva Communal Yanesha, Sector Pampa Hermosas, Junio Siete – pilot area
- Brazil:
 - a) CIR (Conselho Indigena de Roraima)
 - b) Bonfim Municipality (villages: Jacamim, Marupa, Wapam and Agua Boa)
- Mexico:
 - a) SER-Mixe (Servicio de Pueblos Mixes)
 - b) Asamblea Mixe Para Desarrollo Sostenible (ASAM-DES)
 - c) Santiago, Malacatepec, District Mixe, Oaxaca Region – Pilot Area
- Kenya:
 - a) MPIDO (Mainyoto Pastoralists Integrated Development Organization)
 - b) Loita Development Foundation

c) Loita, Narok County – Pilot Area

- Cameroon: a) LELEWAL (Enlightenment)
b) Djoum, Southeastern Forest Zone of Cameroon – Pilot Area
- Global: Tebtebba Foundation (Indigenous Peoples’ International Centre for Policy Research and Education) – Coordinator and Secretariat for the Partnership

The main objectives of this Partnership are mainly to enable indigenous peoples’ organizations and networks to strengthen their capacities to influence climate change and forest-related decisions made at the local, national and global levels to respect indigenous peoples’ rights and knowledge systems and to enhance their communities to mitigate and adapt to climate change. The focus of the work of the Partnership is on REDD+. This is one of the proposed climate change mitigation measures which will have direct impacts on indigenous peoples who dwell or depend on tropical forests in developing countries.

Since the concept, policies and programmes on REDD+ are still being shaped, it makes a lot of sense for us, indigenous peoples, to actively engage with this process for various reasons. One is to ensure that our rights to have access, control and ownership over our forests and forest resources will not be further undermined by REDD+. Another is to generate better respect and recognition of our traditional knowledge and customary forest governance systems. The persistence and use of these knowledge and customary governance systems account for the fact that many of the last remaining tropical forests in the world today are found in indigenous peoples’ traditional territories.

Decisions and actions on monitoring and measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of REDD+ has been one area which we tried to influence during the negotiations. Aside from this we also carried out several activities to make us understand better what MRV of REDD+ means and how to design and implement participatory MRV methods at the national and local levels.

3. Engagement with Climate Change Negotiating Processes and National Formations on REDD+

To enable us to influence decisions, the Partnership has been engaged in the climate change negotiation processes of the UNFCCC, which includes the intersessional meetings and the Conference of Parties. Our involvement ranges from active participation in the International Indigenous Peoples’ Forum on Climate Change (IIPFCC), which is the global caucus of indigenous peoples in climate change negotiations, to being part of official government delegations. We organized side events and press conferences during the UNFCCC sessions to make our issues and concerns more visible.

One of the authors, Tauli-Corpuz, was part of the Philippine Government delegation and she was specifically assigned to negotiate REDD+ since 2010 up to the present. In 2011, she was appointed by the Chair of SBSTA (Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technological Advice) to co-chair with Canada, the SBSTA Working Group on REDD+. The Working Group is the body mandated to discuss the methodological guidance on how the Safeguards for REDD+ can be implemented by Parties. In her capacity as the negotiator for the Philippine Government, she pushed strongly for safeguard provisions

which include the need to respect the rights and knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, mention of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, biodiversity conservation and non-conversion of natural forests into other uses, and good forest governance.

Other colleagues in MPIDO (Joseph Ole Simel, Nanta Mpayei, Soikan Meitiaki) were also made members of the Kenyan delegation and Ibrahim Njobdi of LELEWAL was a member of the Cameroon delegation. As part of the government delegations, they sat in the meetings of the African Group of Countries and also in the meetings of their own delegations. They also sat in the informal negotiating sessions where only Parties are allowed to take part.

The rest of the partners are active members of the IIPFCC and they help develop language proposals on the various areas, e.g. REDD+, adaptation, shared vision, technology transfer, etc. They discuss their proposals to the government negotiators to convince them to champion these.

Because of the presence and active engagement of our partners at the global meetings, all of them were able to make contact with the members of the government delegation from their countries. Their networking with government delegates and the work they do at the local and national levels led to their inclusion in the National multi-stakeholder bodies on climate change or on REDD+. Those who are part of REDD+ formations at the country level are contributing substantially to the discussions and activities because of their knowledge of the climate change issues, including the agreements reached at the UNFCCC, and their concrete work on the ground.

Our partner in Viet Nam (Vo Thi Hienh, CERDA) , for example, heads the Working Group on Benefit Distribution Systems of REDD+ and a member of the Working Group on MRV. Our partner in Nepal (Pasang Dolma Sherpa, NEFIN) is a member of the REDD Cell and is requested to provide inputs on how the MRV system should be set up.

We can say with confidence that we contributed in the inclusion of some of the safeguards which are contained in the UNFCCC decisions in the 2010 Cancun Agreements. These are the provisions on the need to respect the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities by taking into account relevant international obligations, noting the adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities in REDD+; and that REDD+ actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that REDD+ actions are not used for the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of benefits. (FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1, Appendix 1)

We also influenced the decisions on monitoring and reporting. The Cancun Agreements called for a robust and transparent national forest monitoring system for the monitoring and reporting of REDD+ activities and, if appropriate, subnational monitoring and reporting (Paragraph 71.c) and a system for providing information on how the safeguards are being addressed and respected in all the phases of REDD+ (Paragraph 71.d). While our ambition was to get stronger commitments in monitoring, reporting and verification of how these safeguards are going to be implemented, the negotiations around this proved to be tough.

Notwithstanding this weak language, the Partnership continued to pursue activities to discuss further what monitoring and reporting systems should be established which will push governments in REDD+ countries to implement the safeguards properly. An aspect of this work is the development of indicators which can be used for the monitoring and reporting processes.

4. Partnership Workshops on MRV and Tebtebba Work on Indicators

In Tebtebba, we have been doing and continue to do work on indicators related to biodiversity conservation, access and benefit sharing and sustainable use. This is done at global negotiations taking place at the Convention on Biological Diversity and also in the Philippines. We are linking the work we do in the CBD and in the UNFCCC together because forest biodiversity and REDD+ cannot be separated. The extent of the work we did on developing indicators in the CBD and how these are relevant for REDD+ monitoring and reporting purposes, will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

Part of the programme of work of the Partnership is the holding of three workshops amongst us and with other NGOs and other indigenous peoples organizations outside of Partnership. We also invited representatives of intergovernmental organizations like CIFOR and the FAO to some of these activities. The results of these workshops will be briefly summarized below.

The first training workshop was on “Indigenous Peoples and Gender Sensitive MRV ” which was held from April 1-2, 2012 in Bangkok, Thailand. This discussed the results of the Cancun 2010 UNFCCC Conference of Parties which are relevant to MRV of REDD+. Colleagues from RECOFTC and from the Forest Peoples’ Programme were invited to share their work on REDD+ monitoring and reporting. We looked at the initial results of the review of existing MRV concepts, tools and instruments and standards which have been developed by the UN-REDD Programme, Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA), the World Resources Institute, among others. This review process was led by Stanley Kimaren Riamit, the co-author of this report. He analyzed whether these are able to integrate the concerns and perspectives of indigenous peoples.

At this workshop Joji Carino, head of the CBD programme of Tebtebba, shared the work we did on indicators relevant for indigenous peoples for the CBD and for indigenous peoples well-being and sustainability. The Workshop ended with an agreement on what are the core themes or issues for indigenous peoples upon which indicators will be further developed. We also came up with suggestions on how to pursue further the work around MRV of REDD+.

The second workshop was held in Bonn from 11-12 June 2011. Tauli-Corpuz shared the updates on the state of the negotiations of SBSTA around the development of guidance for the information system on safeguards and the modalities for MRV of REDD+. Riamit presented updates in his review of MRV processes . We invited the FAO and CIFOR to share their work and ideas on how to do MRV on REDD+. The partners then shared the work they are doing in their pilot areas in terms of establishing baselines, indicators and methodologies for monitoring and reporting. We concluded with some elements of the draft instrument, particularly principles which will underpin the instrument that reflect indigenous and

gender-sensitivity. We agreed on what we will do to influence development of guidance for the information systems which is still negotiated within the Working Group on REDD+ of SBSTA.

The third one, which was held in Baguio City from 24-26 October 2011, was more a sharing of technical experts in community participatory monitoring and reporting, indicators development, and participatory community mapping. These are meant to help partners in crafting the instrument which they will test in their own communities.

Riamit presented the final draft of his review. He covered the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards (CCBS) of the CCBA, the UN-REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards, World Bank Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA), Plan Vivo Standard, CarbonFix Standard (CFS), Social Carbon Standard, Voluntary Carbon Standards (VCS), Governance Forest Initiative (GFI), and the Convention on Biological Diversity Programme of Work and indicators and monitoring systems.

5. Observations

From these three workshops there are several observations we reached. Some of these are;

- Most of the MRV tools developed, so far, have been developed in anticipation of an agreement reached by the UNFCCC on forest carbon offsets and market-based financing of REDD+. Thus, the focus has been on the measurement of carbon emissions and reductions, reporting and verification of reports and less on monitoring and reporting on social, economic, environmental and governance safeguards or what is generally referred to as non-carbon aspects of REDD+.
- To ensure the success of REDD+ it is crucial that robust, transparent and participatory forest monitoring, measuring and reporting systems should not only address carbon emissions and reductions but also how non-carbon elements like the safeguards, contained the UNFCCC agreements, are being implemented.
- The domains which were identified as important for the development of indicators to be used for monitoring and reporting on REDD+, include the following: 1) land tenure; 2) respect for human rights; 3) full and effective participation, including free, prior and informed consent; 4) customary law on governance systems on ecosystem and natural resource management; 5) traditional knowledge systems and role in forest management; 6) traditional occupations and livelihoods; 7) benefit-sharing and management; 8) conflict resolution and management; 9) gender. These also serve as the criteria upon which we evaluate the existing MRV standards and systems.
- The imperative for us, as indigenous peoples, is to make use of the gains achieved by us, so far, in terms of getting our rights and knowledge recognized in various international instruments, standards and policies. These include, among others, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the ILO Convention No. 169, the recognition of the relevance of the UNDRIP

in the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the policies and principles of engagement on indigenous peoples of various intergovernmental bodies (e.g. World Bank, International Finance Corporation, UNDP, FAO, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, International Fund for Agricultural Development, etc.).

- There is a need to enhance the capacities of indigenous peoples in REDD+ countries to assert their rights and build upon the gains in the work around indicators such as the inclusion of relevant indicators for indigenous peoples in the Convention on Biological Diversity and identification of domains and themes for further indicators development.

6. Indicators Development for the Convention on Biological Diversity and for Monitoring and Reporting of REDD+

Tebtebba was the focal point of the Indigenous International Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) working group on indicators related to the Convention on Biological Diversity. In this capacity, we lobbied the Parties to include indicators relevant to indigenous peoples in the CBD decisions. During the COP 10, there were decisions reached which further affirmed the importance of the indicators agreed upon the COP 9. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (2011-2020) was adopted in COP 10. This Strategic Plan included the possible indicators (UNEP/CBD/AHTEG-SP-Ind/1/2.2011). Some of these reflected what indigenous peoples lobbied hard for in the previous COPs.

Strategic goal E. Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building ;

- Target 18: By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.
- The possible headline indicators identified for Target 18 are
 - 1) Status and trends of linguistic diversity and numbers of speakers of indigenous languages ; (UNESCO was the agency proposed to measure this)
 - 2) Status and trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities and;
 - 3) Status and trends in the practice of traditional occupations

Another decision of COP 10 is the Decision on Sustainable Use. Paragraph 3 calls on Parties, other governments and relevant international and other organizations to:

- (e) Address obstacles and devise solutions to protect and encourage customary sustainable use of biodiversity by indigenous and local communities, for example by incorporating customary sustainable use of biological diversity by indigenous and local communities into national biodiversity strategies, policies and action plans...

The Strategic Goal E and its Target 18 and possible Headline Indicators under the CBD Strategic Plan are highly relevant for the indicators for REDD+. Measuring status and trends on land-use change and land tenure includes natural forest lands converted into agriculture, mining or other land uses. Land tenure remains a major challenge both for REDD+ and the CBD. About 68% of forest in Asia-Pacific and 97.9 % in Africa are still administered by governments, compared to 32% in Latin America. (RRI 2009). Although many of these lands are customarily owned and managed by indigenous peoples, the State still claims statutory ownership over these. Tenure reform is a very slow process in most countries.

The REDD+ Cancun Decisions called on Parties that when they develop national action plans and policies on REDD+, they should address land tenure issues and drivers of deforestation as well as gender considerations (Paragraph 72). A key demand of indigenous peoples' movements in most countries is for states to recognize their rights to lands, territories and resources (Article 26, UNDRIP). It is the violation of this basic right which is also the major source of conflicts between indigenous peoples and the state. It is very important, therefore, to include the monitoring and reporting on how tenure reforms to recognize this rights are taking place in REDD+ countries.

Traditional occupations include occupations of indigenous peoples who are forest-dwellers and who are forest dependent. Linguistic diversity and number of speakers of indigenous languages is related to transmittal of traditional knowledge. Some occupations of indigenous peoples related to forests include healers, ritualists, honey harvesters, shifting or rotational agriculturists, etc. In the Philippines, Tebtebba managed to convince the National Statistics and Coordination Bureau (NSCB) to include traditional occupations in its Philippine Standard Occupation Classification (PSOC).

There is a problem in that there are no agencies which volunteered to do the other two on land-use change and tenure and on practice of traditional occupations. Since the CBD, on its own, cannot do all these, it stands to reason that other UN agencies present themselves as the agencies to support countries in gathering data and monitoring. For instance the ILO can volunteer to measure the indicator on traditional occupation. The FAO can do land-use change and land tenure in traditional territories of indigenous peoples.

Much more needs to be done to ensure that the CBD Strategic Plan gets implemented at the national level. The National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan has to be developed already in many countries. Unfortunately, this is not yet the case. Only a few countries came up with their NBSAPs. In climate change, the Partners have developed key principles and possible indicators which is contained in the 2nd part of this report. They will test some of these in their communities and we will come together again with the Technical Experts in a workshop to refine the indicators. We also need to engage more closely with the governments to convince them to include what we have developed or aspects of these into their information systems on how they are implementing the safeguards for REDD+.

7. Conclusion

The conceptualization and initial work on monitoring and indicators development has been started by the Indigenous Peoples' Partnership on Forests and Climate Change. Three workshops were held to map what has been achieved at the global level and to increase the capacities of the members of the

partnership to understand better the implications of decisions reached at the UNFCCC. These are decisions in REDD+ which are related to safeguards and the need to set up information systems by the Parties to report on how they are addressing and implementing the safeguards. A review of literature of the existing MRV concepts, instruments and tools related to REDD+ has also been done to assess how indigenous and gender-sensitive these are. The partnership has agreed on the components of an indigenous peoples' sensitive and gender-sensitive MRV system or tool. This will be presented in Section 11 of this report. The work that has to be done yet is to refine and identify the headline, primary and sub-indicators for measuring the progress reached by Parties in implementing the REDD+ safeguards as well as doing an MRV of carbon emissions and reductions from the forests.

In the biodiversity front, the work in terms of integrating indigenous peoples' concerns into the indicators and strategic plan of the CBD has started much earlier and some gains are achieved. It makes sense to use the gains achieved by indigenous peoples in this area. There are already efforts done with communities in terms of monitoring the state of biodiversity at local levels. At the global level, indigenous peoples succeeded in integrating strategies, targets and possible indicators relevant to indigenous peoples. The possible headline indicators which will be used to monitor how the CBD Strategic Plan for 2011-2020 is implemented still have to go through another phase, which is identifying the possible primary indicators and sub-indicators. However, the ones which are in place such as the headline indicators on status and trends in linguistic diversity, land-use change and tenure, and traditional occupations can be used for the REDD+ as well.

Section 11:

A Review OF MRV Concepts, Tools and Instruments: An Indigenous Peoples' Perspective ON REDD+ MRVs on Social, Economic and Environmental Safeguards

Stanley Kimaren Riamit

1. Introduction

Climate change is undoubtedly the greatest environmental challenge facing the world in this century, a change mostly attributed to human activities.¹ The extent, both in scale and intensity transcends households, local, national, regional and international boundaries. The impacts of Climate change goes beyond the obvious and direct influence on the physical and economic environment of earth systems, to include social, cultural and political processes. The level of discourse and negotiations as embodied within the UNFCCC framework, the global hype around the topic with a disproportionately slow pace in terms of outputs, attest to this fact. The poorest members of society, the poorest societies, Indigenous Peoples & forest dependent communities are among the most vulnerable groups – mainly people of the land.

Indigenous peoples are not only faced with direct adverse impacts of Climate Change, caused by among other factors extreme weather conditions, changing rainfall, draught, and rising sea-levels, but they also suffer from effects of mitigation measures and actions – which are taken in response to climate change. In a sense, Indigenous Peoples pay a “double negative price” for Climate Change - they suffer from direct adverse climate change impacts, as well as from actions or measures taken to stop climate change from occurring or developing further. Often, mitigation efforts such as forest conservation and carbon offsetting, wind power installations which require waters and lands, turn to Indigenous peoples' lands and waters for this purpose.

In efforts aimed at mitigating negative impacts of climate change, there is recognition that Land use-based emission reduction and carbon uptake mechanisms such REDD Plus can offer relatively inexpensive options. Climate change intervention efforts have therefore centered on cap-and-trade systems under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) with opportunities for offsets in tropical forestry under regulated markets environment.

Under this scenario Carbon markets would pay for the carbon sequestered in forests, thereby giving a commodity value to standing trees. Market-based mechanisms including Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) projects under compliance schemes - a private sector driven initiative - Emissions Trading, Joint Implementation, Voluntary carbon market, REDD+ “demonstration” projects are underway around the world.

¹ <http://www.global-greenhouse-warming.com/IPCC-4th-Report.html>

REDD Plus was born during the Bali Road Map in the 2007 expanded, to include forest conservation and the human-induced increase of forest carbon stocks under the Convention. At its thirteenth session in Bali in December 2007, the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the UNFCCC adopted decision 1/CP.13: Bali Action Plan, and decision 2/CP.13: Reducing emissions from deforestation in developing countries. Several developing countries and donor governments are working with the World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) and UN-REDD program to explore how carbon markets might pay for programs to reduce deforestation and forest degradation.

Concomitantly the growing interest in the likely positive value of REDD+ as mitigation action, are emerging concerns over the possible adverse social, economic and environmental impacts of the scheme. The EU for example, had by the ninth conference of parties held at Milan in 2003 started pushing for the introduction of a set of social and environmental safeguards to be independently verified by designated operational entities with respect to afforestation and reforestation under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). But, the initial concern over this approach following the line of binding international standard was the perceived threat to national sovereignty within developing countries and specific individual country situation. It was eventually agreed that the responsibility for ensuring that social and environmental safeguards are adhered to within CDM projects was left to the host country.

The scope of these social and environmental safeguards were thereafter integrated into the emerging REDD Plus architecture. The preamble to the decision taken by the *Ad hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action in Cancún includes principles and safeguards such as protection of local and indigenous community rights, broad participation within countries, support for adaptation benefits, good governance, poverty reduction, and biodiversity conservation.

Beyond the healthy discussions and negotiations under UNFCCC, civil society has also been proactive in this area, leading to formulation of various tools/ voluntary accounting schemes targeting promotion of Sustainable Management of Forests (SMF); quantification, monitoring, and verification of emission reductions from deforestation and enhancement of carbon removals from the atmosphere; poverty alleviation; and biodiversity conservation, often seeking to promote credible forest carbon projects for the voluntary carbon markets.

In contrast to internationally agreed norms, such standards create uniformity of principles and criteria without challenging host countries' national sovereignty, as their application is strictly voluntary. However, as each standard has its own specific attributes, there is no single consistent and widely accepted frameworks for forest carbon standards that grant real, additional, permanent GHG benefits and that at the same time can —ensure the integrity of existing forests, protect biodiversity and promote a range of other environmental and social values, including respect for indigenous peoples' worldview.

2. Objectives of Study

The objective of this study was to review some of the existing MRV tools on Climate change and REDD Plus that focus on standardizing GHG accounting while ensuring social and environmental performance of projects and to assess their applicability to REDD+ activities on national and subnational levels in the context of indigenous peoples and women. Specifically the study sought to respond to the following questions:

- i. What are the existing MRV concepts and tools already developed and used?
- ii. What are the existing gaps in so far as the integration of indigenous peoples concerns and rights are concerned
- iii. What is the level of participation of IPs in the MRV initiatives?
- iv. What principles, criteria and indicators are relevant for an Indigenous Peoples-sensitive MRV system/tool?

Some of the instruments and standards reviewed include: Climate, Community and Biodiversity (CCB), CCB REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (CCBA REDD+ S&E), CarbonFix Standard (CFS), Plan Vivo Standard, SOCIALCARBON Standard, Voluntary Carbon Standard (VCS), Governance Forest Initiative (GFI), WB-Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA), UN-REDD Programme Social and Environmental Principles & Criteria and Convention on Biological Diversity. In addition, the Copenhagen Accord (COP15) which encouraged developing countries parties to consider issues of measurement and reporting; the REDD Plus Decision of the Cancun Agreement arrived at the UNFCCC Conference of Parties in 2010 Cancun, Mexico were also incorporated in the review.

We draw from the now broadly recognized crucial REDD+ components to develop a set of assessment criteria, against which we evaluate and discuss the major differences among the MRV standards schemes with respect to indigenous peoples. The framework focused on the following key indigenous peoples' substantive issues which were developed through a series of consultative meetings amongst Indigenous Peoples representatives (especially those working in partnership with Tebtebba²): (1) Land tenure, (2) role of indigenous/traditional knowledge in forest management (3) Customary law, Governance and institutions (4) Benefit sharing and management, (4) Effective participation of Indigenous peoples, including FPIC; (5) Conflict management and resolution (6) Respect for human rights 7) Traditional occupations/livelihoods 8) Gender

Our analysis shows that of all the tools reviewed the CCB REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (CCBA REDD+ S&E), treats these eight criteria a little more comprehensively than the rest of the tools and standards.

² Tebtebba is an indigenous peoples' organization and a research, education, policy advocacy and resource center working with indigenous peoples at all levels and arenas, based in the Philippines. Source: <http://www.tebtebba.org>

A number of studies have been published on different aspects of implementation of MRV standards however; little of these studies have focused on the relevance of the standards/tools in addressing safeguards concerns with respect to indigenous peoples and gender. The paper is directed to Indigenous Peoples and local communities interested in safeguarding against the possible negative impacts of climate mitigation action and perhaps project developers who are considering using a standard, either to procure services (e.g., MRV or positive social or environmental performance) or market their projects. Carbon buyers or project sponsors who want to understand the variety of standards proposed to ensure the integrity of forest management or conservation activities and respect for indigenous peoples' rights will also find this information valuable. We conclude with recommendations on key principles for establishment of Indigenous peoples' and gender sensitive MRV tool as an improvement to existing tools.

The ultimate key principles and indicators proposed is hoped, would provide an integrated framework by which indigenous peoples can eventually develop an indigenous peoples and Gender Sensitive MRV on Social and environmental safeguards and thereafter effectively track both whether or not adequate 'safeguards' are being applied in REDD plus projects as well as assess whether REDD projects are actually delivering carbon gains. As such the development of the contemplated tool would in the first instance require a vibrant participatory way of defining 'baselines' in terms of rights and livelihoods as well as ecosystems and carbon and then require a system for monitoring change against the baselines.

2. The Place of Forests in Climate Change Mitigation

According to CBD Secretariat report titled; *Biodiversity and Livelihoods: REDD Plus Benefits (2010)*, more than 1.6 billion people globally have livelihoods directly dependent on forests and over 2,000 groups of indigenous peoples derive their basic needs (food, energy and health) from forest ecosystems. Further, global trade on forest products is valued at USD 300 billion per year.

Competing demands for food, fuel and profit are driving the loss and degradation of the world's remaining forests. Governments, the private sector and citizens in many countries are struggling to manage the conflicts between these priorities while also protecting long term public interests.³ Many of these challenges stem from underlying weaknesses in the way forest resources are governed. Poor forest governance is typically characterized by low levels of transparency, accountability, and participation in decision-making and a lack of capacity and coordination in forest management and administration. These manifest in high levels of corruption, pervasive illegal and unplanned forest conversion and use, and conflicts over forest ownership and access rights. There is widespread agreement that improving governance of forests will be essential in order to manage competing demands on forests fairly and effectively.

Specifically, Forest carbon has the potential to play an important role in climate change mitigation and adaptation. Deforestation rates have been a concern in the environment and development area for many years and a variety of national and international measures have been proposed and established to finance reductions in deforestation. In addition to releasing large fluxes of carbon (and other

³ The Governance of Forests Initiative (GFI) – September 2009. Accessed at: <http://www.wri.org/gfi>

greenhouse gases) to the atmosphere, deforestation is also a main driver of global biodiversity loss and contributes to a range of regional environmental problems including water scarcity, soil degradation, and desertification.⁴ Forest ecosystems that have the ability to adapt to climate change can provide for the livelihoods of forest dependent people and communities who are partners in safeguarding forests and supporting the mitigation of climate change.

In the context of climate change, deforestation and forest degradation account for 15 to 20 per cent of global annual GHG emissions, which is approximately 5.8 Gt of carbon dioxide equivalents per year representing 13 million hectares of forests destroyed or degraded.⁵ Forest carbon payments (e.g. REDD+) – can help to prevent and reverse forest loss; BUT, forest carbon transactions today raise many challenging issues for all the actors. Buyers and sellers for example (indigenous peoples, rural land owners and companies) are likely to be on unequal footing in terms of their financial resources and commercial experience.

Unless properly safeguarded, REDD+ can further impoverish the lives of the poor besides impinging negatively on biodiversity, food security and on national sovereignty. The importance of biodiversity and livelihood aspects, within the design of REDD-plus has also been recognized, at many levels. Achieving these multiple benefits will, require new levels of collaboration among different, actors at national and international levels, including that of indigenous peoples. To achieve the multiple benefits, promotion of ecosystem resiliency through ensuring permanence in REDD plus intervention becomes critical. This is where biodiversity becomes central in providing a pool of future options for reacting and adapting to environmental changes such as climate change.⁶ According to the CBD, the integration of biodiversity and livelihoods into the design of a REDD-plus mechanism has vast potential to result in more stable projects, improve the permanence of carbon stocks, and achieve higher returns on investment, thus fulfilling the interests of all stakeholders.

Therefore, one of the key elements for REDD+ implementation is the development of transparent, comparable, coherent, complete and accurate measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) national systems with respect to Carbon stocks. Beyond this, the question of how to transfer finance, technology, and technical capacity to developing countries in support of measures to protect forest resources while ensuring integration of Social, economic and environmental safeguards is a central debate within the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The UNFCCC COP16 adopted a decision, encouraging developing country Parties to contribute to greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation actions in the forest sector by undertaking REDD-plus. The implementation of REDD-plus activities will take place in three different phases, starting with (i) the development of national strategies or action plans, policies and measures, and capacity-building, followed by (ii) their implementation including technology development and transfer and results-based

⁴ Financing Mechanisms to Reduce Emissions From Deforestation: Issues In Design And Implementation. Katia Karousakis and Jan Corfee-Morlot, OECD www.oecd.org/env/cc/aixg. 2007

⁶ Biodiversity and Livelihoods: REDD Plus Benefits – Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (giz) GmbH. 2011-05-29

demonstration activities and evolving into (iii) results based actions that should be fully measured, reported and verified.

REDD-plus pilot and demonstration activities are currently implemented by several initiatives such as the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), the UN REDD Programme and other Country sponsored bilateral projects. These pilots integrate efforts to include ecological and socio-economic aspects. For example, one of the FCPF objectives is “within the approach to REDD, to test ways to sustain or enhance livelihoods of local communities and to conserve biodiversity.” Thus, one of the selection criteria for FCPF pilot projects is that they “focus on innovative and/or advanced concepts of monitoring, reporting and remote sensing, including for forest degradation, biodiversity protection and *social benefits*.” Priority is therefore given to countries with, “high relevance of forests in the economy of a country including relevance for poverty reduction, the livelihoods of forest-dependent *indigenous peoples* and other forest dwellers”(italics, added for emphasis).⁷

3. Monitoring/Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRVs): The Concepts

The Bali Action plan (BAP) highlighted the importance of “measurable, reportable and verifiable” greenhouse gas mitigation actions and commitments for a Post-2012 climate framework. The kind of language on MRV was introduced to apply both to developed countries’ commitments and actions (paragraph 1(b) of the BAP), as well as to “nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) by developing country Parties in the context of sustainable development, supported and enabled by technology, financing and capacity-building” (paragraph 1(b)(ii)). The GHG mitigation actions and commitments proposed for the post-2012 period vary in terms of scope, legal nature and possibly whether it applies to developed and/or developing countries. With respect to mitigation actions aimed at reducing GHG emissions the following are some of the possible aims of MRV provisions:

- Generating a more timely and comprehensive picture of global/national or sectoral GHG emissions trends⁸ in order for example to assess if global action on GHG mitigation needs to be enhanced;
- collecting qualitative or quantitative information on what GHG mitigation actions different countries are taking, in order for example to provide international recognition for these actions
- Quantifying the GHG impact of such actions (i.e. calculating the difference between performance and baseline)
- identifying promising areas for future GHG mitigation action;
- Building trust, by providing for an MRV system that will confirm that what is actually happening in terms of GHG mitigation actions (and/or support) reflects the actions/commitments that different countries have agreed to.

⁷ *ibid*

⁸ Annex I countries report annually on GHG emission levels, but GHG inventory information from non-Annex I Countries are very patchy and/or out of date

MRV provisions will therefore vary, depending on which of the above aims they are trying to fulfill, though all the aims are potentially valid. The process of carrying out MRV of mitigation actions can also vary with respect to:

Measurement: Accurate emission measurement or monitoring forms the backbone of sectoral targets, as it is needed to assess performance/progress towards a particular target. Similarly, a sectoral target that aims to produce tradable GHG credits would need to allow for MRV in terms of greenhouse gases. Countries could agree to guidelines, rules and/or best practices to be followed when estimating the impacts of measures that mitigate GHG emissions. Agreement will also be needed on whether measurement/monitoring requirements should vary, for example according to type of action. Alternatively, country and action-specific estimation methodologies and processes could be used. There is already a large body of material relating to how to monitor or measure emissions from different sources and sectors – at the project, organization or national level (e.g. IPCC 2006, WRI/WBCSD 2001).

Reporting: While it is not possible to eliminate uncertainties from projections, establishing some sort of “best practices” (or agreed methodology) to estimate emission projections would help increase the comparability of such projections. Countries could agree to a common reporting format, and/or common reporting guidelines outlining how actions are reported, such as which language, what units, what timing, where reports are collated/collected, what should be reported, and/or when reporting should take place. It is generally agreed that the reporting under the UNFCCC would be consistent with the five reporting principles namely: consistency, comparability, transparency, accuracy, and completeness (UNFCCC 2009B) while at the same time being Efficient, Effective and Equitable (the 3Es).

Verification: Parties’ views differ on the role of verification for mitigation actions in non-Annex I countries, in terms of what should be verified (e.g. mitigation actions and/or the results of such actions), how they should be verified, and whether any verification should be undertaken at national or international level. Agreement will be needed on who the verification body or bodies (national and international) is/are; what the verification process should be, how results should be reported, and how to make any needed adjustments in reports of GHG mitigation.

Mitigation actions contemplated include: 1) *national emissions limits*, (in which some experience is already gained), 2) *sector no-lose targets* (binding or non-binding) or *nationally appropriate mitigation actions* (NAMAs) (yet to be implemented)⁹, 3) Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) or other crediting mechanism and 4) domestic policies and measures or other non-crediting approaches (p.9). The types of actions/commitments proposed can also vary from “soft” actions e.g. non-binding to “hard” actions e.g. binding national targets, with each presenting different MRV-related challenges.

National emissions targets (binding or non-binding): Under the Kyoto Protocol, Annex B Countries (highest emitters) adopted national emission targets, and are required to report GHG emissions annually, while non-Annex I Countries do not regularly report their GHG emissions, but rather submit inventory information with national communications. Legally-binding national emissions limits are the

⁹ Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). GHG Mitigation Actions: MRV Issues and Options. Jane Ellis (OECD) AND Sara Moarif (IEA) March 2009

only type quantified GHG emissions currently allocated under the KP. The UNFCCC, KP and the Marrakech Accords include several provisions relating to monitoring, reporting, and reviewing (MRR) national GHG emissions, such as guidance on calculating national inventories; on establishing national inventory systems; on reporting and reviewing of national inventories and on reporting transactions of different GHG units between countries. A country's emissions inventory forms the basis for any MRV provisions relating to a national emissions target and calls for country-specific activity data.

CDM and/or other crediting mechanism: At present, most reporting of emissions is done at either a national level (e.g. using the IPCC inventory guidelines) or at a project level (using agreed CDM methodologies). CDM was established by the Kyoto Protocol as a project-based activity, and has since been extended to include "bundles" and "programmes" of activities. An important insight regarding verification under the CDM is the need for *sufficient capacity*. A lack of trained authors has resulted in a significant bottleneck of projects at the verification stage.

MRVs is therefore one of the key areas of negotiations under the UNFCCC.¹⁰ Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) systems have been recognized to be a key element for an effective REDD+ mechanism as well as an essential component of any post Kyoto agreement. REDD+ as an independent mitigation action from the forest sector, with its own specific rules and modalities, encompassing reducing emissions from deforestation; reducing emissions from forest degradation; Conservation of carbon stocks; Sustainable management of forests; enhancement of carbon stocks is one of the mechanism contributing to the discussions on development of MRV, Social, Environmental and economic safeguards.

The IPCC Good Practice Guidelines (GPG): MRVs on Mitigation Actions

The IPCC methods relevant for REDD+ activities are mainly contained in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (IPCC 2006 GL) and the IPCC Good Practice Guidance for LULUCF (IPCC GPG-LULUCF). The IPCC Good Practice Guidelines (GPG) provides a broadly discussed and recognized framework for International requirements for an MRV system. Ultimately, the outcome of the proposed MRV system is to support countries to develop their National forest GHG Inventory to report on REDD+ activities to the UNFCCC Secretariat.

The Guidelines serve to estimate and report National inventories by dividing GHG emissions and removals into main sectors (groupings of related processes, sources and sinks). Further, each sector comprises individual categories and sub-categories. For example the land use categories includes: forest land, cropland, grassland, wetlands, settlements and other land. Each land use category is then further subdivided into land remaining in that category.

The goal for example in the context of *forest area change* is to deliver spatially explicit trajectories of forest area change (deforestation and re-growth of forests) through use of remote-sensing methods (satellite Land monitoring). While in the areas of *carbon stock change estimation or emission factors*

¹⁰ Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change REDD+ and the Present State of Negotiations

(*carbon per hectare*), the IPCC GPG provides different tiers with respect to the level of detail and accuracy required. A tier therefore represents a level of methodological complexity. At present 3 tiers are provided; with Tier 1 being the basic method, Tier 2 intermediate and Tier 3 most demanding in terms of complexity and data requirements.

For each land use category, carbon stock changes are estimated for all strata or subdivision of land area (e.g. climate zone, ecotype, soil type management regime ...) chosen for land use category. Carbon stock changes within a stratum are estimated by considering carbon cycle processes between the 5 carbon pools: *aboveground biomass, belowground biomass, dead wood, litter and soil organic matter*. Overall, carbon stock changes within a stratum are estimated by adding up changes in all pools (IPCC, 2006). But, estimating and monitoring anthropogenic changes in carbon stocks and non-CO₂ GHG emissions and removals at the project level involve several challenges and specific circumstances, which may not be appropriately captured within GPG developed for national inventories. This may call for application of higher-tier methods at the project level.

Particularly relevant to REDD+ projects are methods provided by the IPCC 2006 GL to estimate the CO₂ emissions and removals on land converted to a new land use category (e.g. forest to other land use categories such as cropland/grassland), which consider the initial change in carbon stocks due to land use conversion, as well as annual increases in biomass due to growth and annual decreases due to losses from harvesting. These standards provide basic methods and best practices required for the design of a robust REDD+ methodologies as a mitigation action. For a project estimating baselines for REDD+ - a baseline shall cover both significant carbon changes in all relevant pools and significant emissions by sources of all GHG that would occur within the project boundary.

The overall aim of the MRV process (on mitigation actions) under the UNFCCC is to develop strong nationally-owned and coordinated forest monitoring systems with competent technical and institutional capacity. This would entail establishment of a national coordination and steering body or advisory board, a national carbon registry; a central carbon monitoring, estimation, reporting and verification authority and forest carbon measurements and monitoring units. The requirements for a national institutional framework for an MRV system are therefore:

- coordination: a high level national coordination and cooperation mechanism to link forest carbon MRV and national policy for REDD+, and specify and oversee roles, responsibilities and co-benefits, and other monitoring efforts
- measurement and monitoring: protocols and technical units for acquiring and analysing data related to forest carbon at national and subnational levels;
- Reporting: a unit responsible for collecting all relevant data in a central data base, for national estimates and international reporting according to IPCC GPG, and uncertainty assessments and improvement plans; and
- verification: an independent framework for verifying the long-term effectiveness of REDD+ actions at different levels and by different actors

Beyond the MRVs on Carbon flows, in the case of fund based mechanisms, monitoring the financial flows, (i.e., how much money is spent and for what) and linking reported emission reductions under REDD+ to mitigation action and verifying that these are additional is also critical. Accurate and consistent monitoring is needed to assess the achievement of any environmental goal under any type of mechanism. Monitoring systems will provide information from which to establish baselines and/or to detect leakage or permanence problems. It considers current capacity for monitoring and the size and nature of the capacity “gap” that would need to be filled to implement a mechanism for REDD Plus. A significant international monitoring framework is already in place under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol (p.20).

But it is also important to mention that REDD+MRV are not only about carbon, but also about Social-cultural issues, governance and benefit sharing. Projects applying robust carbon accounting methodologies and generating clear social and environmental benefits will have better chances of being accepted under regulated carbon markets at both international and national.¹¹

REDD+ and Non-Carbon MRV: Social, Environmental and Economic Safeguards

Reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries has been recognized as a major climate change mitigation tool. But since deforestation and forest degradation so often accompany extreme poverty, particularly among women, indigenous people and forest dependent communities, it has been argued that unless properly safeguarded REDD plus can further impoverish the lives of the poor besides impinging negatively on biodiversity, food security and on national sovereignty. The Cancun Agreement has now addressed these concerns (to some degree) through well designed safeguards.¹² The value attached to the various elements of REDD+ vary according to the scale at which they are being monitored (global, national, local). For instance, carbon and governance are more important for a global scale, but benefits and impacts have more importance at a local level.

The development of the REDD+ mechanism has been one long, contentious but progressive debate as indicated by the evolution of the scope it covers i.e. RED, REDD and REDD+. The debate has been driven by the need to clarify the scope, scale, appropriate financial mechanism, reference emission levels, accountability, participation of various stakeholders and right-holders and benefit sharing. On the *Scope* for example the questions of what types of activities to be accounted for, deforestation and degradation Vs carbon stock enhancement and definition of forest(s) have remained critical. Concerns around *scale* relate to level of accounting and crediting to be recognised in an international agreement, whether they are subnational, national vs. nested approaches.

Financing mechanism: This relates to funding sources and delivery mechanisms (different international funds, carbon market integration, hybrid solutions; governance and institutional arrangement) for

¹¹ Center for International Forest Research (CIFOR). Working Paper 52 (2011). Standards and Methods available for estimating project-level REDD+ carbon benefits. Reference guide for project developers. Manuel estrada

¹² Institute of Green Economy (IGREC) WORKING PAPER IGREC-19:2010; The REDD Safeguards of Cancun by Dr Promode Kant et. al. Website: www.igrec.in

REDD+. One of the considerations here is how to lower the global costs of mitigation, with emphasis being placed on sufficient and long-term financing mechanism. The advantage of a market-based mechanism is argued, is that it is better able to address the challenge of sustainable financing for REDD+ than a fund-based mechanism because it has demonstrated an ability to engage both private and public sector financial resources directly. A market-based financing mechanism for REDD+ is therefore generally espoused over a fund-based mechanism.¹³ In the case of fund-based mechanisms to support capacity building, eligibility criteria and priorities for fund allocation need to be established beforehand so that funds can be disbursed in a cost-effective manner. Alternatively, financial resources could be distributed based on a host country's ability to contribute to low cost emissions reductions.

Reference levels: The harmonisation of accounting methods and the development of comparable baselines and national data on emissions from deforestation is argued to be a necessary starting point for any financial mechanism for REDD+. Criteria and procedures to use for establishing reference; Baselines (or caps) are necessary to assess mitigation performance and provide a means to determine whether emission reductions achieved are additional to what would have occurred anyway. In principal, estimates of past trends of deforestation emissions are required in order to assess whether an emissions baseline is appropriate when assessed against past experience.

Participation of indigenous peoples and local communities: The types and extent of safeguards to be included and appropriate benefit-sharing arrangements are some essential issues that must be addressed. Questions of whether payments are to be made to governments or to forest owners/users for example, abound. Payments for REDD+ (either via a fund- or market-based mechanism) should ideally be made to forest owners/users making the individual land use decisions, so as to compensate them directly for the global carbon benefits they provide. This would provide an incentive to individual forest owner/users to make informed decisions on the land use choices, given full information on the opportunity costs of alternative land uses. Monitoring and institutional capacities in developing countries would determine whether REDD+ payments could be made directly to the governments, or whether international payments could also be made directly to forest landowners and users.

Co-benefits/Multiple benefits: The discourse on benefits has seen relative emphasis being placed on climate benefits with a growing interest on co-benefits, in particular poverty alleviation and sustainable development. A REDD plus mechanism would provide compensation to nations and/or forest owners/users directly, for the global public good benefits provided by the carbon stocks preserved in forest areas. Such a mechanism would serve to internalise at least a portion of the external environmental costs stemming from loss of carbon sequestration and emission of other greenhouse gases deriving from deforestation. The level at which emissions reduction incentives may be devolved however will depend crucially on the monitoring abilities of a particular country and the obtaining relation between individual states and indigenous peoples and local communities. If there is accurate monitoring at the forest owner/user level, then payments could be made directly to these individuals (or communities). Though ex-post payments may disadvantage small-landholders who are poorer, ex-post payments increase the environmental integrity of the mechanism. Payments for REDD Plus (either via a

¹³ Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change REDD+ and the Present State of Negotiations

fund- or market-based mechanism) should ideally be made to forest owners/users making the individual land use decisions, so as to compensate them directly for the global carbon benefits they provide (ibid p.7)

It is also necessary to link up calls for system of information and safeguard implementation to support for capacity building. Such a system of information must be an opportunity to assess capacity and funding gaps. Key capacity building needs are likely to include data availability, measurement and monitoring capacity and technical assistance (e.g., satellite data access; data storage; data analysis/validation; and data dissemination). As expected the costs would be much higher in the absence of reliable data to make informed choices. The purpose of the current institutional infrastructure is to deliver high quality, comparable and consistent data as the basis for international decision-making under the Convention and the Protocol. High quality national GHG inventories are the backbone of the international climate change mitigation regime, providing a means to monitor progress internationally with respect to national obligations laid out in the Convention and the Protocol.

Institution and capacities: good and efficient governance of forest resources at all levels will be central to the success of REDD policies and measures. Unenforced land tenure systems, elite capture, marginalization/exclusion of indigenous peoples, forests dependent communities and women; uncoordinated mechanisms or corruption are often recognized as some of the constraints to be addressed with respect to forest governance translating to the need to establish social and environmental safeguards with strong linkages to pro-poor, gender sensitive outcomes. Current discourse on capacity building focuses on lack of capacity of governments rather than on denial of rights. Governance is mostly related to state institutions and strengthening of central state control over people, and land through law enforcement. Safeguards are “contingent” on good governance for their implementation. Monitoring of governance is very important as this will target: Improvement of national REDD strategies; .Support equitable systems of performance-based payments; assess results of REDD plus activities and more importantly supports implementation of safeguards, accountability and transparency.

Domestic REDD+ debates are shaped by a variety of more or less powerful actors, operating at different scales and embedded among markets, hierarchies, coalitions, networks and the state. The debates are driven by a multitude of interests, strategies and process (p.26).¹⁴

4. Factors Driving the MRV Debate and Safeguards

While REDD-plus is foremost a climate change mitigation strategy, it can also provide significant adaptation benefits for societies and its long-term success will depend on the ability of forest ecosystems to adapt to climate change.¹⁵ This is due to the role of forests in the global carbon cycle, their significant carbon stocks, their contribution to adaptation, and the wide range of ecosystem

¹⁴ Excerpts from: Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) Realising REDD+: National Strategy and Policy options. Edited by Arild Angelsen. 2009

services they provide that are essential for human well-being. Although forest carbon payments such as REDD+ can help to prevent and reverse forest loss, the contemplated forest carbon transactions today raise many challenging issues for all the actors, stakeholders and rights-holders. Key amongst the concerns is the prevailing *power differentiation* among stakeholders and right holders including Indigenous Peoples, States, local communities and other market players often with privileged knowledge. Concerns also abound over the likely negative impacts of REDD+ on biodiversity, food security and on national sovereignty. These concerns are driving the growing calls for proper safeguards measures.

Reference levels: REDD Plus under the Cancun agreement has been clearly oriented towards the achievement of the objectives of the UNFCCC in its Article 2 which is to stabilize the GHG concentration in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system but it has to be achieved in a manner that does not threaten food production and enables economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner {Annex 1, 1(a)}. Key concerns under the reference emission levels discourse is how not to reward high deforestation' by relying on historical baselines; arrive at appreciable interpretation of '*national circumstances*' and that of the principle of '*common but differentiated responsibilities*'.

Economic benefits: this drives many developing country governments with low deforestation rates and high degradation to expand the scope from avoided deforestation to REDD+. It also drives the argument by conservation NGOs because of links to financing protected areas, biodiversity conservation including forest conservation. The factor also drives private sector positions on using systems based on markets and projects and inform positions taken by some local communities and indigenous peoples to engage with REDD+ because of perceived benefits.

Cost efficiency: This is one of the main interests of developed countries and the private sector. Developed countries concerns range from the need to tap into the low-cost abatement potential of REDD+ , the environmental integrity and economic implications of including REDD+ within Mechanisms such as international carbon markets. It drives many developed country governments positions on the use of off-sets and the interest in market-based systems for REDD+, but also avoids transfers beyond actual costs of REDD+. It drives private sector positions on the use of projects-based systems for REDD+, which may be easier than working through government.¹⁶

Environmental integrity: Drives opposition from anti-market NGOs to the use of offsets and market-based systems and drives positions on the scope of REDD+ in relation to sustainable forest management including logging or conversion to plantations.

National sovereignty: Concerns among developing countries with respect to an International REDD+ mechanism vary from the possible negative impact on economic growth and loss of national sovereignty, to being left out of future compensation mechanisms, because of the terms on which they

¹⁶ Excerpts from: Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) Realising REDD+: National Strategy and Policy options. Edited by Arild Angelsen, 2009

will be established. This concern also drives many developing country governments' positions on offsets, scale of safeguards relating to indigenous peoples and development of MRV systems involving third parties verification.

Fairness and social justice: This factor informs the positions of Indigenous Peoples, Local communities and anti-market international NGOs that REDD Plus activities would harm the interest of indigenous people and other forest dependent communities, who depend upon forests for their very survival and hence push for the development of social safeguards and co-benefit approaches in project and programme design. Also drives pro-market NGO positions on the use of social safeguards for co-benefits in REDD+ and anti-market NGO opposition to offsets and market based approaches.

Political positioning and public relations: This interest drives some developed country governments positions on use of offsets and market systems. Also a key impetus for developing country governments' positions on co-benefits and socio-economic development while at the same time positive public relations drives private sector interest in systems to demonstrate co-benefits. Critics in several areas have voiced concerns about potentially large financial flows leading to misuse, corruption, displacement of poor and indigenous people and possible perverse incentives.

The need to address the concerns over *Payment for Ecosystem services (PES)* including *Additionality, Permanency & leakage* have also informed the debate on MRV around REDD+ and social safeguards. Reliable monitoring is necessary to underpin management of emissions from deforestation, baseline development (or target setting) as well as detection of leakage and permanence. Baselines (or caps) are necessary to assess mitigation performance and provide a means to determine whether emission reductions achieved are additional to what would have occurred anyway.

There are large uncertainties to estimate CO₂ fluxes. Direct measurements are extremely difficult and have an inherent variability. In principal, estimates of past trends of deforestation emissions are required in order to assess whether an emissions baseline is appropriate when assessed against past experience. Inevitably, national governments need to have the capacity to monitor and report performance of national-scale activity. At the international level, there will also be a need for capacity to compare, review and assess performance across nations and/or projects. Thus institutional capacity is necessary both internationally and at the national level to implement a mechanism for REDD+.

Leakage refers to deforestation activities that move from one area to another. Given the large potential magnitudes of intra-national leakage, a national baseline would significantly promote the environmental integrity of a mechanism for REDD+. It refers to changes in anthropogenic emissions by GHG sources which occur outside the project or national boundary. Leakage can occur at the intra-national or international (i.e., transnational) level but it is only an issue if emissions fall outside an accounting framework (ibid, 33).

Leakage can also occur over a temporal scale and is referred to as the issue of "*permanence*". Ensuring permanence of emissions reductions is also an issue common to both fund and market-based mechanisms for REDD Plus. There is a risk that the amount of carbon emissions avoided (and paid for) in a period may be reduced if deforestation occurs in the future. Forests may burn, be cut or destroyed by

pests. There is a risk therefore that the amount of carbon emissions avoided (and paid for) in period t may be reduced if deforestation occurs in the future. The term refers to the length of time that carbon will be stored in a carbon sink, in this case in a forest, either as biomass above ground (mostly in trees) or in the soil. A financing mechanism for REDD+ in an environmentally effective and economically efficient manner will need to manage and account for this type of risk. The risk of forest loss will vary depending on location. Risk can be assessed, and measures can be put in place to mitigate and manage risk. Permanence of forest-based carbon storage is therefore pertinent for the success of REDD-plus efforts.

The IPCC defines *permanence* as, “the longevity of a carbon pool and the stability of its stocks, given the management and disturbance environment in which it occurs.” Entering into a REDD-plus related agreement requires forest land owners to commit to a time period to maintain their standing forests and thus the carbon stored within them. Therefore, permanence is directly linked to the stability and resilience of forest ecosystems (Thompson et al., 2009). A recent synthesis report by the CBD strongly supports the conclusion that the capacity of forests to resist change, or recover following a disturbance, is dependent on biodiversity at multiple scales (CBD, 2009b). Therefore, maintaining and restoring biodiversity in forests is an essential insurance policy and safeguard against climate change impacts, and a strategy to minimize the investment risks of REDD-plus.

These considerations amongst others have therefore advanced the debate of MRVs in the context of REDD+ from that entirely focused on Carbon stocks to include consideration of Social, Economic and Environmental safeguards. This has been necessitated by the need to advance the debate from conformity with procedural rights such as consultation to address issues related to more substantive rights (e.g. rights to land; rights of access to forest resources and livelihoods). The necessity to clarify what MRV systems covering social and environmental safeguards entails; the issues and groups of interest (Indigenous peoples, forest dependent communities, poor, local communities); and appropriate institutions to implement the proposed MRVs system is equally central.

In Summary, possible risks associated with REDD+ Include¹⁷:

- Conversion of natural forests to plantations and other uses of low biodiversity value and low resilience
- Loss of traditional territories, displacement, relocation of IPs & forest dependent communities
- Erosion/loss of rights
- Loss of ecological knowledge and Loss of traditional and rural livelihoods
- Social exclusion and elite capture - Corruption & governance concerns
- Loss of/reduced access to forest products important for local livelihoods
- Other benefits of forests trade-off (Multiple functions)

¹⁷ Forest Carbon Partnership and UN-REDD Programme: A Review of Three REDD+ Safeguards Initiatives. Nicholas Moss and Ruth Nussbaum. June 1, 2011

- Human-Wildlife conflict as populations of crop raiding animals benefit from better protected forests

The term “safeguards” therefore refers to the need to protect against social and/or environmental damages or harm, including measures such as policies or procedures, designed to prevent undesirable outcomes of actions or programmes. The approach to application of safeguards is two pronged: (i) address potential risks and impacts by incorporating social and environmental considerations during the design phase of the national REDD+ Strategy and (ii) manage and mitigate risks and impacts at the time of application of the selected REDD+ policies during implementation phase (ibid p.6). Safeguards therefore appear as a combination of minimum standards and best practice guidelines.

5. MRV Tools/Standards Reviewed: A Synopsis

Attempts to address the contentious issues under Climate change mitigation action including REDD+ while taking care of the diverse, overlapping and divergent interests of the multiple stakeholders has given rise to some broad categories of MRV tools and standards namely: 1) Mitigation - Carbon/emission reduction centered MRVs, mostly under the UNFCCC, 2) Environmental safeguards MRVs and Biodiversity or ecosystem approach e.g. CBD, 3) Governance centered tools often addressing cross-cutting issues among stakeholders e.g. Sustainable Management of Forests (SFMs), and 4) MRVs on Social safeguards including those speaking on Indigenous peoples and local communities’ concerns e.g. CCB REDD+ SES; and Financing mechanism centered approaches amongst others. Under this section we provide an overview of some of the MRV tools and standards reviewed under this study.

i) Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

The CBD has three main objectives: the conservation of biodiversity; the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources. These goals overlap with the interests of the global community on REDD+ both as a mitigation and adaptation strategy. The common interests, were re-affirmed through COP decision which underscored that the implementation of REDD-plus activities should include the promotion and support of a number of safeguards, including consistency with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements, consistency with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity ensuring that REDD-plus actions are not used for the conversion of natural forests, addressing the risk of reversals and reducing the displacement of emissions. There is therefore growing convergence amongst forest-related aims of UNFCCC, CBD, and UNFF).¹⁸

Further, the CBD COP decisions calls for parties to enhance the benefits for, and avoid negative impacts on biodiversity from reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries, and other sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use activities, taking into account the need to ensure the full and effective participation of

¹⁸ Biodiversity and Livelihoods: REDD Plus Benefits – Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (giz) GmbH. 2011-05-29

indigenous and local communities in relevant policy-making and implementation processes, where appropriate; and to consider land ownership and land tenure, in accordance with national legislation. (ibid).

The CBD, during its eleven sitting of the Conference of the Parties considered an application for the establishment of relevant safeguards for biodiversity, without pre-empting any future decisions taken under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, based on effective consultation with Parties and their views, and with the participation of indigenous and local communities, so that actions are consistent with the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and avoid negative impacts on and enhance benefits for biodiversity.

In advancing the discussions under REDD+ the CBD views the mechanism as an opportunity to contribute to the objective of allowing ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change. From the perspective of the CBD adaptation approaches that include ecosystem-based adaptation will often be more cost-effective than other adaptation efforts and can provide significant additional social, economic and environmental benefits. As such, ecosystem-based adaptation can achieve multiple benefits for many sectors through a single investment. Ecosystem-based adaptation aims to identify and implement a range of strategies for the management, conservation and restoration of ecosystems to provide services that enable people to adapt to the impacts of climate change. The concept aims to increase the resilience and reduce the vulnerability of ecosystems and people due to climate change.

The poor are often the most directly dependent on ecosystem services and thus benefit from adaptation strategies that maintain those services. Ecosystem-based adaptation can be consistent with community-based approaches to adaptation, can effectively build on local knowledge and needs, and can provide particular consideration to the most vulnerable groups of people, especially women, and to the most vulnerable ecosystems. For the CBD, the secretariat views REDD+ as an opportunity to promote ecosystem resiliency through ensuring permanence in REDD plus intervention. They see the value of forest to conserve biodiversity. Given the objectives of CBD, and the push for adoption of an ecosystem based approach, the connection between Indigenous Peoples to the forest is clearly considered.

II) Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard (CCBS)

Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (CCBS) is a tool developed by the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA).¹⁹ The Standard promotes projects that deliver compelling climate, biodiversity and community benefits. It is based on voluntary standards for multiple-benefits on land-use projects. The standard beyond promoting projects that contribute to net reductions in GHG concentrations, aims at ensuring that “there are net community and biodiversity benefits to a planned project” (ibid).

Meanwhile, Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards (CCBS) endeavors to market a project that complies with climate change mitigation by promoting integrated approach to development. The tool aims at fostering the development and marketing of projects that deliver credible and significant

¹⁹ World Resources Institute (WRI) The Governance of Forests Initiative : An Introduction to the Indicator Framework (Version 1), July 2009 Accessed at <http://www.climate-standards.org>

climate, community and biodiversity benefits in an integrated and sustainable manner. CCB Standards distinguish between obligatory and optional requirements that must be met by the projects, which are divided into general climate impacts, community impacts, and biodiversity impacts. The tool is based on voluntary standards for multiple-benefits on land-use projects.

To earn CCB Standards approval, projects must satisfy all fifteen required criteria ratings. The CCBS is weak on the recognition of indigenous knowledge, FPIC and Indigenous peoples rights with no mention of the UNDRIP. 32 CCBA projects had been successfully certified and 18 further projects are currently in the third-party validation stage by the time of this study.

III) The Governance of Forests Initiative (GFI)

The Governance of Forests Initiative (GFI)²⁰ seeks to bring widely accepted principles of good governance to bear on the challenges of sustaining forests in developing countries. The purpose of the GFI Framework is to provide a common definition and conceptual framework for understanding governance of forests across a variety of developing country contexts, based on widely agreed principles of good governance. The tool defines a set of measurable, reportable and verifiable qualitative indicators of good governance of forests for conducting civil society led assessments of forest governance at the national level. The Framework consists of key “principles” and “components” that are utilized to define good governance of forests. The resulting matrix provides an organizational structure for 94 governance “indicators”, or diagnostic questions that assess the quality and adequacy of a particular aspect of governance relating to one of four major “issues” in the forest sector.

The tool focuses on five principles of good governance namely – *transparency, participation, accountability, coordination and capacity*; each of which is applied to four critical issues/areas in forest governance i.e. forest tenure, land use planning, forest management and forest revenues and economic incentives. The nature of *actors* (government, international institutions, civil society, private sector), *rules* (policy & law-making processes), and *practices* (implementation, administration, monitoring, enforcement) are equally identified as three key governance components influencing the interplay between the principles of governance and the issues of concern. In order to make the tool applicable to the diversity obtaining in specific country contexts, the data/assessment report is complimented with a country’s profile on forests and land use trends, providing key facts and qualitative information relating to forest sector outcomes/outputs.

The focus of these indicators is therefore on *how* decisions are made, rather than *what* decisions are made. The tool attempts to ‘balance the need to be comprehensive and capture the full range of governance considerations against the need to limit the number of indicators for simplicity and manageability’ (GFI, p.5). Each indicator is framed as a diagnostic question, which is broken down into several “elements of quality” that describe the various attributes that must be met to demonstrate good governance. For each diagnostic question, an indicator value of (i) Low, (ii) Low-Medium, (iii) Medium, (iv) Medium-High, or (v) High is possible based on a documented explanation of the extent to which various elements of quality are met.

²⁰ The Governance of Forests Tool Kit

The contemplated assessment process can create a potentially powerful platform to advocate for changes from the local to the national level. National coalitions will develop and influence strategies with the aim of leveraging assessment results to influence major ongoing processes in the country and region; for example, climate change and REDD policy. It is essentially a CSOs oriented tool for advocacy.

Forest tenure indicators calls for representation of Indigenous Peoples, conflict resolution mechanism, recognition of communal and Indigenous peoples' tenure rights, recognition and resolution of community forest tenure claims and participatory community mapping. Lands use planning indicators promotes representation of grassroots interest but fails short of mentioning Indigenous peoples.

Although the tool is fairly elaborate on general issues on participation and inclusivity, there is no mention of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with respect to indigenous peoples. There is no explicit requirement for FPIC under rules governing land use planning and use of indigenous knowledge/technologies in land use planning. Instead the tool calls for 'meaningful' as opposed to FPIC public participation. Further, the guidelines on forest revenues and incentives, aspects of monitoring and benefit sharing are not clear.

On Forest Management indicators there is no mention of Indigenous peoples as community/groups under actors (only as IPs' CSOs), under rules only those protecting biodiversity and forests are monitored but none on Indigenous Peoples' rights. There is also little recognition of customary law.

Under *rules*, there is recognition of indigenous rights over forests land and/or resources, that they have traditionally managed and recognition of collective forest ownership by communities under customary tenure systems. The tool asserts that mere recognition of rights is not sufficient to provide tenure security and requires that rights must be supported and protected under the law which should clearly be stated that rights cannot be taken away or changed unilaterally and provisions made for adequate protection against force eviction, regardless of whether formal rights are held by the evictees.

The need to build capacity to conduct land use planning at the grassroots level though provided in the tool is heavily skewed towards technocratic approaches with little space for bottom up approaches. Another interesting issue that seems to severe the gap between forest and indigenous peoples is the impression that land use planning and mapping are disconnected. This is not supposed to be the case as it is obvious that the two are interconnected. Benefit sharing is focused on national and sub-national but there was no mention on how Indigenous peoples will benefit.

IV) Voluntary Carbon Standards (VCS)

The Voluntary Carbon Standards was initiated by the Climate Group, the International Emissions Trading Association and the World Economic Forum in 2005.²¹ The VCS covers a broad spectrum of AFOLU, including REDD+. It establishes different verification requirements for projects according their size (ranging from micro – under 5000tCO₂-eq per year – to Mega projects - 1mm tco₂ eq per year) Credits verified to the standard are branded as Voluntary carbon units (VCUs). Although the VCS was created as a base for carbon accounting standard, developers have the option of 'tagging' their VCUs with other standards such as the CCB/SOCIALCARBON to provide proof that projects generate co-

²¹ <http://www.v-c-s.org>. (Version, VCS 2007.1)

benefits including enhanced community development and improved biodiversity. Methodologically it is a robust carbon standard in the voluntary market.

V) The Plan Vivo Standards

The standard is administered by the Plan Vivo Foundation.²² Projects admonish a bottom-up approach to increase the number of participating communities and land overtime. The goal is to increase local capacity through knowledge, skills and resources transfer to developing countries. Communities decide which land use activities will best address threats to local ecosystems and are of interest and value. The tool is often used by NGOs managing and monitoring community projects. The Standard accepts a range of land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) projects, including REDD+. Projects are issued a Plan Vivo Certificate with a unique serial code for each tone of carbon dioxide sequestered or reduced. Plan Vivo System is one of the leading standards for the verification of social and environmental benefits (including adaptation) associated to forest carbon project activities.

VI) SOCIALCARBON

The Standard aims at enhancement of social and environmental co-benefits of Carbon offset projects, as well as to increase active participation of stakeholders. The tool is comprised of a set of analytical tools that asses the social, environmental and economic performance of projects. At the base of the methodology is the sustainable livelihood approach, which guarantees that projects reducing GHG emissions can also encompass issues of sustainable development. The Standard is often used in conjunction with another standard such as VCS or the CDM and therefore does not set its own project type, size, location, crediting period, baseline or monitoring methodology. Credits certified to the Standard produce SOCIALCARBON-certified Voluntary Emission Reductions (VERs) and certified Emission Reductions (CERs) (together with CDM), which are assigned a unique serial number to address the risk of double-counting.

VII) REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards

The tool is part of a response to the growing concerns recognizing that beyond the potential of REDD+ to deliver social and environmental co-benefits, there is also serious risks notably for women, indigenous peoples, local communities, and especially the forest-dependent communities. The standard is a response to the growing awareness at both international and national levels of the need for effective social and environmental safeguards, that “aims to define and build support for higher level of social and environmental performance of REDD+ programmes (p.1)²³ The tool is targeted for use by governments, NGOs, financing agencies and other stakeholders to design and implement REDD+ programs that respect the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities and generate significant social and biodiversity co-benefits. The tool is designed to work for the new global REDD+ regime

²² <http://www.planvivo.org> (August 2008)

²³ REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards Version 1 June 2010 (www.climate-standards.org/REDD+)

expected to emerge out of ongoing UNFCCC negotiations, essentially government-led programs implemented at national or state/provincial/regional level and for all forms of fund-based or market-based financing.

The standard consists of principles, criteria and indicators that define the issues of concern and the required levels of social and environmental performance. The principles and criteria are the same across all countries, while the indicators provide for strategies for country-specific interpretation to develop a set of indicators that are tailored to the context of a particular country. An international review processes will ensure consistency across country-specific interpretations. The tool integrates the following eight key principles that are central to indigenous peoples, local communities and gender concerns.

Rights to lands, territories and resources are recognized and respected by the REDD+ program,- calling for identification of right holders and recognition of statutory and customary tenure and provision for FPIC in the context of Indigenous and local communities, including for collective right holders. Also provides for avenues for effective resolution of any disputes over rights to lands, territories and resources. Where ownership of carbon rights is made possible, it should be done possible under both statutory and customary rights.

Benefit Sharing: The benefits of the *REDD+* program are shared equitably among relevant right holders and stakeholders. In this regard, projected costs, potential risks of REDD+ program, are identified for right holders and stakeholders through a participatory process so as to establish transparent, participatory effective and efficient benefit sharing mechanism. This process should be monitored.

Ensuring Security of Livelihoods: the REDD+ program should improve long-term livelihood security and well-being of indigenous peoples and local communities with special attention given to most vulnerable people. That, overall REDD+ program generates additional, positive impacts on long-term livelihood security and well-being. One of the criteria under this principle is the requirement to continually assess positive and negative social, cultural, human rights, environmental and economic impacts of the REDD+ program. The provision for identification of most vulnerable peoples among indigenous peoples and local communities participating in the REDD+ program is also instructive, important especially in addressing gender based marginalization.

Respect for Human rights: The REDD+ program contributes to broader sustainable development, respect and protection of human rights and good governance objectives. The principle demands that REDD+ not only contributes to the objectives of sustainable development but that it also leads to improvement in governance of relevant sectors and contributes to respect and protection of human rights. Land use planning elements of the REDD+ program including recognition of customary rights to land territories and resources are consistent with other land use planning processes.

The REDD+ program *maintains and enhances biodiversity and ecosystem services*

Participation: All relevant right holders and stakeholders *participate fully and effectively* in the REDD+ program. Interesting under the framework of indicators here is the provision for 'a procedure to enable

any interested party to apply to be considered as relevant right holders or stakeholder based on their rights and interests related to the REDD+ program. The need to recognize and respect right holders and stakeholders' own decision-making structures. It calls for effective and equitable representation of marginalized and or vulnerable groups including women and access to sufficient resources to participate fully and effectively.

Information Sharing: All right holders and stakeholders have timely access to appropriate and accurate information to enable informed decision-making and good governance of the REDD+ program.

Respect of Law: The REDD+ program complies with applicable local and national laws and international treaties, conventions and other instruments. Including but not limited to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations Convention on Climate Change, The Convention on Biological diversity, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women and the International Labour Organization Convention 169.

The strength of this tool is that it is the most connected to the UNFCCC processes and targets government-led REDD+ programs thereby increasing chances of acceptability at all levels. An attempt is made to provide an operational and contextual definition of some of the key but contentious terms including right holders, stakeholders, full and effective participation and FPIC, Vulnerable and marginalized groups as distinguished from Indigenous peoples; resources, good governance, livelihoods, equity and equitable, customary and ecosystem services. The standard is more generally one of the few (if not the only one) targeted at providing safeguards to protect the interests of Indigenous peoples, local communities, the marginalized and vulnerable groups, hence the relevance. In 2010 and 2011 pilot projects are being tested in Nepal, Ecuador, and Tanzania. This is perhaps the most integrated of tools reviewed - with respectable provision relating to Indigenous peoples. Overall the tool privileges the local voice.

VIII) The UN-REDD and Safeguards

The aim of the UN-REDD Programme Social and Environmental Principles & Criteria is to enhance the multiple benefits of, and reduce risks from REDD+. It draws from the broad guidance provided by the Cancun agreement on safeguards for REDD+. The standard is the product of a joint consultation with UNDP, UNEP and FAO with input from expert reviewers on rights, forest & climate change, and national practitioners. The principles and criteria contained in the standard apply to the design, planning and implementation of national REDD+ programmes. The UN-REDD programme considers application of human-rights based approaches to its programming as a 'responsibility' and feeds into the UN-REDD country preparedness processes consistent with international conventions, treaties and declarations such as CBD, CEDAW, ILO No. 169, UNAC(United Nations Convention Against Corruption, UNDRIP, MDGs & UNCERD).

The principle and criteria is supported by the Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool guide the UN support and assess programme delivery. The Key Principles include

- Upholding norms of democratic governance - including accountability and legitimacy of participating bodies, accessibility of all information, full and effective participation including that of indigenous peoples and adherence to rule of law and access to justice.
- Respect and protection of rights – whether statutory, customary and or collective rights, including right to equitable land tenure and carbon rights by indigenous peoples, gender equality and equity; FPIC of Indigenous peoples, no involuntary resettlement, respect and protection of traditional knowledge and cultural heritage.
- Promotion and enhancement of forests to sustainable livelihoods including transparent and equitable benefit sharing and minimizing adverse impacts on stakeholders’ livelihoods

On the UN-REDD Guidelines, the interesting aspect this standard is on FPIC. The issue on FPIC is really a strong issue as this entail the question on who should be consulted, how is it going to be done and for whom? Given these questions, still, UN-REDD is visible in doing consultations with IPs. This practice of UN-REDD has made Forest Investment Program (FIP)²⁴ to observe FPIC.

x) Forest Carbon Partnership Facility: WB-Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA)

The World Bank’s Safeguard policies are designed to avoid, mitigate or minimize adverse environmental and social impacts of projects supported by the Bank. The Bank’s policies on Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04), Forests (OP/BP 4.36), Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12), and Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10) are the most relevant policies with respect to REDD+ safeguards. The limitation inherent in these policies in their application to the REDD+ safeguards mechanism is the fact that they were designed with ‘project-based lending in mind rather than strategic planning processes’ (ibid p.7).²⁵

In response to this challenge the Bank has established safeguards standards for the REDD+ “Readiness” phase – the Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA). SESA incorporates environmental and social concerns into national REDD plus strategy processes and ensures that the FCPF readiness activities comply with the Bank’s policies at the strategic planning phase. The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) - an output of SESA – is a framework to avoid and/or mitigate and manage potential risks of the REDD+ strategy options related to the adoption of future REDD+ projects, activities and policies.

The strength of SESA for REDD+ is that it combines analytical and participatory approaches in an iterative fashion throughout the preparation of the R-PP and R- Package. It aims to integrate key environmental and social considerations relevant to REDD+ at the earliest stage of decision making, establishing inter-linkages with economic, political, and institutional factors.

²⁴ Forest Investment Program (FIP) is a program within the Strategic Climate Fund (a multi-donor Trust Fund within the Climate Investment Funds). The FIP's overall objective is to mobilize significantly increased funds to reduce deforestation and forest degradation and to promote sustainable forest management, leading to emission reductions and the protection of carbon terrestrial sinks.

²⁵ <http://go.worldbank.org/WTA1ODE7T0>

The Bank's policy on indigenous people aims to ensure that the development process fully respects the dignity, human rights, economies, and cultures of indigenous peoples, including calling for recipient country to engage in a process of free, prior, and informed consultation, making access to the Bank's financing contingent upon broad community support and participation arising from free, prior, and informed consultation. The policy also includes measures to avoid potentially adverse effects on the indigenous peoples' communities; minimize, mitigate and/or compensate for such effects where avoidance is not feasible and finally ensure the indigenous peoples received social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate and gender and inter-generationally inclusive (ibid)

Other Mechanisms with Possible Lessons for REDD+ MRV on Social and Environmental Safeguards

In addition to the MRV and Social, Environmental and Economic standards reviewed, it's important to appreciate that, there are other instruments, programs and/legislation from which valuable lessons could be drawn to inform the development of Social and environmental safeguards.

- The *Environmental Sustainability Index (ESI)* of the World Economic forum which includes indicators of environmental governance
- *The Wellbeing of Nations* an IDRCR/IUCN production which includes a survey of 180 countries that combines measures of environmental conditions with measures of respect for human rights.
- Human Development Report prepared by UNDP which also incorporates indicators of governance
- *Measuring access: performance on environmental governance (UNDP/UNEP/WRI)* - a framework of indicators that measure a country's progress toward implementation of the access principles articulated in Principle 10 of the 1992 Rio Declaration; highlighting the fact that good environmental governance embodies not only environmental sustainability, but also human rights, political freedoms and transparency.
- *Draft American Clean Energy and Security Act (ACES)* of 2009 – in which rights and interests of forest-dependent communities, indigenous peoples, and vulnerable social groups; full participation; governance and enforceability; sharing of profits and benefits are addressed.

Summary of the Review Outcomes

While strengths were appreciated in each of the MRV tools/standards reviewed, certain gaps/weaknesses were noted with respect of Indigenous people's issues indicating the need for indigenous peoples and local communities to remain vigilant in seeking ways to contribute to the improvement of the standards. Not surprisingly, safeguards have different meaning to different groups (government, donors, financiers and investors, multilateral institutions, indigenous peoples and forest dependent communities, the private sector and civil society) and benefits too.

Indicative Summary of Assessment²⁶

	Land tenure	Human rights	IK	Customary Governance	FPIC	Conflict Resolution	Benefit Sharing
GFI		*☆	☆	v*	x	☆	v*
Voluntary C							
CCBS	☆			☆	x	☆	
Plan Vivo	☆			☆		☆	
UN-REDD			☆	☆	☆		☆
CBD		☆	☆	☆	☆		☆
Socialcarbon		☆					☆
REDD+ SES	☆ ☆	☆ ☆	☆	☆	☆☆	☆☆	☆
WB - SESA		☆					☆

Safeguards in REDD+: THE UNFCCC, Cancun Agreements

²⁶ The Governance of Forests Initiative (GFI) – September 2009. Accessed at: <http://www.wri.org/gfi>; Biodiversity and Livelihoods: REDD Plus Benefits – Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (giz) GmbH. 2011-05-29; World Resources Institute (WRI) The Governance of Forests Initiative : An Introduction to the Indicator Framework (Version 1), July 2009 Accessed at <http://www.climate-standards.org>; <http://www.v-c-s.org>. (Version, VCS 2007.1); <http://www.planvivo.org> (August 2008)

The REDD Plus Decision of the Cancun Agreement arrived at the UNFCCC Conference of Parties in 2010 requests developing country Parties to develop a robust and transparent national forest monitoring system for the monitoring and reporting of REDD Plus activities including subnational monitoring and reporting as an interim measure (Para. 70 c) with no provisions for the verification aspect.

On safeguards, some developing country Parties resisted the move to use the phrases like monitoring and reporting, with the ultimate outcome being the development of a system for providing information on how the safeguards referred to in Annex 1 of the REDD Plus Decision are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of the REDD Plus activities (Para. 70 d). These safeguards which should be promoted and supported are contained in Annex 1 of the Cancun Agreement (Para. 2 sub-paras a to g).

Paragraph 72 of the Decision also says that when developing country Parties are developing and implementing their national REDD Plus strategies and action plans they should address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, land tenure issues, forest governance issues, gender considerations and the safeguards contained in Annex 1. The Cancun Agreements therefore recognizes 5 key principles of interest to Indigenous Peoples namely; integration of a *human rights* approach (at the preamble) in all climate change intervention efforts with specific reference to the United Nations Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) Annex I (2) and art. 87; *effective participation* of Indigenous Peoples (shared vision para, 7 & para. 69); recognition and respect for *traditional and indigenous knowledge* (para,12); *security of land tenure* (para. 69) and *multiple functions of forests* and other ecosystems. Overall the Cancun agreement includes four key elements that form the basis for the safeguard information system.²⁷

Information System – Paragraph 71(d) requests developing Countries undertaking REDD+ actions to develop a system for providing information on safeguards. The intent is to ensure that information is not merely provided on an ad-hoc basis. A system has to build on a defined structure that will enable the regular provision of information.

Respect – Paragraph 71 (d) also requires that the information provided should demonstrate that the safeguards are addressed and *respected* throughout the implementation of the activities, while paragraph 69 affirms that REDD+ activities should be carried out in *accordance with* the safeguards. The intent of this agreed language is to ensure that the safeguards will be implemented and respected throughout. Thus the Safeguard Information System (SIS) should describe actions taken to address the safeguards and to assess outcome of these actions – i.e. the extent to which the safeguards are being adhered to in practice.

Support – Paragraph 69 and paragraph 2 of Appendix I provides that the safeguards should be promoted and *supported*. Further, paragraph 71 provides that support should be adequate and predictable. The intent is to ensure that developed countries will provide adequate and predictable support for REDD+

²⁷A contribution of NGOs participating in Bonn, June 2011, describing the key elements relevant to safeguard information system (SIS) as contained in the Cancun agreement.

actions, including implementation of the safeguards, and the SIS. In this context, it should be noted that support provided through the Green Climate Fund will also be subject to specific environment and social safeguards.²⁸

Participation: Paragraph 72 requests developing country parties to ensure *the full and effective participation* of relevant stakeholders when addressing the safeguards. This includes participation in the SIS. The system should therefore be designed in a way that ensures input and participation of indigenous peoples, local communities and other stakeholders in a gender equitable manner throughout the process, and on different levels (local, national and international). This could potentially link to the establishing of conflict resolution mechanisms at various levels. This safeguard on information system is quite relevant because it implies that complete information must be gathered especially from the ground. Hence, we should look into all aspect of information to create the baseline.

Gaps in Current MRVs instruments with regards to Indigenous Peoples and Gender Concerns

The current MRVs tools and standards in the public domains focuses on climate change dynamics at the Global and National level and least on local communities. It therefore over relies on State Parties under the UNFCCC as the organ of both negotiation and eventual implementation of mitigation and adaptation activities. In situations for instance where the state is seen as less supportive (which is often the case) to the course of indigenous peoples, climate change intervention mechanisms such as REDD+ may worsen the human and economic rights violation of indigenous peoples, local communities and women. In this respect the FCPF/FIP and UN-REDD+ deliberate efforts to safeguard some aspects of indigenous peoples' concerns - participation and benefit sharing - is therefore a step in the right direction.

Secondly, most of the tools and/or standards reviewed place great emphasis on developing MRV standards on Carbon stock and less on non-carbon (social, economic and environmental safeguards). This trend might be informed by the overriding goal of Climate change mitigation through emission reductions, under the UNFCCC. But, as recognized under the Cancun agreement, forests especially in the context of Indigenous peoples and local communities are not just about carbon. There are multiple functions of forests including: spiritual, social-cultural and water access. It is also evident that governance, livelihood and ecosystem services issues are now emerging as requisite elements of REDD+ MRV systems, otherwise referred to as social, economic and environmental safeguards.

The development of these tools, standards and the methodologists (measurements/monitoring, reviewing and reporting) adopted is guided by 'expert' meetings and technical agencies often informed by Scientific research with little recognition and input of both Indigenous peoples and Indigenous Knowledge. And, while development of these methodologies is essential to address the challenges associated to the uncertainties of carbon fluxes, enhance accountability in carbon-market transactions, eliminate/minimize resource wastage, the role of indigenous peoples in making this goal a reality and their current capacity in this technical dynamics needs to be addressed. Indigenous peoples' mitigation measures should be included in the MRV processes in undertaking REDD+ activities and Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs).

²⁸ Decision 1/CP.16, Appendix III, para. 1(h)

Additionally, emphasis is also placed on the nature of the financial architecture required at the international level deemed necessary to deliver the goals of mitigation and to facilitate the transfer of payments from developed countries to developing countries (state parties) for emission reductions. But, the delivery of emission reductions will take place at the local level and issues of governance, livelihoods and benefit sharing are of critical concern. Deliberate efforts should therefore be made to transfer finance, technology, and technical capacity to Indigenous peoples and Women in support of measures to protect forest resources.

It is equally important to note that REDD+ activities to date, are focused on readiness activities (establishing reference emission levels, historical trends, understanding the drivers of deforestation, policy and legal environment amongst others) and the technical issues surrounding the measurement of actual and lasting emissions reductions. There is therefore very little to learn from actual practice/project implementation on the ground, except for a few REDD+ pilot project areas. These accords climate change mitigation and adaptation actors an opportunity to develop and share MRV and safeguards tools in readiness for full implementation of REDD+.

The World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Charter, for example, provides for safeguard policies in recognition of the special circumstances of the world's indigenous peoples, including the adoption of new rules recognizing the need to respect the rights of indigenous peoples and forest dwellers, in accordance with applicable international obligations. Furthermore, the Bank has also made a small fund available to support indigenous and local participation in the REDD+ planning activities under the Forest Investment Program (FIP).²⁹ The same provisions can also be seen in the UN-REDD mechanism. Beyond simply making provision for indigenous peoples' participation in the intervention mechanism, the UN-REDD more importantly requires participating countries to respect the provision for indigenous peoples' full and effective participation, including Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC).

REDD+ policies should therefore provide sufficient incentives and minimize negative social impacts, and promote structures of service delivery and payments geared towards sustainable development and poverty reduction outcomes. Since reducing deforestation can also deliver a range of other sustainability benefits from biodiversity to water conservation, among others, attention should be made to ensure that a mechanism for REDD+ does not create perverse incentives in these other areas.

Indigenous peoples exchange visits (Tebtebba partners) and the sharing at the global level under the International Indigenous Peoples Forum on Climate Change (IIPFCC) has demonstrated growing concerted effort by indigenous peoples groups and communities to initiate and follow through the development of Social, economic and environmental safeguards with an Indigenous peoples' perspectives. Indigenous peoples groups in Nepal, Vietnam and Indonesia for example are in advance stages of developing MRVs on social safeguards, essentially through self-determination. The REDD+ discourse appears to have granted indigenous peoples an opportunity to address long-standing rights, land tenure and livelihoods issues.

²⁹ Forest Peoples Program Oct. 2009.

6. Components of an Indigenous Peoples and Gender-Sensitive MRV System/Tool

Key Principles and Indicators

For an Indigenous Peoples' sensitive approach, it is clear that a human rights and ecosystem based approach are the frameworks that must be integrated in order to achieve a multiple benefit approach with minimal perverse incentives.

PRINCIPLES	Criteria/indicator
1. Overarching human rights approach to all intervention	The implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples' in addition to other relevant international treaties and conventions is key to delivering benefits from REDD-plus to indigenous peoples, local communities and women while reducing potential threats.
2. Recognition and integration of collective rights	Recognition and protection of Territorial rights, autonomy, self-representation, exercise of customary law, non-discrimination and customary Land Use principles is also essential
3. Customary institutions	Elements of local and traditional customary governance structures could also serve as a blueprint for benefit sharing in terms of mechanisms for REDD-plus financing. Local and traditional knowledge could also support forest law enforcement and governance through traditional governance systems, and through local reporting on infringements.
4. Ecosystem and Livelihoods	Multiple-benefits approach
5. Indigenous /traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities includes innovations, practices, knowledge, technologies, institutions and adaptation skills in relation to their environment.	<p>Traditional knowledge can be an excellent and cost-effective means of ground-truthing, as part of monitoring, verification and reporting efforts.</p> <p>Traditional knowledge can also be an element of early warning systems for threshold degradation levels,</p> <p>This long-term memory of forest aspects can contribute valuable recommendations for forest restoration: what species might work best in the long term, and which natural vegetation existed on degraded lands</p> <p>Traditional knowledge can also support communication with local and indigenous stakeholders, through traditional</p>

	<p>communication networks and channels</p> <p>Indigenous knowledge must find space in the adaptation and mitigation.</p>
6. Full and effective participation and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) ³⁰	<p>Collective decision-making on matters that affects Indigenous Peoples on basis of their right to self-determination and to cultural integrity.</p> <p>Space for Indigenous peoples to exercise their own decision making processes, including the right to say NO, and or to set their terms and conditions for partnership with other entities</p> <p>FPIC as a substantive mechanism to ensure the respect of indigenous peoples' collective rights undertaken in good faith to ensure mutual respect & participation</p> <p>FPIC defines the relationship of IPs to outside entities wanting to do an activity/ project in their territory, or action that has potential adverse impacts such as the utilization, management, extraction and development of their resources</p>
7. Benefit Sharing	<p>The REDD payments must not only be adequate but must also reflect the realities of cost of REDD plus to different stakeholders and right holders, and the need to ensure that the compensation reaches them adequately and in time, if the program is to succeed beyond the mere infusion of money from outside.</p> <p>Awarding those who participate in forest conservation sustainable management as opposed to paying for a damage not done. Monitoring financial flows to IPs</p> <p>Secure tenure and enforcement to minimize elite capture, marginalization of stakeholders, and corruption</p>
8. Conflict management and	Recognition and integration of role of customary

³⁰ Articles of the UNDRIP of FPIC - Article 10: related to the right to land and territory; Article 11, No.2: related to the right to culture and religion; Article 19: related to self-governance and the formulation of laws and policies affecting IPs; Article 28, no 1: right to land and to redress; Article 29, no.2: right to territory and security from hazardous materials; Article 32, no.2" right to land and resources The International Labour Organization: Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) and

resolution	institutions in conflict management and resolution
------------	--

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

There are several MRVs voluntary standards in use. Each standard has its own specific attributes, there is no single consistent and widely accepted framework for MRV on forest carbon standards that grant real, additional, permanent GHG benefits and that at the same time can ensure the integrity of existing forests, protect biodiversity and promote a range of other environmental and social values.

The most robust of the MRVs tools reviewed with respect to Indigenous peoples and Gender on social, economic and environmental safeguards is the REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards initiative which aims at building support for government-led REDD+ programs that make a significant contribution to human rights, poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation with a specific focus on indigenous peoples and local communities developed by the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) and CARE International. This tool is argued would provide a starting point upon which to integrate any emerging and missing IPs issues.

Indigenous and local communities are critical right-holders in the maintenance of forest ecosystems and in supporting the permanence of REDD-plus efforts through MRVs on Carbon and non-carbon aspects. Integrating them in any REDD-plus design and implementation as equal partners is a prerequisite for success. It will activate vital local knowledge, strengthen ownership and build essential local support and localize benefits.

While there is a clear requirement for the government to provide national system of information and the need to abide by international obligations, it is still vital to develop indigenous peoples' sensitive MRVs on social safeguards. An Indigenous peoples sensitive MRV instrument would serve to assess the extent of respect of safeguards in IP lands and territories and will feed in into "feedback loop mechanisms (FPIC, recourse mechanisms), national reports, biannual reports and financing institutions. Indigenous peoples-sensitive MRV system would not substitute National systems of information but would bring information retrieval/MRV down to the level that is closer to IP sovereign space and culturally appropriate. Such an instrument would also contribute to the need to prevent the likelihood of governments cherry-picking on the implementation of safeguards besides ensuring an effectively participatory process.

Indigenous peoples, local communities and women must therefore effectively participate in the development and implementation of REDD+ MRVs on social and environmental safeguards to ensure their continued access to resources, secure and expand their space for participation at all levels and develop feedback mechanism sensitive to Indigenous peoples.

Recommendation

Indigenous peoples must continue to engage with the UNFCCC negotiations processes and debates on current safeguard's under the Cancun Agreement. Special attention should be given to the discussion on operationalization of the Cancun agreements under the SBSTA guidelines and methodologies (REDD+). The discussion also under the AWG-LCA on impacts of response measures is another critical

In order for the Indigenous and Gender sensitive MRVs and safeguard tool under development to be considered by other players in the climate change discourse and praxis, Indigenous peoples need to strengthen their dialogue with Bilateral, Multilateral bodies and Environmental NGOs (UN-REDD, WB, FAO), donors and private sector investors to increase the possibility of its acceptance.

Thirdly, it is evident that the individual States within which Indigenous peoples find themselves in will exert the greatest and direct impact as implementers of REDD+ projects at the national and community level. Indigenous peoples' communities should therefore lobby for the integration of the safeguards standards so developed into national (country specific) REDD+ Strategy policies and National safeguards mechanism of Climate change. Of particular concern is how to overcome the rhetoric of national sovereignty, as a possible escape route for states in respecting safeguards measures. Related to this point is the need to establish recourse/grievance mechanism existing Human rights instruments and mechanism, International obligations.

But, perhaps the first initial challenge with respect to an indigenous peoples' sensitive MRV tool is building consensus and popularizing it amongst the various indigenous peoples' communities at the community and project level. Efforts should be initiated to allow for enrichment from other safeguards processes/efforts across Indigenous peoples' regions, e.g. FPIC processes in Indonesia. Finally, piloting implementation at the community and/or project level should contribute towards improvement and eventual popularization of the standard.

Proposed criteria for the Safeguards Information System³¹

Since the exact form of the SIS will vary from country to country, an initial step in the SBSTA process could be the consideration of broad, over-arching criteria that can be further developed and made operational in the course of the process. Further, it could be helpful to frame an approach to developing the SIS in terms of: *what* information to provide; *how* to provide that information; and *who* to provide the information; and who should be involved in providing that information.

The following describes criteria that we consider should form the basis of the SIS.

Complete - completeness is needed in any credible information system and to ensure the system contains in one place the information necessary to understand how safeguards are being addressed and respected. The SIS should include information about each of the safeguards, and be applicable at all levels of decision-making and feed into an international reporting system. The SIS should provide information on actions taken to address the safeguards, the outcomes of these actions and how the safeguard are being respected to ensure consistency with the Cancun Agreement.

Participation: The SIS should be designed with the participation of all relevant stakeholders including indigenous peoples and local communities and considering gender equity, as well as experts, when determining the type information to be collected, the relevant indicators, and the methodology for collecting it. This will help ensure broad stakeholder engagement ‘on the ground’ and confidence in the information system.

Milestones: The SIS should consider implementation of the safeguards cross all three phases of REDD+, incorporating milestones for determining progress, which would inform the provision of finance and enable progression from one phase to the next. This will help to ensure that measures for implementation of the safeguards are prioritised.

Reliability and integrity: In order to ensure the information is reliable and the system has integrity, the SIS should include independent verification and assessment of the information, with stakeholder participation in the process.

Review and Analysis: The SIS should include domestic multi-stakeholder review and analyses of how the safeguards are being respected, including by indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as by expert and scientific communities, to ensure the completeness, accuracy and reliability of the information

Feedback: The SIS should be designed to facilitate continual improvement of REDD+ implementation as this will ensure confidence is maintained overtime.

³¹ A contribution of NGOs participating in Bonn, June 2011, describing the key elements relevant to safeguard information system (SIS) as contained in the Cancun agreement

Existing systems – with cost effectiveness and practicality in mind, SIS should draw on and build on existing data sets and processes. This avoids duplicating efforts.

Range of sources – To ensure reliability of the information and quality of the reporting, information should be collected from a range of sources including indigenous peoples and local communities, academic institutions, independent experts, private sector, dispute resolution mechanism and existing process

References:

¹ Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). GHG Mitigation Actions:MRV Issues and Options. Jane Ellis (OECD) AND Sara Moarif (IEA) March 2009

Programmatic Project for the Payment for Environmental Services Mitigation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions through Avoided Deforestation of Tropical Rainforests on Privately-owned Lands in High Conservation Value Areas of Costa Rica, March 2009; <http://www.climate-standards.org/standards/>

The Stern Review, The Eliasch Review, and research by McKinsey and Company; © 2010 Forest Trends and the Katoomba Group. Contracting for Forest Carbon: Elements of a Model Forest Carbon Purchase Agreement

World Resources Institute (WRI) The Governance of Forests Initiative : An Introduction to the Indicator Framework (Version 1), July 2009

UN-REDD Programme – June 2009; CCBA. 2005. Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (First Edition). CCBA, Washington DC. May 2005. At: www.climate-standards.org

UN-REDD Event at the Climate Change Talks in Bonn (<http://www.fao.org/climatechange/unredd/62159/en/>)

IPCC Good Practice Guidance and Uncertainty Management in National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. <http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gp/english/index.html>

Defining National Reference Emission Levels: MRV Meeting with UN-REDD Countries and GEO-FACT National Demonstrator “Measurement Reporting and Verification”, Guadalajara-Mexico, 22-24 June 2010 by Ruandah Agung Sugardiman

¹ Country experience Ecuadorian Strategy to REDD+ Measurement Reporting and Verification Joint Workshop: by during *UN-REDD MRV Session Zapopan, Jalisco, México; 23rd June 2010*

Reflection on Reference Emission Levels Measurement Reporting and Verification Joint Workshop; Presented by : Gerald J. Kamwenda-Tanzania during *UN-REDD MRV Session at Zapopan, Jalisco, México 23rd June 2010*

Measurement, Verification and Reporting Joint Workshop: *Building a GEO Forest Carbon Tracking Database*; by Douglas M. Muchoney, Ph.D.USGS, Geography; Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico 23 June 2010

Building National Inventory Capacity: U.S. Government and UNFCCC Efforts; a presentation by Kimberly Todd

Climate Change Division U.S. Environmental Protection Agency at Barcelona, Spain
November 7, 2009

© 2010 Forest Trends and the Katoomba Group. Contracting for Forest Carbon: Elements of a Model Forest Carbon Purchase Agreement;

IUCN WPC Recommendation 27 Mobile Indigenous Peoples and Conservation, Durban 2003

ZERO DRAFT Prepared by The Kenya Environmental Information Network (KEIN) a project initiated by United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Institute of Green Economy (IGREC) WORKING PAPER IGREC-19:2010; The REDD Safeguards of Cancun by Dr Promode Kant et. al. Website: www.igrec.in

Biodiversity and Livelihoods: REDD Plus Benefits – Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (giz) GmbH. 2011-05-29

Options for REDD+ Voluntary Certification to Ensure Net GHG Benefits, Poverty Alleviation, Sustainable Management of Forests and Biodiversity Conservation. *Forests* 2011, 2, 550-577; doi:10.3390/f2020550. Eduard Merger 1, Michael Dutschke 2 and Louis Verchot 3,* www.mdpi.com/journal/forests