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1. Introduction

The REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES) initiative aims to define and build support for a higher level of social and environmental performance of REDD+ programs through the development of standards that can be used by governments, NGOs, financing agencies and other stakeholders to design and implement REDD+ programs that make a significant contribution to human rights, poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation. These standards are designed for government-led programs implemented at national or state/provincial/regional level and for all forms of fund-based or market-based financing.

The REDD+ SES consist of principles, criteria and indicators which define issues of concern and conditions to be met to achieve high social and environmental performance and a process for assessment. At principle and criteria levels the standards are generic (i.e. the same across all countries). There is a process for country-specific interpretation to develop a set of indicators that are tailored to the context of a particular country and to develop an assessment process defining how information on performance will be collected, reviewed by stakeholders and reported.

The REDD+ SES Initiative is overseen by an International Standards Committee representing a balance of interested parties. The majority of committee members are from countries where REDD+ will be implemented, recognizing that developing country governments and civil society should lead the adoption of the standards. The process for development and use of the standards is being facilitated by an International Secretariat composed of the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) and CARE International with technical support from Proforest.

Phase 1 of the REDD+ SES initiative culminated in June 2010 with publication of Version 1 of the standards for use in pilot countries. Starting in May 2009, these standards were developed through an inclusive and participatory process including consultations with stakeholders at national and local level in four countries that are developing REDD+ programs. During Phase 2 of the initiative from July 2010 to December 2011, the standards are being applied in five pilot countries including the State of Acre in Brazil, Ecuador, Nepal, Tanzania and the Province of Central Kalimantan in Indonesia.

This workshop, held over three days 15, 16, 17 February 2011 at the Hotel Akros in Quito, Ecuador, provided an opportunity for exchange and learning between the facilitation teams from each of the pilot countries along with representatives of organizations interested in and supporting the initiative. It also provided an opportunity for some participants from other countries to learn about the initiative in order to help assess the potential for the use of the standards in their country. This workshop was the second exchange and learning event that has been organized during the current Phase 2 of the initiative, applying the standards in pilot countries, and follows the first exchange and learning event that was held 3-5 August 2010 in Washington DC, USA.

This REDD+ SES exchange and learning workshop was preceded by a one-day workshop for exchange between countries on processes for REDD+ design hosted by the Government of Ecuador held on 14 February 2011 at the Hotel Akros in Quito. Please contact Aurelie Lhumeau alhumeau@ambiente.gob.ec for more information about the one-day workshop on 14 February. Many of the workshop participants also participated in a field visit to Pahuma Orchid Reserve on 18 February 2011 where the landowners are participating in Socio Bosque, an incentive-based conservation mechanism implemented by the Ministry of Environment of Ecuador.
2. Workshop objectives

1. Shared understanding of the guidelines for the interpretation and application of the REDD+ SES at country level.
2. Sharing of experience on the interpretation and application of REDD+ SES including implementation of the guidelines and identification of challenges and opportunities.
3. Identification of needs for further information and tools to support interpretation and application of REDD+ SES.
4. Clarification of complementarities of REDD+ SES with other safeguards mechanisms (FCPF, UN-REDD, UNFCCC, Brazilian Principles and Criteria, CCB Standards etc.).
5. Development and review of strategies and mechanisms/platforms for external and internal communication.
6. Revised work plans for 2011 for each country and the international secretariat.

3. Participants

A total of 28 participants attended the workshop (see Appendix 1). The target participants were the key government and civil society partners who are facilitating the process for the application of REDD+ SES in each pilot country and there were 13 of these participants from Ecuador, Acre, Tanzania and Nepal. Representatives from Central Kalimantan where REDD+ SES will also be used were unable to attend. There were 6 participants from Peru, Guatemala and Chiapas who attended the workshop in order learn more about the standards and how they are being used in other countries in order to assess the potential for the use of the standards in their country. Two participants represented the International Standards Committee that is overseeing the REDD+ SES initiative at the international level and provided technical input. Six participants were from organizations supporting the standards initiative (CCBA, CARE, ProForest, Conservation International and the Moore Foundation) and there was one representative from UN-REDD.

4. Agenda

Day 1, 15 Feb
- Objectives and update on progress of the REDD+ SES initiative
- Overview of social and environmental safeguards for REDD+ and the role of REDD+ SES
- Developing country-level governance for REDD+ SES and managing the country-specific interpretation process

Day 2, 16 Feb
- Best practices for governance and the country-specific interpretation process
- Developing country-specific indicators
- Designing an assessment process including participatory monitoring, stakeholder review and reporting

Day 3, 17 Feb
- Clarifying the complementarities of REDD+ SES with other safeguards mechanisms
- Reviewing a new draft REDD+ SES website to enhance communication about the REDD+ SES initiative
- Identifying challenges and opportunities for the use of REDD+ SES in each country
- Identifying needs for further information and tools to support the use of REDD+ SES
- Developing/revising plans for 2011 for each country and for the International Secretariat

A more detailed agenda is provided in Appendix 2.
5. Understanding Standards, their structure and use

Presentation by Dawn Robinson

Key points from questions/answers and discussion
- What are the characteristics of indicators? They tend to be written in present tense, even if not applicable until a later phase.
- Some issues are difficult to define such as Free, Prior and Informed Consent. The standards can help to understand and clarify the key elements of these terms and issues.
- How do we find the right balance between what we would like to report on and what is actually feasible at reasonable cost?
- How far do we need the indicators to be verifiable? Are they a reporting mechanism or something to be assessed? This will have an impact on how the indicators are developed. Even if the standards are used as a reporting tool, we need to ensure that the indicators provide a framework for consistent reporting.

6. Introduction to the REDD+ SES Initiative

Presentation by Phil Franks

Key points from questions/answers and discussion
- How much does it cost to use the standards? The country-specific interpretation and development of the first assessment report is taking approximately 18 months and needs at least 50% of a person for facilitation. Recurrent costs would be lower but projections for ongoing costs have not yet been done.
- How frequently should there be a performance assessment? Could be done every 2-3 years. This will be reviewed towards the end of this phase.
- These standards have been developed as a voluntary initiative. Some groups are using them for advocacy about what should be required for REDD+ but this was not explicitly the intention of the initiative. The REDD+ SES provide a framework that countries can use if they choose to report on, and hopefully get recognition for, higher social and environmental performance.

7. Context for monitoring and reporting on REDD+ safeguards: UNFCCC, FCPF, UN-REDD and how the REDD+SES Initiative fits with these

Presentation by Joanna Durbin

Key points from questions/answers and discussion
- Proforest produced a report in October 2010 on ‘REDD+ SES: Briefing on Complementarities with Other REDD+ Social and Environmental Safeguards Mechanisms’. This provides an overview on how REDD+ SES can support a country also responding to requirements of FCPF and UN-REDD.
- Q: How open is the REDD+ SES initiative? Do countries need to go through the entire process? A: Any country can use the standards to indicate areas of concern and use the standards as guidelines to help design their REDD+ program. The development of requirements to be part of the ‘REDD+ SES initiative’ is up to us all as a group.
- Q: From the country perspective how are we positioning the standards so there are not too many standards for governments? A: We are developing an overview of how REDD+ SES play a complementary role and are now working with individual countries to help clarify how the REDD+ SES can play a supporting role.

8. Guidelines on country-level governance and the process for country-specific interpretation

Presentation by Phil Franks

Key points from questions/answers and discussion
- Q: Would it be the government that would convene the Standards Committee? A: Yes, usually, because these standards are for government-led programs and the government needs to take the lead in adopting them.
- In Ecuador, the NGOs in the facilitating team, CI and CARE, would not be part of the SC. Govt would be part of SC, but not the entity in Govt responsible for using the standards. They are trying to encourage national NGO participation.
- Role with respect to the SC must be clear – need to clarify if facilitators, non-voting members, observers etc. Need to clarify these roles in advance.
- Different people on facilitation team can play different roles. May need specific type or person/skills to facilitate meetings and public comment process.
- Need to recognize that facilitation team starts by being motors for making the initiative happen and later must evolve into implementers responding to the SC.
- Period of consultation should respond to type of consultation. Might need more time when asking for feedback from local communities.
- Q: Can we have a sub-group for IPs from different parts of country/ecosystems. A: often good to set up sub-groups.

9. Feedback from countries on development of country-level governance and process adopted for country-specific interpretation. Ecuador, Acre, Nepal

Country teams were asked to prepare 15 minute presentations covering the following points:

- What are the key rights holder and stakeholder groups that need to be involved in REDD+ SES in your country?
- Are there any existing multi-stakeholder bodies involved in REDD+ design and implementation in your country, how are they structured and what are the roles and responsibilities? What link should there be between existing groups and a Standards Committee?
- How is the Standards Committee structured and which groups are represented, what is the decision-making mechanism?
- How were/will representatives be identified for the Standards Committee?
- How is the Facilitation Team composed, and why does this make sense for facilitating interpretation and use of REDD+ SES in your country?
- What process have you/will you adopt for development of country-specific indicators and designing the assessment process (eg workshops, working group, experts/stakeholders etc)?
- How have you/will you organise consultations on drafts of the indicators and assessment process?
- What challenges and opportunities have you encountered?

9.1 Acre

Presentation by Monica de los Rios

Key points from questions/answers and discussion

- The SISA Validation and Monitoring Committee will play the role of the Standards Committee. Will include representatives of civil society from 3 state councils, Will also include representatives of govt. An advisory body will include other personalities in Acre state or outside to contribute to approve the indicators. Will be identified by the councils.
- Challenges:
  - New govt and new governor. Slow process to continue activities and implement SISA. Taking longer
  - Public consultation before activity on REDD. When will REDD start? Creates expectations. But already have certification process
- Opportunities
  - Standards process develops good interaction with stakeholders (beneficiaries)
  - Helping to design norms/regulations for SISA

9.2 Ecuador

Presentation by Daniela Carrion

Key points from questions/answer and discussion

- Intend to apply SES to full REDD strategy but start with Socio Bosque. Start with 90-day consultation process including workshop with IPs and website. Extended to end of February so can include second workshop with IPs at beginning of March. Submit for approval to National Standards Committee (NSC) in April.
- Same representatives in each workshop or do need to explain again each time?
- NSC: 12 members, 3 govt, 4 CSO, 5 IPs. Use self selection process. Asked for feedback on selection criteria. Extended period for nominations to encourage CSO and IP.
- In case of no consensus, each member has a vote. Each of the sectors must have a majority before taking to NSC.
- Next steps: in March will define NSC. Second workshop with IPs in early March. First meeting NSC end March. And early April approval of national interpretation.
- Challenges and opportunities:
  - How to make the decision on final version of interpretation of indicators
  - How to apply to national REDD strategy
  - Define monitoring and reporting
  - Integration with UN-REDD

9.3 Nepal

Presentation by Keshav Khanal

Key points from questions/answer and discussion
- REDD working group – Public sector 4, Forestry agencies 3, CS (IP/LC) 2, Donor 1, REDD cell -1. This group provides technical support and monitoring.
- REDD Multi-stakeholder forum is much larger. This group provides an opportunity for exploring and exchange
- REDD+ Civil Society Alliance – coordinated by FECOFUN – discussion on issues of REDD+ and advocacy.
- REDD WG would be National Standards Committee. Decisions would be consensus-based. Currently no Private Sector. Could include (also in REDD WG?). Why no voting system?
- Challenges:
  - Harmonization with other national policies and national legislation
  - Financial and human resources for initiation
- Opportunities
  - Positive response from stakeholders
  - Harmonization with FCPF, Norad pilot project and others

10. Group work 1: Multi-stakeholder processes, decision making, voting mechanisms: experiences of finding pragmatic solutions

Participants were divided into three groups (one Spanish speaking) and conducted the following role play and analysis.

Scenario

A group of stakeholders are in the process of developing content for a new national-level Standard for sustainable forest management. A number of key stakeholders have been convened to meet and develop the standard. The country is under the spotlight internationally for its forest management practices (including both social and environmental aspects). It is urgent to agree a standard for sustainable forest management, that can be independently verified. All forestry operations – government run, private concessions, and community forestry – will all be able to use this standard, voluntarily. If they comply with it they will have access to government grants, and national and international markets their timber. The country has a mixture of forest operations:
- Very large government controlled areas; including national parks, tribal and community land zones and timber management areas.
- Very large private timber harvesting operations (private ownership and government concessions)
- An area in the S.E which has many small private holdings (of less than 100ha each).

A Principle “Workers are fairly treated” (Principle 4), has already been agreed, and several criteria developed. The group is now trying to develop some indicators for two of the criteria:
- Criterion 4.1 “Contracting and working hours are fair and transparent.”
- Criterion 4.2 “Adequate measures are taken to protect the health and safety of the workers”

Instructions
1. Divide into groups as instructed by the facilitators.
2. Each person will be given information on their stakeholder role (information about the sort of stakeholder you are or the people you represent). Read your stakeholder role, but don't show it to anyone else.
3. As a group, you should develop indicators (one or more) which would be relevant to the two criteria within Principle 4 as instructed by the facilitators.

4. You should take into account the opinions and positions of the group members. Some stakeholder may bring proposals for possible indicators. Use these to start discussions.

5. Decision making will be as follows:
   - EITHER Type 1: consensus based decision-making. Use the following definition of a consensus decision “when no party involved has registered a persistent or serious objection, i.e. all parties are willing to live with the decision”. Do not approve an indicator until you have consensus.
   - OR Type 2: Majority voting. Decisions are made on the basis of voting by all group members. An indicator text is approved if 50.1% or more of your group approve it.

6. The group was asked to report back on:
   a. The indicators the group agreed upon.
   b. Any issues with the composition of the group (and what was learned from that)
   c. Any issues with the decision-making process (and what did as learned from that).

Feedback from the three working groups:

Spanish group
- 100% of workers has previous agreement of job co-responsibility (contract, verbal or an act of assembly)
- Lack of community representatives and lack of government
- Need neutral facilitator
- Too many representing forestry industry
- Very difficult to get consensus but thought that consensus was better than voting.

Group 2
- Need facilitator, some voices were not heard
- No govt representative
- Too many people from producer side
- Consensus led to least common denominator
- Difficult to discuss indicator without discussing principles and criteria

Group 3
- Seasonal workers not at the table
- No pre-agreement between groups with common interests
- Workers under-represented
- Private sector not fully represented as none with social principles
- Power levels and strengths not equal
- NGOs don’t always represent communities but follow their missions
- No facilitator
- No protocol for agreeing consensus
- Sectoral interests overrode the desire for consensus
- Lack of trust in consensus process
- Led to vague and general indicators

Key points from questions/answer and discussion
- One group use % threshold for indicators, like sugar cane standards. eg. can’t get approved if > % of accidents/no workers
- Careful not to create indicators that sound good but don’t actually mean anything
- Note that an agreement on anything at all could be a great accomplishment.
- Consensus has highest level of credibility
- Potentially time consuming and may never reach agreement
- Majority decision-making can be quicker but can lead to exclusion and lack of credibility
- Sector voting is another option, where sectors are grouped. There must be a majority agreement within each sector and each sector must agree (see Dawn's PPT for more details).
11. Findings from a workshop on multiple stakeholder processes

Presentation by Dawn Robinson
Key points from questions/answers and discussion
- Make some resources available: IMAFLORA report of Brazilian process for development of social and environmental safeguards, ISEAL good practice etc.
- Q: How to deal with rotation? People start getting involved and then a new person next time. And also how to deal with power imbalances? A: when people start to negotiate and form positions and try to dominate – actually a healthy sign because shows they are engaged but need clear process to manage this. Need to ask people to sign up to a commitment, TORs, to participate throughout the process. Agree to TORs in first meeting. Can have a nominated alternate person. People sometimes see participation as a capacity building.
- Comment: Capacity building in advance or providing separate capacity building opportunities helps to avoid the desire to send new people each time just to build capacity.
- Question: How do you define ‘vulnerable’ or ‘marginalized’? A: Who will be affected by REDD+? There are vulnerability assessment tools that CARE has developed. Can define vulnerability with respect to something specific eg CC or REDD+. Or can be defined more generally as lack of capacity to respond to shocks/stresses. Perceptions of vulnerability may be different from ours.
- Comment: In San Martin have a group that provides liaison between regional govt and IP communities. Have selected IP reps who understand the technical issues and will ensure good feedback and communications with IPs.
- Comment: In Ecuador, Socio Bosque and Govt are thinking of vulnerability with respect to REDD+. CARE has a tool to help identify which communities (check with Belen)

12. Group work 2: Identifying best practices for participatory governance, stakeholder engagement and effective consultation and resolving challenging issues

Introduction to group work by Mauricio Voivodic.
- Note that the document on the multi-stakeholder process for development of Brazilian safeguards is not an IMAFLORA guide. Very important to reinforce collective ownership, not put one organization logo on the front.
- Opportunities
  o The civil society safeguards initiative in Brazil led to Government willingness to engage stakeholders in development REDD+ regime
  o Use consultation activities to build capacity of IP and LC on REDD+ concepts
  o Builds trust and increases legitimacy – increases IP/CSO support for govt action

Working groups were asked to consider and provide recommendations on how to address some of the challenges that had been raised during presentations on 14 and 15 February and during discussion

Issues
1. Ownership/sustainability/institutionalization
   o How to ensure collective ownership?
   o How to ensure continuity with change of government?

2. Ensuring a balance on the committee
   o who convenes?
   o who decides?
   o Pros and cons of using existing committees?
   o How to manage different levels of representation, for example of indigenous peoples and local communities?

3. Managing public consultations
   o How many comment periods, how long and how proactive? Who decides?
How to manage expectations?
How to manage overload with multiple consultations before REDD action/benefits?
How to ensure participation of key stakeholder groups, capacity building, different approaches needed, language constraints?
In workshops and public meetings, how to manage domination by some groups?

   - what is the role of a facilitation team/committee/working group?
   - How to manage and respond to comments?

Questions
What suggestions do you have to resolve these issues?
Give examples from the different countries around the table

Feedback from working groups

Group 1 Monica, Ayri, Alejandro, Cristina, Sylvia

How to ensure collective ownership
- Enhance/strengthen community associations by training, create leadership in this issue
- Also need leaders from private sector—producers, need legitimate representatives
- Provide information and training at field level before consultation
- Participatory methodologies and appropriate language—not too technical
- Give feedback about the results of the consultation process to the communities regarding the suggestions from the different sectors. Important for stakeholders decisions to be seen in the document and made it easier to pass law
- How to involve people if they don’t have resources to participate in every meeting. Need to provide resources and training
- Take advantage of existing platforms and experience from similar processes in the country
- Ownership across government is a challenge
- should also engage associations of private sector.
- Sometimes the platforms do not engage as you expected?

How to ensure continuity with change of government
- Create groups or bodies established by law that represent civil society. Need to be established by law to ensure that still exist if govt changes.
- Include REDD+ programme/initiative in development plans of govt. These are often long-term plans eg 15-20 years. Helps to ensure continuity.
- Create instruments for participation on a massive scale in monitoring to help to guarantee continuity
- Creating collective ownership helps to ensure continuity across governments
- In Brazil government asked CS to facilitate the stakeholder working groups, which has ensured participation across

Group 2. William, Belen, Keshav, James, Daniela

Ensuring a balance on the committee
- Government should convene. Calls for meetings should come from the Ministry. Because it is a government-led program
- Need an independent facilitator for workshops, because they are perceived as objective, facilitation skills, trusted by the group,
- Who decides who should be on the committee? Different models in different countries
- Important to have clear criteria for committee members
Example of Ecuador. Committee from workshop participants (the participants become a working group) where possible to ensure continuity.

Brazil, half from govt selected by governor, half from cs – selected by councils

Nepal – existing committee

Pros of existing committees – already involved, already have procedures, already representative, can be more efficient (cost/knowledge), more sustainable

Cons of existing committees – not a balanced or representative committee creates a risk, overburden without remuneration – many work on volunteer basis. They may not be interested in standards and safeguards as joined committee for other issues.

How to manage different levels of representation –
  o mapping of real stakeholders,
  o seeing inside the stakeholder ‘black box’, understanding their dynamic, do the real stakeholders feel represented by their federations
  o criteria for representation, eg geographic diversity, levels (federation and communities)

Group 3. Pierre-Yves, Aurelie, Dil Raj, Carolina

Managing public consultations
Considered Ecuador and Nepal cases

• Ecuador has very few comments, maybe because of lack of confidence. Blog was not most appropriate? Maybe letters or emails would be better?
• Should make the process more transparent from the beginning.
• Need clarity on what happened to comments
• Would have been good to list all comments, respond, if it is relevant, how it led to change.
• Also respond individually to all commentors.
• Can generate statistics on number of comments
• Two consultation periods is a good idea for Ec and Nepal. Ec plan to change to more specific indicators and will need second comment period – maybe 30 days.
• Diversify means of access to information
• Tailored workshops

Managing expectations
• Need to clarify the benefit sharing mechanism
• Important to have a balanced committee to decide on benefit sharing

Avoiding overload
• This was raised by IP participants in Panama FPIC workshop. Spend all time in consultations so can’t
• Coordinate one meeting with multiple purposes
• Coordinated approach between donors. In Panama are organizing monthly meetings between donors to coordinate consultations

How to ensure consultation of key stakeholders
• Not enough to translate words but need to translate concepts

How to manage domination
• Clear process
• Facilitator neutral
• Prior capacity building for vulnerable and marginalized groups
• Cultural difference between way of explaining their views

Group 4. Milagros, Susan, Montse, Connie

Making decisions
• Need a clear process and make it public
• Need transparency
• Clarify the roles
• Facilitation team
  o Organise the consultation process
  o Composition of working group
  o Manage consultation process/comments
  o Define the comment process, incorporate the comments
  o Make the comments available
  o Reconciling time for comments vs commitment time
  o Have most work because part of their job
• Working group
  o Provide input
  o Represent advice sectoral interest
  o Advice on proper representation
  o Advisors/representatives
• National SC
  o Represent sectoral interests
  o Report to constituencies
  o Chosen from sectoral working group
  o Make final decisions based on draft proposed by the facilitation team.
• In Ecuador
  o Facilitation team is MAE, CARE, CI
  o Working group include IP/LCs, NGOs, PS, University
  o IPs have a sub-group
  o PS are not participating actively
  o Will use the same methodology as for UN-REDD. Facilitation team will decide whether relevant, how it will be included and where. Will send this document to SC to make decision. Final decision in SC.
  o Working group provided the comments.

Key points from questions/answers and discussion
- Q: Are there no representative bodies in Ecuador representing civil society for engagement with government? A: for NGOs there are 2 groups, national organization of NGOs (CEDENMA) and Ecuadorian IUCN but little engagement. Surprised by their lack of interest.
- In Peru there is a national committee of CC which was created by Govt. There are representatives from civil society. Within there are technical groups within it to discuss specific issues.
- In Brazil. In workshops presented comments when they were made. Asked if raising an issue or making a comment. Name, sector, comment. He can see the comment on the screen and agree that reflects his comment. Made available next day so could check. Facilitator organized all comments in groups. Presented all to SC
- In Acre: used similar process for a policy. Categorised the comments and presented to the government. Based on government decision created the wording for the law. Scheduled special meetings with different sectors. This worked well for us.
- REDD+ SES: Facilitation team organized and made a proposal. Highlighted contentious issues for SC

13. Preliminary experiences of country-level indicator and monitoring plan

Ecuador and Acre, the two countries that have started country-specific interpretation, were asked to prepare presentations covering the following:
• Examples of indicators that were
  o Maintained – why
  o Adapted – why
  o Deleted – why
  o Added – why
• Which kind of indicators generated a lot of discussion and have been hard to agree on?
Experiences developing ‘specific monitoring information’: was this helpful in guiding the development of feasible indicators? Has this helped clarify what/how information will be gathered on performance against the indicators (ie first step towards a monitoring plan?). When focusing on ‘specific monitoring information’ for the current assessment cycle, to what extent did the number of indicators reduce?

Advice for other countries or feedback on the principles, criteria and framework for indicators

13.1 Ecuador

Changes to indicators:
- FPIC to free prior and informed consultation for consistency with the constitution
- Agreed time frame
- Monitoring takes differentiated approach

Added a new indicator for:
- Legal framework for National Strategy
- Creation of MRV committee to identify and mitigate impacts

Need legal opinion on FPIC, carbon rights, Customary rights are not recognized in the constitution

13.2 Acre

- Only planning to do one 60-day consultation.
- Some of the indicators are unrealistic?
- Indicators are comprehensive but complex.

14. Group work 3: Identifying challenges for country-specific interpretation of indicators based on review of Ecuador and Acre draft indicators

Participants were asked to join groups according to their interest in the principles that each group would focus on.

Questions to answer and feedback to the group:
- Are their proposed indicators appropriate and sufficient? (please do not feedback on the detail of specific indicators: just comment in general)
- Would similar indicators work in your country context? If not, why not.
- What are likely to be other challenges for formulating country-specific indicators in your country?
- What feedback

Group 1: Principles 1 and 2
Focused on criteria 1.3, 1.5, 2.2
Cristina, William, Susan, Carolina, Alejandro

- Provide more clarification related to consent/consultation in the standards – explanation. Would not need to use own legal framework
- Acre standards eliminated some specific words related to the principle eg land issues – why?
- Acre 1.3.3 replaced collective stakeholders for institution? Social?
- Ecuador representation criteria of the consultation process – people, community and nationalities (based on the constitution in Ecuador) useful for Guatemala but not for Tanzania
- 1.5 In Ecuador constitution art 74. In Guatemala can have carbon rights
- 1.5 Standards go too far linking carbon rights to land title/rights. In Acre don’t link, Ecuador link, Tanzania don’t link. Guatemala carbon rights for municipalities and incentives for communities.

Group 2: Principles 3 & 4
Focused on criteria 3.1, 4.2, 4.1
Sergio, Belen, Connie, Sandie

- Ecuador indicators very similar to framework. Seemed like a first step. An adaptation of framework to country context. Still need to develop an indicator that can be used to measure performance. Suggested indicators are helpful. Need to add some country-specific elements.
- Jump from framework to indicator needs technical work. Probably this phase will be less participatory. Some of the framework could be split into many indicators.
- Should recognize these different steps in the guidance.
- 3.1.2 Problem with translation. Most vulnerable people defined ‘by the communities’ in Ecuador. But in original English it says ‘among’ not ‘by’. ‘By’ would not work in Mexico, as in Lacandona can’t ask the communities to define who is vulnerable as will exclude women.
- Suggest simplifying the international indicators.

Group 3: Principle 5 & 8  
Focused on criteria 5.1, 5.2, 8.1  
Milagros, Ayri, Heather, James, Keshav
- Indicators are appropriate but not sufficient. Need to be more country-specific
- Good to simplify by combining indicators
- Work with the essence of the indicator
- Identify process of consultation on indicators that works for each country
- Some indicators can be general but others have to be adapted to legal framework of each country

Challenges
- Building consensus on indicators with all stakeholders
- Number of indicators is challenging – need several workshops
- Is there enough funding for all these indicators
- Need for capacity building for the committees
- Harmonizing the national interpretation of indicators with legal framework

Group 4: Principles 6 & 7  
Focused on criteria 6.1, 6.3, 7.2  
Monica, Di Raj, Aurelie
- Criteria 6.1 Found that 3 indicators enough. Ecuador eliminated 6.1.3 but consider to review. Information for 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 can be gathered at the same time (cost effective).
- For Nepal have to adapt to groups characterized in the constitution
- Challenge with 6.3.2 How to ensure that stakeholders own decision-making process is transparent
- 7.2.3 Eliminated in Acre as similar to 7.1.1. Can delete one of these.
- In case of Nepal ‘public’ means government. In Acre it means everyone.

15. Understanding REDD+ safeguards (UN-REDD, FCPF SESA) and how the REDD+SES Initiative fits with these in Nepal and Ecuador

15.1 UN-REDD approach to safeguards and multiple benefits

Presentation by Pierre-Yves Guedez

Key points from questions/answers and discussion
- Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria – will be presented to Policy Board in March
- No indicators but do have guiding questions. Won’t need indicators but will need to answer the questions
- Thinking about developing Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool for social and environmental aspects. Also want to evaluate potential impacts to provide incentives for positive impacts
- Complementarity will depend on country-level interpretation and country response to UN-REDD guiding questions
- Monitoring Governance Frameworks from FAO and Chatham House process. Will produce more static framework than the Participatory Governance Assessment that doesn’t need interpretation.
- NJP = national joint program document
- Q. Will guiding questions be like those in RIMT?
- Q: FPIC for IP and LC – What happens in Ecuador?

Use of UN-REDD approach in Ecuador – remarks by Daniela Carrion
- Have not yet defined complementarities. Have created a matrix to help compare which indicators fit with RIMT. REDD+ SES is broader as includes environmental.
- NJP for Ecuador includes an activity to work on harmonization of both tools. Will use platform and committee created for SES to support the harmonization with UN-REDD.
- Have not yet compared with national interpretation of indicators. Will do this when have a final version.

Questions
- Is there to be ongoing consultation on the NJP etc?
- Process: how do the process elements of UN-REDD guidelines work? How can we fit the SES platforms with UN-REDD processes?

15.2 FCPF approach to safeguards and multiple-benefits

Presentation prepared by Neeta Hooda/Kenn Rap of the World Bank and given by Joanna Dubin

Use of FCPF approach in Nepal – presentation by Keshav Khanal
- Just about to receive the next 3.4 M for RPP implementation to develop the R-Package
- Will do ESIA Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
- SES provides principles, criteria and indicators for ensuring ESMP implemented in right way
- Nepal proposes to use REDD+ SES for monitoring of other benefits

16. Presentation of draft design of a new REDD+ SES website

Presentation of draft design of new website by Ana Augustine

Key points from questions/answers and discussion
- Need to include credits for photos.
- Would like to launch by end of March
- Is it possible to add links to country websites and documents?
- Would be nice to have tools included. Where would they go? Tools section?
- Would be nice to have news, maybe on each country page.
- Contacts: Have each country contact person listed on main contacts page & individual country pages.
- Can we add a photogallery?
- Would be good to give the standards an identity. Should we design a logo?

17. Group work 5: Developing monitoring plans for Ecuador and Acre

Ecuador and Acre country teams started completing the monitoring plan framework for a few indicators that they thought could be difficult to monitor.

|----------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|

Feedback to the plenary group on development of monitoring plans

Acre
- Probably need primary information or relevant secondary information for impact indicators. These are very few. Even impact criteria have process indicators.
- 3.2.1 Added the need to gather data and also to share with people. Existence of regulation will be in 2011 but the actual implementation will be in 2012 so can’t monitor in this period.
- 3.1.4 Found this was a priority indicator. This could be a very important one for communication so will be important to develop ongoing monitoring after CIFOR.

¹ Relevant to the current monitoring period.

Workshop Report, 9 March 2011
Ecuador
- Selected indicators thought would be difficult eg. 2.3.2
- Found that it is difficult to know what information is available.
- Completing the monitoring plan may lead to adjustment of indicators. Maybe draft monitoring plan before second public comment period.
- For Ecuador, want to think about whether will start now with applying to design of REDD+ strategy or only to Socio Bosque as a pilot. This would require two separate monitoring plans.

18. Group work 5: Identification of challenges and opportunities for effective use of REDD+ SES in Nepal, Tanzania, San Martin, Guatemala, Chiapas

While Ecuador and Acre country teams were working on monitoring plans, the other countries developed analyses of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of using the REDD+ SES in their countries. The SWOT analyses are presented below. The country groups were asked put their top 3 weaknesses and threats and top 2 opportunities onto cards and these were then grouped and are also presented below.

**SWOT for REDD+SES initiatives– Nepal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Well established institutional set up (Apex body, REDD working group)</td>
<td>• Limited facilitation capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commitment of government and well motivated stakeholders for REDD+SES</td>
<td>• Level of awareness – low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well established networks of IPs, forest users</td>
<td>• Conflicting interests of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well defined policies and legislations (NBS, EPA, ratification of ILO 169, CBD, UNFCCC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Harmonization with other initiatives (SESA)</td>
<td>• Constitutional making process – May lead Federal states with different policies and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding and technical backstopping by different sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SWOT for REDD+ SES initiative in TANZANIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• FBD/CARE/CCI already have a strong relationship with each other and with other key actors</td>
<td>• No capacity in government (Forest Department) to support REDD+ SES – depth and spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FBD/CARE/CCI have experience from across the country</td>
<td>• Safeguards is not considered as priority in Forest Department – no-one has this responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pool of human resources available to FBD</td>
<td>• Complexity (very many indicators) may discourage some key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Government is looking for assistance in developing safeguards and has asked REDD SES to take a lead</td>
<td>• REDD SES could be marginalised by SESA and/or UNREDD safeguard process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Norwegian and other funding is available</td>
<td>• New REDD+ initiatives could come along which could interfere with REDD+ SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nine REDD pilot projects – many interested in safeguards</td>
<td>• Lack of awareness of REDD+ SES amongst technical staff in key government agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lack of awareness and political support for REDD+ SES at high political levels
- Political and/or personal conflicts between key government agencies/individuals
- Possibility of change of leadership in government
- Flow of funds to CCI/CARE may be delayed by bureaucracy
- Lack of political commitment
- National policy does not recognise IPs and IP’s rights

### SWOT for REDD+ SES Initiative in Peru

**Strengths**
1. High political will for REDD+ as a PES in the San Martin Region.
3. Technical skills present in government officials and partners.

**Weaknesses**
1. Weak coordination of REDD strategy within various sectors of the government.
2. Management is sectoral rather than through the territory – management and coordination is sectoral.
3. Funds needed to work with SES Initiative.
4. Need to strengthen capacities of government, implementers and indigenous peoples regarding REDD related skills.

**Opportunities**
1. Strong partnerships between San Martin Region and diverse NGO’s and donors, partners that help move forward REDD process as a model.
2. High international interest for the development and implementation of a REDD+ process in Peru.

**Threats/Constraints**
1. Rising of prices on the biofuels/coffee market – increase agricultural development and land use change as drivers of deforestation.
2. Increase demand for access to land for agriculture – constant migration waves.

### SWOT for REDD+ SES initiative in Guatemala

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Guatemala has a lot of basic country information about Natural Resources, land uses and communities location.</td>
<td>1. Not easy to find funding to develop the standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indigenous peoples have strong conscience of the necessity to manage natural resources</td>
<td>2. IP now aren’t represented by current organizations that are participating in different forum spaces as CC, natural resource management or REDD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Existence of many international organizations working in CC mitigation and adaptation</td>
<td>3. In some parts of the country land tenure is not clear. In other cases like Peten, delegated properties is by State of Guatemala for 25 years that is running on year 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The government Environmental Ministry presented a National Adaptation Policy.</td>
<td>4. The REDD+SES information is weak in Guatemala civil society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opportunities**

**Threats**
1. Land Titling is almost ready in places like Peten and other Counties that still exist forest areas.

2. Existence of CONESFORGUA (Steering Committee of Forest Standards in Guatemala) who will become a REDD+SES facilitator team

1. The Environmental Ministry will change the staff at the end of 2011 for new election period

2. The government hasn’t any inventive politics to develop the communities

3. Still exist the Subsistence Agriculture Advance in Forest areas

SWOT for REDD+ SES initiative in Chiapas

Strengths

- Working Groups already established: REDD+ Chiapas, OEST Chiapas
- Advanced MRV, Carbon contents evaluation
- MOU: Chiapas-California (Comite techno consultivo)
- Adherence to the national (gov.) REDD+ strategy-CONAFOR
- Sound legal framework for land tenure- more clear links LU-BEN

Weaknesses

- Insufficient mechanisms for benefit sharing (related to PSA
- Unclear engagement structure for interested stakeholders
- Unclear support scheme-federation-states (insufficient communication, exc. Struggling, ect.

Opportunities

- General interest from the international community in supporting Chiapas (IP, high marginalization, natural disasters, uprisings, ect.
- Build on long standing research on CC (Carbon forest, ex: longer standing C. forestry project using the P.V standards).

Threats

- Fear of losing sovereignty due to external standards usage.
- Heavy burden in terms of work load to adapt & implement SES framework.
- External pressure for compliance grade credits.
- Indicators not necessarily relevant. Ex: Long term livelihood security.

Grouping of priority weaknesses and opportunities from all countries

Capacity

- Limited facilitation capacity
- Benefit sharing: insufficient effective mechanisms to ensure equitable benefit sharing among stakeholders (i.e. related to experience with PSAs)
- Need to develop mechanisms for engaging stakeholders.
- Need to strengthen capacities of govt. implementers and IPs in REDD+ related skills.(Peru)
- Capacity in place
- Working groups already established (multi-stakeholder platforms) eg REDD-Chiapas GESE-Chiapas
- Advanced MRV system in Chiapas (i.e. C monitoring system)
- Long term experience w/forest C research & projects (experience w/plan vivo standards)
- Clear land tenure: established C rights
- FBD/CARE/CCI have already built strong relationships with each other and have long experience from across the country.

Awareness

- Level of awareness
- Lack of awareness of REDD+ issues & REDD SES amongst technical staff in key gov. agencies.
- IP have strong conscience of the necessity to manage their natural resources.
- External Interests/Influence
External Interest: Partnerships:
- MOU Chiapas-CA (Enabling Chiapas to participate in CTC)
- General interest/support from international stakeholders (international NGO, multilaterals, International govts.

Other safeguard Initiatives
- Harmonization with other initiatives (SESA)
- Gov. is looking for assistance in developing safeguards and has asked REDD SES to take the lead.
- Difficulties associated with country-specific interpretation & assessment of REDD SES indicators.
- Indicators identified not necessarily relevant to Chiapas (i.e. ensuring long-term livelihood security)
- Overload of various approaches/policies/frameworks (i.e. project with own monitoring framework.
- New REDD initiative could come along with high interest from the gov. and interfere with REDD+ SES.

Funding
- Lack of funding to implement SES initiative.
- It is not easy to find funding to develop the standards because REDD+SES is not known.

Threats to REDD
- High prices for biofuels & coffee, increasing agriculture development, land use change & migration as drivers of deforestation.

Political Context
- Lack of awareness & political support for REDD+SES, high political level (political leaders are the symbol of the society & gov't.
- In some countries the land tenure not always clear. That makes the IP representation difficult.
- National policy does not recognize indigenous peoples or their rights.
- Constitution making process-may lead federal states with different policies and regulations.

Sovereignty issues
- Fear on behalf of federal government of compliance with international framework. (heavy burden for development, implementation)
- Fear of federal government that they will fall behind state level REDD (Chiapas-CA MOU)
- External pressure to fast track compliance grade credits for market.
- High political will for REDD+ as a PES in San Martin Region.

Institutional Framework
- Well established institutional set up and networks of IPs and forest users.
- Strong partnerships among San Martin gov., NGOs, IPs, and donors in the San Martin region.

19. Group work 6: Identification of tools, information and capacity needs for the REDD+ SES

Participants were asked to identify priority needs for (1) capacity building, (2) information and (3) guidance and tools to use REDD+ SES in their countries. Each participant added contributions on individual cards.

Capacity building
- Develop skills for facilitating eg with IPs
- Facilitation skills
- Training for facilitating team for SESA and REDD+ SES
- Capacity building for indicator design
- For standards committee on standards and REDD+
- Facilitating team capacity in human rights/indigenous rights in all contexts
- Legal support related to the national context
- Improving communication skills of facilitation team
- Basic training on REDD+ for government and local stakeholders
- How to integrate REDD+ SES with other initiatives
- Training on use of information technology for collection of information eg collection from communities eg handheld devices
Information
- Information and analysis on application of FPIC in SES
- Regular updated information on integration of standards with other safeguard mechanisms
- Similarities and differences in differences between consultation and FPIC
- Define a communication mechanism between international meetings to keep exchange in the interpretation of indicators for monitoring
- Share experience among countries by social network
- Standards application state of the art at global level in current negotiations, experiences of other countries

Guidance and tools
- Including another member of SES secretariat in addition to CCBA/CARE/Proforest from other countries eg Africa forest governance, Asia forest governance
- How to build indicators that can be measured, realistic, replicable
- How to communicate SES to different sectors (IP, Private, Govt)
- IT eg. Virtual platforms
- Guidance on integrating consultation processes in REDD+/Standards work
- Guidance on how to use REDD+ SES in general
- Guidelines for developing country-specific indicators
- Tools for assessment
- Toolkits which include visual aids on REDD+ SES eg for IP/LC on what is a principle, criterion etc
- How to strengthen participation and engagement that allows us to move forward in the process
- Create an electronic specialist forum to discuss standards

Guidelines on monitoring impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services by from UNEP
Joanna Durbin gave a brief presentation provided by Nathalie Doswald of UNEP [Nathalie.Doswald@unep-wcmc.org] on their development of a draft set of guidelines and an annotated guide to resources for monitoring the impacts of national REDD+ programs on biodiversity and ecosystem services. A draft of the guidelines should be available for comment in March 2011.

20. Revision of 2011 work plans for each country

Country groups developed or revised work plans for 2011, presenting the milestones for development of country-level governance, country-specific interpretation of indicators and implementation of the assessment process.
### Ecuador 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Committee Established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee Approval Final Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSW</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft for REL NSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Version</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Collecting Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start the report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acre 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building of the commission on indicators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building in order to integrate &amp; use indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st consultation period</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd consultation period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final version</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governance
- :red: March
- :green: April
- :blue: May

### Interpretation
- :red: June
- :green: July
- :blue: August

### Assessment
- :red: September
- :green: October
- :blue: November
### Tanzania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation team in place</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar April</td>
<td>May Jun</td>
<td>Aug Sep</td>
<td>Oct Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Committee in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguards workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second draft indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalized indicators and monitoring plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder review meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft proposal to partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to IRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nepal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country specific interpretation</td>
<td>Mar Apr</td>
<td>Jun Aug</td>
<td>Sep Oct</td>
<td>Nov Dec</td>
<td>Jan Feb Mar</td>
<td>Apr May Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of information and final report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Governance**

**Interpretation**

**Assessment**

**REDD+ SES funding proposal**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare an information sheet (REDD SES) to discuss with AR team &amp; partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach CONESFORGUA to explore that option as a platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Conduct meeting and explain REDD SES (if yes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Create a partnership to meeting (Third week approx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Make a work plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach CARE and LUCN to explore steering committee's option.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a draft project proposal to discuss with steering committee or platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logframe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to community groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance**

**Interpretation**

**Assessment**
## Appendix 1. List of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monica de los Rios</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Brazil, Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayri Rando</td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Brazil, Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Allen</td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keshav Khanal</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dil Raj Khanal</td>
<td>FECOFUN</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Estomih Kimonge</td>
<td>Clinton Climate Initiative</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Chiu</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela Carrion</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelie Lhumeau</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Felix</td>
<td>Conservation International</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montserrat Alban</td>
<td>Conservation International</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belen Cordovez</td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Mancheno</td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Santos</td>
<td>Rainforest Alliance</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Reategui</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Peru, San Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milagros Sandoval</td>
<td>Conservation International</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Callejas</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Mexico, Chiapas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandie Fournier</td>
<td>Ambio</td>
<td>Mexico, Chiapas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio Saldana</td>
<td>Conservation International</td>
<td>Mexico, Chiapas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauricio Voivodic</td>
<td>IMAFLORA</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuelo Espinosa</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Stone</td>
<td>Conservation International</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Durbin</td>
<td>CCBA</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Franks</td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Augustine</td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Robinson</td>
<td>Proforest</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Wright</td>
<td>Moore Foundation</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Yves Guedez</td>
<td>UNDP/UN-REDD</td>
<td>Panama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2. Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14 Feb</th>
<th>17.30-18.30</th>
<th>Optional familiarisation with content of the REDD+ Social &amp; Environmental Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Feb</td>
<td><strong>Context, objectives and update on progress of the REDD+ SES initiative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Welcome and introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>Objectives and agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>Understanding standards: their structure and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Introduction to the REDD+ SES Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>Context for monitoring and reporting on REDD+ safeguards: UNFCCC, FCPF, UN-REDD and how the REDD+SES Initiative fits with these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Developing country-level governance and managing the interpretation process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>Guidelines on country-level governance and the process for country-specific interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>Feedback from countries on development of country-level governance and process adopted for country-specific interpretation. Ecuador, Acre, Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>Group work 1: Multi-stakeholder processes, decision making, voting mechanisms: experiences of finding pragmatic solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>Opportunities and challenges of multi-stakeholder processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Reception-drinks and snacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Feb</td>
<td><strong>Best practices for governance and country-specific interpretation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Findings from a workshop on multiple stakeholder processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Developing country-specific indicators and an assessment process at country level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>Guidelines on development of country-specific indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>Preliminary experiences of country-level indicator and monitoring plan development:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13.30 | Group work 3: Identifying challenges for country-specific interpretation of indicators based on review of Ecuador and Acre draft indicators.
| 15.30 | Break                                                                    |
| 16.15 | Group work 4: Developing a monitoring plan                               |
| 17.30 | Close                                                                    |

17 Feb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Complementarity with other safeguards mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>Communication about the REDD+ SES initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>Challenges, opportunities and revision of work plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>Group work 5: - Ecuador and Acre: developing monitoring plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Nepal, Tanzania, San Martin, Guatemala, Chiapas: Identification of challenges and opportunities for effective use of REDD+ SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>Group work 6: Identification of tools, information and capacity needs for the REDD+ SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>Revision of 2011 work plans for each country and for international secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>Summary of plans and wrap up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>