

---



**GUIDANCE FOR  
THE PROVISION OF INFORMATION  
ON REDD+ GOVERNANCE**

DRAFT

July 2011

This document is the result of a consultative process hosted by Chatham House and the UN-REDD Programme.  
It is not a mandated or approved tool of the UN-REDD Programme or of Chatham House.



### The REDD+ agreement

For reasons of brevity, the REDD+-related sections of the Cancun Decision are referred to as the ‘REDD+ agreement’. While this Guidance has attempted to summarize accurately the core contents of the REDD+ agreement, the reader is encouraged to refer to the full text of **Decision 1/CP.16** [*The Cancun Agreements: Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention*], and in particular to **Section C** [*Policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries*] and to **Appendix I** [*Guidance and safeguards for policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries*]. The full text of these can be found in **Annex A**.



# CONTENTS

CONTENTS ..... i

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....ii

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS .....iii

INTRODUCTION .....iv

1. THE IMPORTANCE OF REDD+ GOVERNANCE ..... 1

2. WHAT INFORMATION TO PROVIDE..... 4

3. HOW TO GENERATE AND PROVIDE INFORMATION ..... 8

4. WHO SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN PROVIDING INFORMATION ..... 16

CONCLUSION ..... 18

ANNEX A EXTRACTS FROM DECISION 1/CP.16 (THE ‘REDD+ AGREEMENT’)..... 19

ANNEX B LIST OF RELEVANT INITIATIVES ..... 23

ANNEX C RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THIS GUIDANCE AND THE ‘FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING AND MONITORING FOREST GOVERNANCE’ ..... 31



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Guidance was prepared by the UN-REDD Programme and Chatham House under their respective authorities. It draws on multi-stakeholder inputs made at meetings convened in London [24-25 May 2010] and Rome [18-19 November 2010] and was reviewed by an expert Advisory Group drawn from participants in those meetings. The UN-REDD Programme and Chatham House would like to express their deep appreciation to the following people who contributed invaluable suggestions towards the development of this Guidance: Lawrence Ang, Daniela Carrion, Tim Clairs, Emelyne Cheney, Siri Damman, Crystal Davis, Estelle Fach, Emmy Haffild, Tina Hageberg, Paul Hohnen, Peter Holmgren, Stephen Leonard, Brian Mantlana, Eva Muller, Ravi Prabhu, Rosalind Reeve, Ken Rosenbaum, Jade Saunders, Andrew Wardell, David Young. We would also like to acknowledge the work of Gordon Ramsay, the proof-reader, and of María Guardia and Gabriele Marcelli for the layout and cover design.

While these contributors broadly share the objectives and approach of the Guidance, the final responsibility for content, including any errors and omissions, is entirely that of the UN-REDD Programme and the contributors from Chatham House alone.

The Guidance has been developed with the option of being revised and improved over time, based on experience. Suggestions for improvement can be sent to [reddgovernanceinfo@unredd.net](mailto:reddgovernanceinfo@unredd.net).



## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<b>APRM</b>	African Peer Review Mechanism
<b>BNDES</b>	Brazilian Development Bank
<b>CBD</b>	Convention on Biological Diversity
<b>CCBA</b>	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance
<b>CNSP</b>	National Centre for Fisheries Surveillance and Protection, Guinea
<b>COP</b>	Conference of the Parties
<b>DEFAM</b>	Department of the Amazon Fund
<b>DENR</b>	Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Philippines
<b>EITI</b>	Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
<b>FCPF</b>	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
<b>FLEGT</b>	European Union Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade
<b>FRA</b>	FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment
<b>GFI</b>	Governance of Forests Initiative
<b>GPS</b>	Global Positioning System
<b>IFM</b>	Independent Forest Monitoring
<b>IM-REDD</b>	Independent Monitoring of REDD+
<b>LAS</b>	Legality Assurance System
<b>MFPCs</b>	Multi-sectoral Forest Protection Committees
<b>MRV</b>	Measurement, Reporting and Verification
<b>NPDs</b>	National Programme Documents
<b>NEPAD</b>	New Partnership for Africa's Development
<b>NGO</b>	Non-governmental organization
<b>PGAs</b>	Participatory Governance Assessments
<b>PGI</b>	Partnership Governance Index
<b>POA</b>	Programmes of action
<b>REDD</b>	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
<b>R-PPs</b>	Readiness Preparation Proposals
<b>SBSTA</b>	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
<b>UNDRIP</b>	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
<b>UNFCCC</b>	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
<b>VPA</b>	Voluntary Partnership Agreement
<b>WRI</b>	World Resources Institute



## INTRODUCTION

This draft Guidance is a response to the rapid developments in relation to REDD+.<sup>1</sup> A major step forward was achieved in Cancun, Mexico, in December 2010 where an agreement was reached on the activities, principles and safeguards underlying REDD+, including on the need for systems to provide information on how the safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout the undertaking of REDD+ activities.

Against this background, this document offers Guidance for the provision of information on dimensions of governance that are important for successful REDD+ implementation, including REDD+ safeguards. Its objective is to provide flexible guidance on main elements to consider when establishing a national information system. The Guidance is structured around three main questions: what information to provide, how to generate and provide this information and who should be involved in providing it.

The content of the Guidance is based on the growing body of experience on governance monitoring and assessment in the natural resources sector. Lessons have been drawn from international and national initiatives, the latter providing the most practical lessons for collecting information on REDD+ governance.

This Guidance has been developed to assist REDD+ countries seeking to achieve the objectives and activities agreed under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) within the context of their overarching goal of sustainable development. It encourages REDD+ countries to build on existing institutional structures, where possible, for the design of national REDD+ information systems.

The Guidance is intended for use by national governments, who are primarily responsible for ensuring that REDD+ activities are effectively implemented and safeguards addressed and respected. However, because of the important role they play in the governance of national REDD+ systems, this document is also relevant for stakeholders other than national governments. The Guidance offers a common language and structure necessary to facilitate multi-stakeholder approaches to the provision of information on REDD+ governance.

The Guidance was elaborated through a consultation process hosted by the UN-REDD Programme and Chatham House. It involved inputs from experts from around the world, including both REDD+ and donor countries (see **Acknowledgments** for more details). It represents a first attempt at addressing the core issues regarding the establishment of national information systems for REDD+ governance.<sup>2</sup> The Guidance was developed in close cooperation with an expert process led by the

---

<sup>1</sup> REDD+ refers to activities to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, as well as for the conservation of forest carbon stocks, the sustainable management of forests and the enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries.

<sup>2</sup> Readers are encouraged to provide comments on the use of the Guidance based on their own national context and experience.



World Bank and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in collaboration with other initiatives to develop a Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance. The Guidance and Framework use a common language and structure and are designed so they may be used in a complementary way.

It is hoped that by discussing, using and adapting the Guidance outlined in this document, all those involved in REDD+ activities can play a role in national information systems, thereby ensuring clarity, transparency, coordination and trust at the local, national and international levels.

Further guidance on the development of this document will be sought from the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board.



# 1. THE IMPORTANCE OF REDD+ GOVERNANCE

1.1 In the context of developing an internationally agreed response to the challenge of preventing dangerous climate change, signatory countries of the UNFCCC have committed, in the Cancun Decision, to collectively “aim to slow, halt and reverse forest cover and carbon loss”, according to their national circumstances.<sup>3</sup>

1.2 The Cancun Decision made a significant step towards reaching an agreement on REDD+. For REDD+ countries and other actors involved in preparation activities, there is now clearer guidance on the activities, principles and safeguards underlying REDD+. The REDD+ agreement [see box above and Annex A] specifically includes:

- *Mitigation activities:* The agreement recognizes five REDD+ activities, “(a) Reducing emissions from deforestation; (b) Reducing emissions from forest degradation; (c) Conservation of forest carbon stocks; (d) Sustainable management of forests; (e) Enhancement of forest carbon stocks”. [para 70]<sup>4</sup>
- *Principles:* REDD+ activities should follow certain principles, such as being country-driven and results-based; being consistent with development goals, environmental integrity and adaptation needs; being supported by adequate financial and technological support; and promoting the sustainable management of forests. [Appendix 1.1]
- *Phases:* The agreement outlines a phased approach to the implementation of the REDD+ mechanism, from planning, preparation and capacity-building (phase 1, also called “readiness phase”) and policy implementation (phase 2), to results-based actions to reduce emissions (phase 3). [para 73]
- *Safeguards:* The agreement lists seven safeguards in accordance with which REDD+ activities are to be undertaken, and which are to be promoted and supported. The safeguards concern forest governance, stakeholder participation, the knowledge and rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, the prevention of conversion of natural forests, conservation of biological diversity, the risk of reversals and the risk of displacement of emissions. [Appendix 1.2] In addition, countries are requested to develop “a system for providing information on how safeguards [...] are being addressed and respected”. [para 71(d)]

---

<sup>3</sup> See Decision 1/CP.16, The Cancun Agreements: Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention, FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1. See [http://unfccc.int/documentation/documents/advanced\\_search/items/3594.php#beg](http://unfccc.int/documentation/documents/advanced_search/items/3594.php#beg)

<sup>4</sup> References are to the relevant paragraph numbers in the REDD+ agreement (Decision 1/CP.16). For ease of reading, specific references to official text have been reduced to the minimum.






**1.3** The REDD+ agreement gives rise to new and, in many ways, unprecedented risks and opportunities in relation to governance. Lack of state capacity to create consistent and enabling policy environments, be accountable to relevant stakeholders and enforce the rule of law, alongside lack of the capacity of non-state actors and civil society to hold governments to account – all key elements of governance – are major challenges for many REDD+ countries. Hence, the international REDD+ mechanism will present huge challenges for countries where institutions are weak and corruption may be widespread. Failing to address these governance issues is likely to exacerbate conflict over the use of natural resources and create perverse outcomes for people and ecosystems.

**1.4** At the same time, the REDD+ mechanism also creates new incentives and for a stronger platform with which to tackle governance and corruption issues. Good governance is not only necessary to avoid the adverse impacts of REDD+ activities, it is also key towards achieving successful climate mitigation outcomes. Having equitable national REDD+ systems, which not only provide incentives based on tangible results but also ensure that emissions reductions are permanent and are not simply displaced, will require increasing levels of good governance over time. There is no doubt therefore that governance information systems shall play an essential role in the development and improvement of national REDD+ strategies.

**1.5** The importance of good governance for implementing REDD+ is recognised in the REDD+ agreement. It features prominently in the seven safeguards to be promoted and supported when undertaking mitigation actions through REDD+. There is explicit reference to “transparent and effective national forest governance structures” as one of the key safeguards, while the other safeguards are either directly or indirectly contingent on good governance for their realisation. Further, the REDD+ agreement requests that countries develop systems to provide information on how REDD+ safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of mitigation activities.

**1.6** There are several additional reasons for assessing and providing information on REDD+ governance, among them:

- Given the complexity of the measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of carbon, it may be difficult to assess the results of REDD+ activities solely based on emissions reductions. Governance information systems can provide the complementary information necessary to evaluate performance.
- Many developing countries will need financial support to develop and implement their national REDD+ strategies and plans. Demonstrating results to donors and investors is likely to require monitoring and reporting on issues other than emissions reductions, such as the effective implementation of activities and the appropriate use of financing. Similarly, matching the scale and type of governance requirements with the scale and type of financing to be mobilized will prove paramount towards incentivizing investment and enabling effective and transparent outcomes across all phases.
- Domestic decision-makers will need a broad array of data at their disposal to assess whether they are on course towards achieving their national sustainable development objectives. Governance information systems will help to identify potential for additional social and political outcomes and co-benefits of the REDD+ mechanism within a given national context.

- 
- Assessing REDD+ governance will increase the level of transparency in REDD+ planning and implementation, both for domestic and international stakeholders, and may provide a basis for evidence-led policy reform.

#### **BOX 1. Why assess and provide information on REDD+ governance?**

To facilitate the improvement of national REDD+ strategies;

To support equitable systems of genuinely performance-based payments;

To assess the results of REDD+ activities;

To help the implementation of safeguards and provide information on how they are being addressed and respected;

To ensure meaningful accountability to domestic stakeholders and to donors/investors;

To ground and trace progress towards national development goals;

To increase transparency in REDD+ planning and implementation.



## 2. WHAT INFORMATION TO PROVIDE

**2.1** A first step towards designing a national information system is to identify governance issues on which information is to be provided. **REDD+ governance is assumed to refer to the oversight of all the institutions, policies and processes that a country has in place at national and sub-national levels to implement REDD+** (including MRV of carbon, respect for safeguards, financial accountability, etc.). Its scope includes previously existing institutions, policies and processes, as well as those specifically created for the REDD+ mechanism.


**2.2** Drawing from the rich experiences in defining national governance and forest governance, as well as from standards beginning to be elaborated in multilateral institutions,<sup>5</sup> this Guidance proposes an operational description of REDD+ governance that is based on the following three pillars:

- **Policy, legal, institutional and regulatory frameworks**
- **Planning and decision-making processes**
- **Implementation, enforcement and compliance**

**2.3** The pillars are facets of REDD+ governance occurring simultaneously. Achieving good REDD+ governance requires that principles of good governance are appropriately and consistently applied throughout the three pillars, as illustrated in Figure 1. A consensus has emerged among practitioners towards identifying some key principles that generally characterise good governance: **accountability, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, participation and transparency**. These are not stand-alone principles, but are interrelated and mutually reinforce each other.

---

<sup>5</sup> The analysis used to define and conceptualise REDD+ governance is outlined in: Jade Saunders and Rosalind Reeve, 'Monitoring Governance for Implementation of REDD+', Background Paper 1, Monitoring Governance Safeguards in REDD+ Expert Workshop (24<sup>th</sup> – 25<sup>th</sup> May 2010), Chatham House, London, and Crystal Davis, *Governance in REDD+: Taking stock of governance issues raised in readiness proposals submitted to the FCPF and the UN-REDD Programme*, Background Paper 2, Monitoring Governance Safeguards in REDD+ Expert Workshop (24<sup>th</sup> – 25<sup>th</sup> May 2010), Chatham House, London. The two papers can be found at [www.un-redd.org/Events/Chatham\\_House\\_Workshop/tabid/4522/language/en-US/Default.aspx](http://www.un-redd.org/Events/Chatham_House_Workshop/tabid/4522/language/en-US/Default.aspx)



**Figure 1:** Proposed description of pillars and principles of REDD+ governance

**2.4** Table 1 elaborates what good REDD+ governance could entail and provides generic guidance on “what information to provide”. The first column shows the three pillars of REDD+ governance; the second column lists the essential elements of each pillar; and the third column identifies the REDD+ safeguards relevant to each pillar. The elements listed in Table 1 highlight critical and widely relevant governance issues. However, they may not be comprehensive with respect to every REDD+ governance issue that is important for a particular country. In addition, the elements may not be relevant in the exact same way in different countries, since governance is a highly contextual concept.



**Table 1.** What information to provide

Pillars	Elements	Relevant safeguards [See Annex A, Decision 1/CP.16, Appendix 1.2]
Policy, legal, institutional and regulatory frameworks	<p>Clarity and coherence of policies, laws and regulations related to REDD+ (forest, land use, climate, trade and investment, freedom of information, etc.)</p> <p>Consistency of policies related to REDD+ with national development plans and strategies</p> <p>Incorporation of international commitments/obligations relevant to REDD+, such as UNFCCC, United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), in national legislation</p> <p>Existence of a legal framework supporting and protecting land tenure, carbon ownership and use rights, including customary and traditional rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities</p> <p>Existence of legal provisions, and of transparent and accountable mechanisms, for equitable sharing of revenues and benefits deriving from REDD+</p> <p>Clarity, consistency and coherence of mandates across all levels of government</p>	<p>Actions complement or are consistent with national forest programmes and international conventions and agreements [a]</p> <p>Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation [b]</p> <p>Respect for the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, taking into account relevant international obligations, national laws [c]</p> <p>Actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, and enhance other social and environmental benefits [e]</p> <p>Actions to address the risks of reversals [f]</p> <p>Actions to reduce displacement of emissions [g]</p>
Planning and decision-making processes	<p>Full and effective stakeholder participation in the design of policies related to REDD+, with special emphasis on vulnerable groups<sup>6</sup></p> <p>Existence, accessibility, fairness, independence and effectiveness of conflict resolution and grievance mechanisms</p> <p>Transparency and accountability (including independent oversight) of agencies relevant to REDD+</p> <p>Transparency and accountability (including reconciliation) of REDD+ payments and revenues</p> <p>Transparency of, and stakeholder participation in, MRV and monitoring processes</p> <p>Accessibility of all information related to REDD+, including active dissemination and appropriation among relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation [b]</p> <p>Full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular Indigenous Peoples and local communities [d]</p>

<sup>6</sup> This includes Indigenous Peoples and women.



<p>Implementation, enforcement and compliance</p>	<p>Effectiveness, equity and transparency of the administration of land tenure and carbon rights</p> <p>Full and effective stakeholder participation in the implementation of policies related to REDD+ , with special emphasis on vulnerable groups</p> <p>Effective cooperative enforcement of laws and regulations relevant to REDD+, both within and between countries</p> <p>Effectiveness, transparency and integrity of the judiciary and law enforcement agencies</p> <p>Effective implementation of, and compliance with, international commitments/obligations relevant to REDD+</p> <p>Cooperation and coordination across agencies relevant to REDD+ at all levels of government</p> <p>Effectiveness of measures to address corruption</p>	<p>Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation [b]</p> <p>Actions to address the risks of reversals [f]</p> <p>Actions to reduce displacement of emissions [g]</p>
---	---	--

**2.5** Country-specific indicators need to be developed to collect data on each element. In-depth guidance on the development of indicators is beyond the scope of this document, although it stresses the key importance of stakeholder participation in this process. The UN-REDD Programme’s Participatory Governance Assessments for REDD+ (PGAs) can assist with the development of indicators in an inclusive, participatory and country-specific manner. See **Annex B** for more information on the PGAs.

**2.6** Good forest governance is an essential component of REDD+ governance (see Figure 3 in Annex C). This is recognized in the REDD+ agreement through the inclusion of the need for “transparent and effective forest governance structures” in the safeguards. The complementary “Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance”, which was developed by FAO and the World Bank, can be used as a specific tool to enable the provision of information on how the forest governance safeguard is addressed and respected within a broader system for providing information on REDD+ governance and other safeguards. Based on the same three pillars and six principles of good governance, the Framework offers useful and detailed advice for the development of indicators for forest governance tailored to national needs and circumstances. This advice can be applied to developing indicators for the provision of information on REDD+ governance as well as forest governance, together with the lessons learnt from existing processes for the development of indicators provided in section 3.4 of this Guidance. It could for instance be used to assist with indicator development under UN-REDD’s PGAs. See **Annex C** for a complete overview of the relationship between this Guidance and the Framework.



## 3. HOW TO GENERATE AND PROVIDE INFORMATION

3.1 A next question to consider is “how to generate and provide information” on the pillars and elements of REDD+ governance. The REDD+ agreement has initiated a process whereby the UNFCCC Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) will develop guidance for modalities on a system for providing information on how the safeguards are addressed and respected for consideration at the next climate conference in Durban in December 2011. [Appendix II]<sup>7</sup>

3.2 Using the provisions of the REDD+ agreement as a starting point, **an information system is understood as the set of institutions and processes through which information is collected, verified, assessed, published and fed back to relevant institutions.** As mentioned, such systems will perform several key functions for the implementation of REDD+, such as facilitating the improvement of national REDD+ strategies and enabling the provision of information on safeguards required by the REDD+ agreement.

3.3 This Guidance draws from past and current experience in the natural resources sector to inform a system for the provision of information on REDD+ governance. There are many guidelines, methodologies, as well as assessment and monitoring tools, to learn from. While several of these have been elaborated within international frameworks, valuable lessons can also be drawn from national initiatives such as the Governance Partnership Index in Indonesia or Multi-Sectoral Forest Protection Committees in the Philippines. Some of the initiatives relevant to REDD+ governance are listed in **Annex B.**<sup>8</sup>

### Lessons learnt from past and current experience

3.4 Existing initiatives and case studies offer a wide range of practical lessons for information systems, as listed below.<sup>9</sup>

### Cross-cutting lessons

#### *Timely access to information*

The credibility of the information provided through a system rests on transparency and the timely delivery of all relevant data. Access to data is necessary to enable the full and effective participation of stakeholders. It is key to verification and assessment activities. To ensure that access to information, and therefore participation, is effective, reports and other relevant information should be published in a timely manner. Furthermore, stakeholders need the capacity to properly analyze, synthesize and interpret data.

#### *Stakeholder participation in all aspects of information provision*

---

<sup>7</sup> The next climate conference will be the 17<sup>th</sup> session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC (COP17).

<sup>8</sup> Please note that Annex B does not claim to be an exhaustive list of all relevant initiatives for the provision of information on REDD+ governance.

<sup>9</sup> For a full description of the “lessons”, please refer to “Section 4: Monitoring Governance for REDD+: Lessons from existing initiatives and country cases” in Saunders and Reeve, *op. cit.*



Full and effective stakeholder participation in all information provision activities (selection of indicators, data collection, verification, assessment, publication and feedback to relevant institutions) as well as in the design of information systems will result in more credible and useful information. It will also ensure that the process of providing information is transparent and accountable to citizens and investors. Bringing stakeholders together with government agencies to design and implement cooperative systems can also help to build trust.

#### ***Capacity building at all levels***

Capacity building will be needed for REDD+ stakeholders engaged in information provision activities. Broad-based capacity building ensures full and effective stakeholder participation in the process of providing information. It also ensures consistent understanding of the system design and effective implementation. It is particularly important to maintain the quality and reliability of data when all stakeholders are not yet capable of performing appropriate functions.

#### ***Building on existing data sets***

Building on existing data collection and reporting commitments relevant to REDD+ governance (e.g. independent audit / monitoring of the European Union's Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) legality assurance systems (LAS), reporting for the global forest resources assessment (FRA), domestic collection of social statistics, etc.), increases transparency and reliability of data at the same time as reducing costs. It is however important to ensure the data is consistent and relevant.

#### ***Building on existing processes***

Building on existing institutions and processes (e.g. the FLEGT LAS, national forest inventories and the FRA, independent forest monitoring systems, governance / social and environmental assessments, standards for voluntary REDD+ schemes, etc.) increases efficiencies and reduces costs. Private sector REDD+ project developers use a variety of voluntary international standards - such as for instance those developed by the Voluntary Carbon Standards Association, Community Climate Biodiversity Alliance and Plan Vivo - to undertake third party validation and verification of methodologies to estimate carbon pool flux and the co-benefits of projects.

## **Lessons for indicator-based data collection**

#### ***Using the smallest possible indicator set and redefining it over time***

One should use the smallest possible set of indicators necessary to deliver sufficient data to make valid governance assessments. Indicator sets should be redefined over time to focus on the specific needs of REDD+ at national level. Such an iterative process increases efficiency and data credibility. If resources for information provision are limited, assessing key issues rigorously is preferable to the superficial assessment of a very broad set of issues.

#### ***Cross-referencing data and using "intelligent" indicators***

Providing relevant data on complex issues such as REDD+ governance requires the use of "intelligent" composite indicators that are designed to perform different functions, such as identifying needed





actions for reform or tracking changes over time.<sup>10</sup> Cross-referencing information on policy, implementation and enforcement, for example, is also key to understanding the relationship between policy design and impacts.

### ***Demonstrating performance against milestones***

Demonstrating progress over time requires the establishment of milestones against which performance can be measured. The necessary baseline-setting exercise can serve as a diagnostic of governance structures and help identify needs for reforms. This initial assessment should be as broad as possible in order to enable indicator sets to change over time without losing comparability with the baseline.

### ***Inclusive and qualitative definition and selection of indicators***

Defining and selecting indicators is a process that will eventually also define the type of governance information provided. As such, it is important to ensure that the indicators selected are aligned with the interests of the relevant stakeholders. Qualitative and participatory analysis (such as focus groups, consultations, participatory approaches in the indicator selection) should be undertaken to select the indicators, followed by quantitative data collection.

## **Lessons for selecting appropriate tools**

### ***Incorporating independent field-based monitoring***

Independent field-based monitoring is an important tool to test whether practice on the ground is consistent with policy on paper. It complements indicator-based assessments. This has been recognized under the FLEGT LAS which incorporates regular independent audits / monitoring of the systems to ensure they are functioning adequately (see Box 3 and Annex B). Triangulation, i.e. the practice of reconciling data collected from a range of sources and through several different methods, ensures relevant and reliable information. Collecting data in the field on REDD+ activities will be particularly central to the improvement of national REDD+ systems. This role is best undertaken by an organization, or actors, whose mandate is independent from, but who cooperate with, the government agencies overseeing REDD+ activities.

### ***Using audit and reconciliation***

Providing information on financial flows, including benefit sharing, requires the use of specific auditing tools. Past experience in the natural resources sector demonstrates that an audit should include reconciliation, i.e. a process through which an institution will verify that reports of payments made and revenues received agree. Reconciliation also implies a detailed follow-up and verification of discrepancies that emerge in the data collected. Audit and reconciliation can be of particular importance to REDD+ governance, as illustrated in Box 2 on the Amazon Fund.

---

<sup>10</sup> The *Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance* developed by FAO and the World Bank offers some useful guidance for the development of “intelligent” indicators.



## **BOX 2. The Amazon Fund: early lessons for providing information on REDD+ financial flows**

Brazil's Amazon Fund is one of the first working models of a national REDD+ fund and provides early lessons on how to provide information on REDD+ financial flows. The Amazon Fund is administered by the Brazilian Development Bank (BNDES) and follows standard BNDES operational procedures, including procedures related to financial accounting and social and environmental safeguards. Annual financial audits of the Amazon Fund are conducted by an independent firm, in addition to a compliance audit to assess all approved projects against established guidelines, criteria and overarching Fund objectives. Records of financial audits are published annually on the Amazon Fund website, in addition to documentation of applications received and approved projects. The current practice of publishing project-related documentation online can be partially attributed to civil society organizations in the Amazon Fund steering committees, which have sought a greater degree of transparency from BNDES on this issue.

The Amazon Fund also has a "Logical Framework," which will be used by the BNDES technical team to track the overall impact of its investments. The Framework provides a methodology for monitoring and then consolidating results from individual projects using key indicators. Each Amazon Fund project is required to develop measurable results indicators. Once project implementation begins, progress is monitored by the Department of the Amazon Fund (DEFAM) at a minimum interval of six months. Project monitoring also includes analysis of project financial data to ensure compliance with contract conditions and financial standards. Project-level monitoring is then aggregated to assess progress towards overarching objectives and strategic targets of the Fund.

### ***Independent verification and review of data***

Verification is the process where independent third parties verify and confirm the accuracy of collected data (including data collection procedures). Generally speaking, verification is technical and non-judgmental. It should be complemented by a multi-stakeholder review aiming to analyze and elucidate inaccuracies (see lesson on peer review below). Verification and review are key tools to ensure the reliability of information provided through a system. Appropriate oversight mechanisms involving verification and review both at national and international level also increase the accountability of processes for the provision of information.

## **BOX 3. FLEGT-VPA experience in Central Africa: the evolving role of independent monitors**

The EU's Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Action Plan encompassed a number of provisions to address poor forest governance, weak law enforcement, illegal logging and the associated trade in illegally-logged timber products. Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPA) aim to support governance reform, strengthen law enforcement and establish national licensing schemes. The credibility of all aspects of the Legality Assurance System of a VPA participating country was to be provided by an independent monitor undertaking field-based assessments.

Early experiences with external third-party monitoring focused on "following the logs" produced by large-scale, industrial concessionaires largely destined for export. Recent research on domestic timber and chainsaw milling in Central Africa has revealed that small-scale chainsaw production in several VPA countries is larger than industrial timber production and remains largely informal. The domestic timber sector has remained outside formal forest legal frameworks despite the significant positive impacts on rural economies. Chainsaw milling and the associated trade creates thousands of direct jobs (an estimated 50,000 in Cameroon compared to 13,000 for the formal industrial timber sector), and sustains rural livelihoods in areas where few alternatives exist. Informal payments represent between 9-15 percent of total harvesting costs. Chainsaw millers continue to operate within a complex network managed by corrupt officials who are supposed to uphold the rule of the law.

The European Parliament adoption of the resolution on FLEGT VPAs on 19 January 2011 has provided renewed impetus to using a market-based mechanism to reduce illegal logging. All Central African countries have now included discussions on the domestic timber market in their VPAs. Each country will need to develop specific measures to formalize the informal sector. This may include revision of forestry laws to acknowledge the existence and importance of small-scale loggers for national economies, the need to professionalize small-scale chainsaw millers, and new independent monitoring initiatives to "follow the money" associated with the timber trade. Corrupt networks run by officials will not be dismantled in the absence of strong sanctions enforced by central governments. Additional research on the ecological impacts of small-scale chainsaw milling is needed to, inter alia, reduce the collateral damage associated with selective logging and to improve processing rates.



### ***National ownership***

Ownership of the information system by national stakeholders is key to its long term viability and effectiveness. Full and effective stakeholder participation in designing and implementing the system will help to ensure national ownership as well as legitimacy in the eyes of stakeholders.

### ***Appropriate financing of information provision activities***

It is important to establish consistent, sustained and appropriate financing for all information provision activities (data collection, verification & review, assessment, publication, feedback to relevant institutions etc.) and all actors involved in undertaking them. The responsible financing institution should be capable of managing appropriate amounts, and foster both national ownership and independence of the process for providing information.

### ***Cost effectiveness***

The costs of a system for information provision need to be realistic while delivering robust data through locally appropriate methodology. While initial set-up costs can be incorporated into readiness, the on-going operational costs of a system should not place a disproportionate burden on national authorities compared with the value of likely REDD+ benefits. Experience from field-based monitoring and low tech systems suggests that cost-effective options do not have to compromise the reliability of information provided. Weighing costs against effectiveness will also be a determinant in the periodicity of indicator-based assessments.

### ***Clarifying roles and responsibilities within an information system***

Roles, mandates and responsibilities need to be clearly understood and laid out in governing statutes relevant to the national information system (including in contracts and terms of reference) and in governing arrangements for multi-stakeholder participation in the information provision process. The ways in which representatives are chosen for a multi-stakeholder process is also important. Clear roles and responsibilities help to insure against institutional failures, and also increase effectiveness and transparency of the information system, as well as encourage trust between stakeholders.

### ***Identifying priorities***

Information systems should prioritise their focus through an approach tailored to the specific national REDD+ context to enable the provision of information in an efficient and cost-effective way. Tools will be needed to identify priority information, which will change as a country moves through REDD+ phases.

### ***Peer review assists credibility and acts as a buffer***

A mechanism for peer review of the information provided, preferably by a multi-stakeholder body, helps to ensure a robust information system. It can also act as a buffer between those providing information and stakeholders. However, peer review should be mindful of undue influence, and not inhibit or delay publication, or affect the veracity of the evidence base.

### ***Coordinating domestic and international information needs***

Information provision will likely serve two distinct needs: the improvement of domestic processes (policy, legal frameworks, implementation and enforcement strategies), and the provision of information to international institutions. A broad array of data will be required, along with operational analysis and strategic assessment, to serve the needs of both domestic and international



processes. To ensure efficiency and accountability, national information systems must cater for all information needs in an integrated and coordinated way with verification and review at national and international levels.

#### *Including a conflict resolution mechanism*

Given anticipated financial flows and unclear land tenure in many forest countries, the risk of local conflict relating to REDD+ activities is high. Arrangements for multi-stakeholder participation will reduce but not eliminate this risk and will often not be sufficient to ensure the accountability and equity of the information system. They need to be complemented by robust and independent conflict resolution mechanisms at local and national levels.

### **Designing a national information system for REDD+ governance**


**3.5** This section considers how the lessons detailed above can be applied to the design of national information systems for REDD+ governance. Recognising that methodologies need to be adapted to suit national circumstances, it is not prescriptive, but rather suggests key elements of a system and relevant tools and proposed activities. In order to promote efficiencies and cost effectiveness, information systems for REDD+ governance can be embedded in existing institutional structures, while taking care to ensure appropriate domestic accountability. Similarly, consideration should be given to integrating information systems that cover wider REDD+ information requirements, i.e. governance, finance, mitigation activities, social and environmental safeguards and multiple benefits.

**3.6** While institutional arrangements may differ from one country to another, it is recommended that a national information system should be composed of four key elements [see Figure 2]:

- **Data collection:** Ongoing, direct observation and recording of governance aspects of REDD+ activities and financial flows;
- **Operational analysis:** Regular analysis of the data collected to draw conclusions informing the implementation of REDD+ activities;
- **Strategic assessment:** Periodic assessment of the state of REDD+ governance, drawing on the data collected as well as additional targeted research, to inform REDD+ national plans and strategies and fulfill international information provision requirements;
- **Feedback:** Providing the results of the operational analysis and strategic assessment to the relevant institutions, followed by agreement on actions required to strengthen the pillars of REDD+ governance.



**Figure 2:** A national information system for REDD+ governance



**3.7** Information provision is the result of an ongoing and multi-faceted process. While data should be collected and recorded on a continuous basis and analysed regularly to inform REDD+ implementation and so meet operational needs, informing strategic/policy development requires periodic assessments that provide comprehensive information on the state of REDD+ governance. Information from operational analyses will inform the periodic assessments. When reported to the relevant institutions, the result of these assessments will form the basis for actions to strengthen REDD+ governance structures. The assessments will also help to improve national information systems by identifying data gaps and needs for new data collection and information provision functions to be developed. Box 4 below identifies relevant tools for the multiple aspects of information provision.

#### **BOX 4. Relevant tools for information provision**

##### **Preparation**

Relevant tools: Inventory of existing assessments and data sets, gap analysis of monitoring, stakeholder mapping and consultation, publication of proposed indicators and feedback, design of a monitoring plan (including milestones and capacity needs), risk profiling to assist priority setting.

##### **Data collection**

Relevant tools: Stakeholders workshops, expert consultation, opinion surveys, audits, report card, field visits, low-tech networks.

##### **Analysis**

Relevant tools: Gap analysis of government's decisions, multi-stakeholder evaluation of findings, reconciliation.

##### **Quality assurance**

Relevant tools: Peer review, independent third party verification, analysis of monitoring quality, stakeholder consultation, multi-stakeholder evaluation of reports (e.g. through a comment period), conflict resolution/grievance.

##### **Dissemination**

Relevant tools: Publication of information, active dissemination of data, analysis and validation (use of Internet, local language, mass media, etc.), review of knowledge uptake.

##### **Feedback**

Relevant tools: Reporting to relevant institutions, multi-stakeholder agreement on corrective actions and responsibilities.



3.8 Table 2 has been developed to suggest some of the activities involved under each of the key elements of a national information system, drawing on the lessons outlined at the beginning of this section and the relevant tools detailed in Box 4. It is not intended to be comprehensive but to give an idea of how a national system might work.

**Table 2: Possible activities under a national information system for REDD+ governance**

	Data collection	Operational analysis	Strategic assessment
	<p>Clarify and publish policies, laws and regulations relevant to REDD+</p> <p>Clarify and publish the mandates of all institutions involved in REDD+ activities</p> <p>Publish REDD+ payments and revenues</p> <p>Conduct low-tech information gathering at field level, and compile into timely, periodic reports</p> <p>Engage Indigenous Peoples, local communities, civil society and the private sector in indicator design and data collection</p> <p>Encourage open-ended monitoring, beyond the indicators, to check that the indicator-based monitoring is capturing everything</p>	<p>Establish milestones for measuring implementation and enforcement</p> <p>Conduct the independent audit and verification of REDD+ payments and revenues</p> <p>Determine capacity-building needs for effective data collection</p> <p>Independently assess the implementation, enforcement and impacts of national REDD+ systems</p> <p>Publish assessment results, including recommendations, and ensure dissemination to all relevant stakeholders</p> <p>Establish conflict resolution / grievance mechanism to resolve differences</p>	<p>Select and publish nationally appropriate indicators</p> <p>Identify assessment priorities through an intelligence-led approach</p> <p>Establish, independently verify, peer review and publish baseline data</p> <p>Reconcile REDD+ payments and revenues and independently verify potential discrepancies</p> <p>Publish information, including recommendations, after peer review and endorsement by government and representative group of stakeholders</p>
Feedback		<p>Report to the relevant implementing/enforcement agencies and to other monitoring institutions</p> <p>Agree on clear responsibilities and obtain commitments to operational-level corrective actions based on this analysis</p>	<p>Report to the relevant policy-setting and implementing/enforcement institutions</p> <p>Agree on clear responsibilities and obtain commitments to policy strengthening and other strategic-level improvements to governance</p>



## 4. WHO SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN PROVIDING INFORMATION

4.1 This final section considers the question of “who should be involved in providing information”. While this Guidance is intended for national governments, it should not be interpreted as suggesting that only governments will provide information on REDD+ governance. Rather, a wide range of governmental and non-governmental actors will play a role in the provision of governance information, as illustrated in the case study from Indonesia in Box 5.

### BOX 5. Governance reforms in Indonesia: a process with multiple actors

The Government of Indonesia (GoI) has demonstrated a clear commitment to move from one-off assessments of the “corruption complex” to a more systematic monitoring over time of specific aspects of government performance. This encompasses efforts by a broad array of institutions including the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK), the Anti-Corruption Commission (KPK), the Financial Intelligence Agency (PPATK), the Bank of Indonesia, and the Presidential Special Delivery Unit for Development Monitoring and Control (UKP4). The Head of UKP4 also heads the Anti-Judicial Mafia Taskforce.

GoI tends to use policy instruments, notably government regulations (PP), Presidential regulations (Perpres), Presidential decrees (Keppres), Ministerial Regulations (Permen) and Ministerial decrees (Kepman), to underwrite reforms. Policies and regulations are being reviewed and if found to be ineffective will be revoked or revised. Bureaucratic reforms have been implemented in the Ministry of Finance, the Supreme Court and National Audit Agency. Furthermore, the audit part of the REDD+ governance assessment in Indonesia builds on the BPK’s annual financial audit system with results published on a widely accessible web site. The KPK has already conducted a comprehensive integrity survey, and prepared a step-by-step action plan to address poor governance in the forestry sector.

The Head of UKP4 also leads the REDD+ Task Force, an interim coordinating structure pending the establishment of a new national REDD+ Agency. Climate change is one of six “debottlenecking issues” being addressed by UKP4. KPK has recently completed a review of the Planning Directorate within the Ministry of Forestry with a clear matrix of reforms to be undertaken over the next year. The Anti-Money Laundering Law was revised in 2010, and the Bank of Indonesia has adopted new guidelines for Customer and Enhanced Due Diligence.

Government-led reforms are also monitored by several non-state organizations which conduct annual perception surveys such as the Corruption Index (Transparency International), Partnership Governance Index (Kemitraan), Autonomy Governance Index (KKPPOD) and Democracy Index (UNDP/Bappenas). These initiatives, together with the growing voice of Indonesian civil society and freedom of the press, provide a critical new context for forest sector reforms in Indonesia.

4.2 It is clear from UNFCCC Decisions and evolving practice that “relevant stakeholders” should be engaged in the implementation and provision of information on REDD+ activities and safeguards.<sup>11</sup> Stakeholders have been defined as “those groups that have a stake/interest/right in the forest and those that will be affected either negatively or positively by REDD+ activities”.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> SBSTA Decision 4/CP.15 (December 2009) recognizes the need for “full and effective engagement” of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in monitoring and reporting of activities related to REDD+. Practice is evolving through the development of national strategies and action plans contained in REDD+ Readiness Preparation Proposals (R-PPs) and UN-REDD National Programme Documents (NPDs). The REDD+ agreement requires these national strategies and action plans, which address both carbon and “non-carbon” monitoring systems, to ensure the “full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, inter alia Indigenous Peoples and local communities” [para 72].

<sup>12</sup> UN-REDD and FCPF, ‘Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness with a focus on the Participation of Indigenous Peoples and Other Forest-Dependant Communities’ (Draft), (November 17, 2010).  
[www.un-redd.org/NewsCentre/UNREDD\\_FCPF\\_IP\\_Guidelines/tabid/4217/Default.aspx](http://www.un-redd.org/NewsCentre/UNREDD_FCPF_IP_Guidelines/tabid/4217/Default.aspx)



**4.3** Relevant stakeholders will vary depending on the national context and should be determined within the country. One can, however, identify five categories of actors that will be engaged in the provision of information on REDD+ governance:

- Government agencies overseeing REDD+ activities
- Independent third parties, including:
  - public institutions (e.g. ombudsperson, human rights commissions, judiciary, parliament, supreme auditor, environmental state prosecutor, etc.)
  - non-state actors (e.g. organised non-governmental organizations (NGOs), broader civil society, academia, media etc.)
- Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent communities
- Private sector (e.g. REDD+ project developers, companies engaged in harvesting and selling forest products) and NGOs engaged in REDD+ project development
- Service providers contracted by the other groups to fulfil specific functions (e.g. financial auditors).

**4.4** Whatever mix is appropriate for a specific national context, a participatory process providing information collected from a variety of sources, independently verified then reviewed by a multi-stakeholder body will carry greater legitimacy in the eyes of citizens and international donors/investors.





## CONCLUSION

This Guidance provides a first attempt to capture the key elements to consider in relation to providing information on REDD+ governance across different country contexts, in line with the provisions of the REDD+ agreement. Its content may be revised over time to incorporate practical lessons learnt through pilots supported by the UN-REDD Programme and other relevant initiatives (e.g. involving use of both the Guidance and the complementary Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance).

No document of this length can be expected to cover comprehensively the potential range of issues that might arise in designing a national information system. These issues, however, should emerge from a robust ongoing multi-stakeholder process using this document, as well as future SBSTA guidance on modalities for systems to provide information on how REDD+ safeguards are being addressed and respected, to frame discussions on what information to provide, how to provide it and who should provide it in specific national REDD+ contexts.

Approaches such as the UN-REDD Programme's Participatory Governance Assessments (PGAs) can assist in the development of national information systems for REDD+ governance. PGAs are initiated, implemented and sustained by relevant REDD+ stakeholders. They provide a suitable platform not only for the initial assessment of governance structures and recommendations for policy reforms, but also for establishing effective and accountable information systems that will help to ensure good REDD+ governance.



## ANNEX A

### EXTRACTS FROM DECISION 1/CP.16 (THE 'REDD+ AGREEMENT')

Decision 1/CP.16 (The Cancun Agreements: Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention)

#### Extracts relevant to REDD+

**“C. Policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries**

Affirming that, in the context of the provision of adequate and predictable support to developing country Parties, Parties should collectively aim to slow, halt and reverse forest cover and carbon loss, in accordance with national circumstances, consistent with the ultimate objective of the Convention, as stated in Article 2,

Also affirming the need to promote broad country participation in all phases described in paragraph 73 below, including through the provision of support that takes into account existing capacities,

68. Encourages all Parties to find effective ways to reduce the human pressure on forests that results in greenhouse gas emissions, including actions to address drivers of deforestation;

69. Affirms that the implementation of the activities referred to in paragraph 70 below should be carried out in accordance with appendix I to this decision, and that the safeguards referred to in paragraph 2 of appendix I to this decision should be promoted and supported;

70. Encourages developing country Parties to contribute to mitigation actions in the forest sector by undertaking the following activities, as deemed appropriate by each Party and in accordance with their respective capabilities and national circumstances:

- (a) Reducing emissions from deforestation;
- (b) Reducing emissions from forest degradation;
- (c) Conservation of forest carbon stocks;
- (d) Sustainable management of forests;
- (e) Enhancement of forest carbon stocks;

71. Requests developing country Parties aiming to undertake the activities referred to in paragraph 70 above, in the context of the provision of adequate and predictable support, including financial resources and technical and technological support to developing country Parties, in accordance with national circumstances and respective capabilities, to develop the following elements:

- (a) A national strategy or action plan;



(b) A national forest reference emission level and/or forest reference level<sup>13</sup> or, if appropriate, as an interim measure, subnational forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels, in accordance with national circumstances, and with provisions contained in decision 4/CP.15, and with any further elaboration of those provisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties;

(c) A robust and transparent national forest monitoring system for the monitoring and reporting of the activities referred to in paragraph 70 above, with, if appropriate, subnational monitoring and reporting as an interim measure,<sup>14</sup> in accordance with national circumstances, and with the provisions contained in decision 4/CP.15, and with any further elaboration of those provisions agreed by the Conference of the Parties;

(d) A system for providing information on how the safeguards referred to in appendix I to this decision are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of the activities referred to in paragraph 70 above, while respecting sovereignty;

72. Also requests developing country Parties, when developing and implementing their national strategies or action plans, to address, inter alia, the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, land tenure issues, forest governance issues, gender considerations and the safeguards identified in paragraph 2 of appendix I to this decision, ensuring the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, inter alia Indigenous Peoples and local communities;

73. Decides that the activities undertaken by Parties referred to in paragraph 70 above should be implemented in phases, beginning with the development of national strategies or action plans, policies and measures, and capacity-building, followed by the implementation of national policies and measures and national strategies or action plans that could involve further capacity-building, technology development and transfer and results-based demonstration activities, and evolving into results-based actions that should be fully measured, reported and verified;

74. Recognizes that the implementation of the activities referred to in paragraph 70 above, including the choice of a starting phase as referred to in paragraph 73 above, depends on the specific national circumstances, capacities and capabilities of each developing country Party and the level of support received;

75. Requests the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice to develop a work programme on the matters referred to in appendix II to this decision;

76. Urges Parties, in particular developed country Parties, to support, through multilateral and bilateral channels, the development of national strategies or action plans, policies and measures and capacity-building, followed by the implementation of national policies and measures and national strategies or action plans that could involve further capacity-building, technology development and transfer and results-based demonstration activities, including consideration of the safeguards referred to in paragraph 2 of appendix I to this decision, taking into account the relevant provisions on finance including those relating to reporting on support;

77. Requests the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention to explore financing options for the full implementation of the results-based actions<sup>15</sup> referred to in

---

<sup>13</sup> In accordance with national circumstances, national forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels could be a combination of subnational forest reference emissions levels and/or forest reference levels.

<sup>14</sup> Including monitoring and reporting of emissions displacement at the national level, if appropriate, and reporting on how displacement of emissions is being addressed, and on the means to integrate subnational monitoring systems into a national monitoring system.

<sup>15</sup> These actions require national monitoring systems.

---

paragraph 73 above and to report on progress made, including any recommendations for draft decisions on this matter, to the Conference of the Parties at its seventeenth session;

78. Also requests Parties to ensure coordination of the activities referred to in paragraph 70 above, including of the related support, particularly at the national level;

79. Invites relevant international organizations and stakeholders to contribute to the activities referred to in paragraphs 70 and 78 above”

#### **“Appendix I**

#### **Guidance and safeguards for policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries**

1. The activities referred to in paragraph 70 of this decision should:

- (a) Contribute to the achievement of the objective set out in Article 2 of the Convention;
- (b) Contribute to the fulfilment of the commitments set out in Article 4, paragraph 3, of the Convention;
- (c) Be country-driven and be considered options available to Parties;
- (d) Be consistent with the objective of environmental integrity and take into account the multiple functions of forests and other ecosystems;
- (e) Be undertaken in accordance with national development priorities, objectives and circumstances and capabilities and should respect sovereignty;
- (f) Be consistent with Parties’ national sustainable development needs and goals;
- (g) Be implemented in the context of sustainable development and reducing poverty, while responding to climate change;
- (h) Be consistent with the adaptation needs of the country;
- (i) Be supported by adequate and predictable financial and technology support, including support for capacity-building;
- (j) Be results-based;
- (k) Promote sustainable management of forests;

2. When undertaking the activities referred to in paragraph 70 of this decision, the following safeguards should be promoted and supported:

- (a) That actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements;
- (b) Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty;



(c) Respect for the knowledge and rights of Indigenous Peoples and members of local communities, by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws, and noting that the United Nations General Assembly has adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;

(d) The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular Indigenous Peoples and local communities, in the actions referred to in paragraphs 70 and 72 of this decision;

(e) That actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that the actions referred to in paragraph 70 of this decision are not used for the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits;<sup>16</sup>

(f) Actions to address the risks of reversals;

(g) Actions to reduce displacement of emissions”

## **“Appendix II**

### **Work programme of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice on policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries**

In the development of its work programme, the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice is requested to:

(a) Identify land use, land-use change and forestry activities in developing countries, in particular those that are linked to the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, identify the associated methodological issues to estimate emissions and removals resulting from these activities, and assess the potential contribution of these activities to the mitigation of climate change, and report on the findings and outcomes of this work to the Conference of the Parties (COP) at its eighteenth session on the outcomes of the work referred to in this paragraph;

(b) Develop modalities relating to paragraphs 71 (b) and (c) and guidance relating to paragraph 71 (d) of this decision, for consideration by the COP at its seventeenth session;

(c) Develop, as necessary, modalities for measuring, reporting and verifying anthropogenic forest-related emissions by sources and removals by sinks, forest carbon stocks, and forest carbon stock and forest-area changes resulting from the implementation of the activities referred to in paragraph 70 of this decision, consistent with any guidance on measuring, reporting and verifying nationally appropriate mitigation actions by developing country Parties agreed by the COP, taking into account methodological guidance in accordance with decision 4/CP.15, for consideration by the COP at its seventeenth session”

---

<sup>16</sup> Taking into account the need for sustainable livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and their interdependence on forests in most countries, reflected in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, as well as the International Mother Earth Day.



## ANNEX B

### LIST OF RELEVANT INITIATIVES

Please note this is not meant to be an exhaustive list of all existing initiatives relevant to the provision of information on REDD+ governance

#### Initiatives Developing Comprehensive Governance Indicators


- **Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance (FAO and the World Bank)**

The Framework developed by a group of experts under the leadership of FAO and the World Bank is based on the same three pillars and six principles of good governance as the Guidance in this document (see Figure 1). In the Framework, each pillar consists of a number of components that constitute different aspects of forest governance. In addition, the framework proposes a range of sub-components that can be used as a basis for developing concrete indicators to assess and monitor forest governance at the country level. Examples of indicator development based on the sub-components are also provided. This Framework can be used, among other uses, for deciding which forestry aspects to assess and monitor in the context of monitoring governance safeguards in REDD+.
- **The Governance of Forests Initiative (World Resource Institute, Imazon and Instituto Centro de Vida)**

The Governance of Forests Initiative (GFI) is a collaboration of the World Resources Institute (WRI) and its civil society partners in Brazil, Indonesia and Cameroon dedicated to advancing more transparent, inclusive and accountable forest governance. Civil society organizations in forest-rich countries have a critical role to play in advocating for good governance of forests and independently monitoring changes in governance over time. To play these roles effectively, civil society must be able to generate credible information and analysis as a basis for engaging constructively with their government. The GFI Framework of Indicators is an evidence-based research tool designed to enable civil society organizations to systematically diagnose forest governance challenges in their country, identify practical solutions and interventions, and generate robust information necessary to spur decision-makers to action. The GFI indicators draw on universally accepted principles of good governance – transparency, accountability, participation, coordination and capacity – to assess the actors, rules and practices that collectively determine how forest resources are managed. The indicators therefore facilitate a multi-sectoral investigation of how decisions are made over land use planning, forest tenure, forest management and forest revenue distribution. For additional information about the GFI project and Framework of Indicators, please visit: <http://www.wri.org/project/governance-of-forests-initiative>
- **Roots for Good Forest Outcomes: Analytical framework for governance reforms (World Bank)**

To begin to solve problems of poor governance in a purposeful way, a diagnostic tool to assess the baseline situation of forest governance and pinpoint areas requiring reforms is needed. Based on an exhaustive review of forest governance initiatives (and other governance work), a Bank report, “Roots for Good Forest Outcomes – An Analytical Framework for Governance Reforms”, compiled a comprehensive and operational framework of forest governance. The five broad building blocks or pillars under which the

---



governance attributes are organized are: 1. transparency, accountability, and public participation; 2. stability of forest institutions and conflict management; 3. quality of forest administration; 4. coherence of forest legislation and rule of law; and 5. economic efficiency, equity, and incentives. A systematic assessment of the components and key attributes in each pillar enables the establishment of a baseline for the quality of forest governance, the identification of areas needing improvement, the formulation of targeted and actionable interventions to improve forest governance, the making of informed choices regarding reform priorities and the provision of indicators to monitor the progress of interventions. This framework has been piloted in Uganda and Burkina Faso. However in all upcoming country applications, supported by the Bank, the framework produced under the joint leadership of FAO and the WB will be followed. The full report can be down-loaded at: <http://www.profor.info/profor/node/1982>

- **Partnership Governance Index in Indonesia (Kemitraan)**

In early 2007, Kemitraan/the Partnership for Governance Reform initiated the development of a Governance Index to assess the quality of provincial governance across Indonesia. In 2008, a national assessment covering all 33 Indonesian provinces was conducted. Using mostly actionable indicators, the goal is not just to “name and shame” low performing provinces but also to point specifically to the aspects of governance where improvement is needed in those provinces. The Partnership Governance Index (PGI) attempts to assess performance of four arenas of governance according to their respective core functions *vis a vis* six principles of good governance. The four arenas are 1. Government - the political office (in this case Governor and Local Parliament), 2. Bureaucracy - the implementing body, 3. Civil Society, and 4. Economic Society - private sector. Seventy-five indicators - developed through extensive consultation with experts, stakeholders and beneficiaries to measure key aspects in the four governance arenas – are then placed in accordance with the six principles of good governance, i.e. *transparency, participation, accountability, fairness, efficiency, and effectiveness*. The results are presented in [www.kemitraan.or.id/govindex](http://www.kemitraan.or.id/govindex). In addition to providing various reports, the web site also serves as a research tool for those interested in analyzing the data further; various comparisons between provinces, arenas, and/or principles can be done using the facilities provided through the web.

## Initiatives addressing specific governance issues

- **FLEGT Voluntary Partnership Agreements (European Union)**

In 2003, the European Commission published its Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Action Plan, which aims at reducing illegal logging and the global trade in associated forest products. At the core of the action plan is the negotiation of bilateral legally binding Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs) between the European Union and timber-producing countries with low levels of forest law enforcement that commit each party to requiring verified legal timber and wood products in their bilateral trade. The first VPA to be formally concluded was with Ghana. Republic of Congo and Cameroon and most recently Liberia are in the ratification process. Negotiations are ongoing with: Gabon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Central African Republic, Malaysia, Indonesia and Vietnam.

Verification of acceptable legal wood is established through a Legality Assurance System (LAS) comprised of five elements, which differ according to national legal codes and circumstances, but must deliver their functions credibly:

1. Stakeholder-endorsed definition of legality drawn from existing national law, covering forest regulations and social, environmental and labour protections as well as other relevant areas of law;



2. Wood tracking system to establish chain of custody from forest to point of export;
3. Legal-compliance validation mechanism;
4. Licensing authority issuing permits for export on the basis of demonstrable compliance with all laws set out in legality definition and effective chain of custody control; and
5. Independent monitor/audit identifying systemic weaknesses in the compliance or wood tracking system, reporting on the ongoing efficiency and credibility of the LAS (see below).

Following the negotiation of an agreement in principle, there is a period of system building and assessment before the trade agreement comes into force. The implementation of the agreement is overseen by a joint committee, on which the EU and partner country government is represented. In some cases the latter is joined by national private sector and civil society representatives. More information on FLEGT VPAs can be found at <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/forests/flegt.htm>

- **Independent Forest Monitoring (IFM)**

Independent Forest Monitoring has been defined as the use of an independent third party that, by agreement with state authorities, provides an assessment of legal compliance, and observation of and guidance on official forest governance systems. It was pioneered in Cambodia and Cameroon a decade ago, and has since been implemented in Central America and Congo Basin countries in particular. The EU FLEGT initiative has included independent monitoring as one of the five essential components of any legality assurance system (see above). Some EU FLEGT initiatives have embraced civil-society-led independent monitoring, whereas others adopt the more limited role of a single independent auditor.

IFM is a form of monitoring without indicators. It is largely - but not exclusively - a field-based activity that seeks to collect reliable information and to identify when forest regulatory systems are failing, and recommends corrective actions at an operational or policy level. It entails a combination of desk-based research and field missions – in effect case studies - conducted by a monitor under a contractual arrangement with a state authority, often in collaboration with forest authorities and/or civil society. Priorities are identified through an intelligence-led process, and mission reports and periodic summary reports are presented (in some cases) to a peer review group for validation of the conclusions and recommendations before publication and adoption by the appropriate government agencies for action. In addition to the more typical case studies on individual infractions, IFM has undertaken regulatory impact assessments (on a regulation regarding disposal of abandoned logs in [Honduras](#)) and reconciliation of production quotas against actual production (in [Cameroon](#)).

For more details, see [www.globalwitness.org/ifm](http://www.globalwitness.org/ifm) (for a definitive Guide to IFM and associated video) and <http://www.rem.org.uk/Forests.html>

- **Measuring the Response to Illegal Logging: Indicators of Progress (Chatham House)**

A major study on the impacts of ten years of efforts by consumer, processing and producer countries to tackle illegal logging and associated trade, published by Chatham House in 2010, included a number of different governance indicators which were used to measure illegal logging and forest governance in five producer countries – Brazil, Cameroon, Ghana, Indonesia and Malaysia. The indicators were developed by Chatham House over a number of years, and included direct quantitative indicators of illegal logging and forest law enforcement, an expert perceptions survey that examined various aspects of the problem and the government response, and a detailed policy assessment. The policy assessment scored producer country governments on 47 different policy questions and sub-questions, organized under 11 major headings (such as transparency); scores were given on existence,



---



design and implementation of relevant policies and were assessed by country partners using detailed guidance. The final report includes the full scores and relevant discussion, but also a simple colour chart summarising each country's performance under each major heading. The full report, a short briefing document, country report cards and supporting documentation can be found at [http://www.illegal-logging.info/approach.php?a\\_id=186](http://www.illegal-logging.info/approach.php?a_id=186)

- **Making the Forest Sector Transparent: Annual Transparency Report Cards (Global Witness)**  
Report cards are an increasingly widespread tool for assessing governance performance, and take on many forms, from a perceptions index (for example, the [Corruption Perceptions Index](#) from Transparency International) to a more fact-based assessment (for example, the [Open Budget Survey](#) on public finance transparency). Building on these approaches, Global Witness has developed a Forest Sector Transparency Report Card and is piloting it in seven countries: Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ecuador, Ghana, Guatemala, Liberia and Peru. The pilot report card consists of some 70 indicators structured across 15 themes, ranging from 'Are forest land use / ownership maps available?' to 'Are logging contracts made public?' and 'Is there a Freedom of Information Act?'

The published results are aimed at highlighting good practices on sector transparency by some governments and seeking ways for these to be adopted elsewhere. For example, Liberia has an obligation, under its Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) legislation, to publish all public concession contracts; Peru and Ecuador have advanced Freedom of Information legislation that forms an effective legal basis for monitoring performance; whilst the EU Voluntary Partnership Agreement in Cameroon includes a commitment to make certain documents available, and the report card there is monitoring the fulfillment of this commitment.

Data collection for the report card is led by a local NGO in each country, and an important purpose of the assessments is to assist local civil society to identify their own information needs, and to develop strategies for improving their public servants' responsiveness to these needs. Full report card results are published each year at [www.foresttransparency.info](http://www.foresttransparency.info) and a summary Annual Transparency Report is published at [www.foresttransparency.info/report-card/downloads/](http://www.foresttransparency.info/report-card/downloads/). Following the pilot stage, the programme will continue in 2011 and 2012 to develop a stand-alone report card for use by others interested in adopting the tool.

- **Forest Governance Integrity Programme (Transparency International)**  
Transparency International's Forest Governance Integrity Programme (FGI) is tackling corruption as a primary driver of illegal logging and poor forest management. It was initiated by the Transparency International (TI) National Chapters in the Asia Pacific region. The programme looks at corruption at all stages of the timber production and processing chain and examines how it facilitates the unsustainable harvesting, production, conversion, export, import and procurement of timber and wood products. The aim is to curb corruption and to improve forest governance. Nine prime areas of intervention have been identified: reducing political corruption; reducing foreign bribery in supply countries; reducing corruption in licensing and concessions; reducing incidence of timber laundering; reducing judicial corruption; improving due diligence of financial institutions; reducing unsustainable demand for timber and wood products; strengthening national/regional forest governance initiatives; and strengthening international governance initiatives through increasing transparency and effective implementation of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and REDD+.

The programme has four components: 1. anti-corruption and advocacy in Asia-Pacific; 2. addressing how demand for timber affects corruption and anti-corruption in producer countries; 3. preventative anti-corruption measures for REDD+ and the CDM; and 4. outreach to other regions. A risk assessment tool has been developed to identify priority corrupt



practices in the forest sector. Anti-corruption tools are then assessed in order to identify existing tools that most efficiently tackle the priority corrupt practices. The corruption risk assessment tool is currently being adapted for application to REDD+. For more information, see [www.foresttransparency.info/report-card/](http://www.foresttransparency.info/report-card/)

- **Multi-sectoral Forest Protection Committees in the Philippines**

The first Multi-sectoral Forest Protection Committees (MFPCs) were set up in 1992 under a World Bank natural resources sector adjustment loan to provide the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) with support in its efforts to enforce forest law and combat illegal logging. The MFPCs are multi-stakeholder institutions funded through the national government and include members of central and local government, law enforcement agencies, NGOs and the media. The tasks of the MFPCs are to assess existing forest protection operations, identify critical areas, carry out forest surveillance and monitoring, apprehend and confiscate illegal products and carry out information and education campaigns.

The experiences of MFPCs formed during the programme have been varied. As a model of decentralised forest sector verification, the MFPCs have been successful in reporting and stopping illegal logging where there is strong local support, clear mandates and understanding of the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders, adequate capacity building in order to ensure consistent understanding of the system design and a mechanism for long-term financial support from national government.

In 2005, the DENR indicated its willingness to renew its commitment to the MFPC programme. (The World Bank stopped funding in 1999). It has proposed the allocation of about US\$15,000 annually per Committee and supported the reactivation of 97 MFPCs nationwide between 2005 and 2010.

## **Initiatives addressing governance for multi-sectoral REDD+ activities**

- **Participatory Governance Assessments for REDD+ (UN-REDD Programme, under development)**

The UN-REDD Programme can offer PGAs for REDD+ as a policy tool for countries preparing for REDD+ aimed at both identifying governance challenges and risks while at the same time and providing a robust evidence base for recommending responses to overcome them. At the same time, a PGA for REDD+ can act as an accountability tool to mobilize public opinion and creating a demand for accountability, as well as asserting the leadership of government in responding to this demand by showing evidence of progress in governance outcomes. To pilot and conduct the PGAs, The UN-REDD Programme is building on UNDP Oslo Governance Centre's approach to and over a decade of experience from conducting democratic governance assessments through their Global Programme on Democratic Governance Assessments.

For governments to be able to provide credible information on the national REDD+ process, and more specifically on how safeguards are addressed and respected, mutual trust in both how this information is prepared, the relevance of this information and a capacity to both demand and provide this information are crucial. Therefore PGAs for REDD+ emphasize the inclusion of various stakeholders from the very beginning to ensure that there is a broad-based agreement on the governance indicator framework developed to monitor how governance issues are being addressed and how REDD+ safeguards are upheld. It is expected



that such a participatory assessment will increase the legitimacy of the process and of the information generated.

Stakeholders are government officials, civil society actors, Indigenous Peoples and/or local forest community representatives, journalists and academics and they participate to provide policy reform input. Resulting from the PGAs for REDD+ is a national system for sharing information on the REDD+ progress (based on the agreed indicators) which is easily accessible, such as the current rate of deforestation, REDD+ funding received as well as revenue distribution of REDD+ funds, cases tried in court, level of perceived corruption etc. These indicators will vary from country to country and are chosen by the participants themselves as the most critical indicators of the state of governance of the REDD+ process.

- **Social and Environmental Principles (UN-REDD Programme, under development)**

The UN-REDD Programme's Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria are being developed with the aim of promoting social and environmental benefits and reducing risks from REDD+. The principles and criteria provide the UN-REDD Programme with a framework to ensure that its activities take account of the safeguards agreed at the UNFCCC meeting in Cancun in December 2010. Parties agreed that implementation of REDD+ activities would be carried out in accordance with a specific list of safeguards and to “promote and support” those safeguards and to provide information on how they are being “addressed and respected” throughout the implementation of REDD+ activities. The principles and criteria are intended to support countries in the operationalisation of these safeguards and may also be used in the evaluation of national programmes and strategies by reviewers and other national stakeholders.

Building on the REDD+ safeguards agreed by the UNFCCC, the draft principles and criteria emerge from the major potential opportunities and risks from REDD+, together with commitments that have been made through other multi-lateral environmental agreements, and other REDD+-relevant standards. They consist of six principles and 18 criteria, addressing issues such as, democratic governance, equitable distribution systems, gender equality, respect for traditional knowledge, consideration of stakeholder livelihoods, coherence with other developmental and environmental policy objectives both nationally and internationally, avoidance of natural forest conversion, minimization of natural forest degradation, maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and minimization of indirect adverse impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services. This [first \(draft\) version of the principles and criteria](#) was presented at the sixth Policy Board meeting held in March 2011. An earlier version had been released at the 5th Policy Board meeting, together with a social risk assessment tool (now Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool). Following review by the Policy Board, experts worldwide and other interested stakeholders, the principles and criteria will be revised and the tool further developed to include environmental aspects. The UN-REDD Programme will then work with individual countries to test and refine the principles and criteria and associated tools. An interim report will be submitted to the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board in October 2011, and the principles and criteria will be finalized by the end of 2011. UN-REDD Programme operational guidance will be developed for the application of the principles for all future National Programmes in order to realise social and environmental benefits and avoid harms.

- **REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance and CARE International)**

The REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES) initiative aims to build support for government-led REDD+ programs that make a significant contribution to human rights, poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation. The standards consist of principles, criteria



and indicators that define the necessary conditions to achieve high social and environmental performance and provide a framework for assessing social and environmental performance using a multi-stakeholder assessment process. They aim to enhance positive outcomes – respect for the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation – as well as avoid social and environmental harm. A Standards Committee representing a balance of interested parties is overseeing the REDD+ SES initiative and the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) and CARE International are facilitating the initiative. More information is available at [www.redd-standards.org](http://www.redd-standards.org)

- **Independent Monitoring of REDD+ (Global Witness)**

Independent Monitoring of REDD+ (IM-REDD) is an adaptation of IFM to meet the specific needs of REDD+. It provides one mechanism for local civil society organizations to be an essential building block of the overall architecture for monitoring REDD+ governance. Independent monitoring is a tried and tested means to provide a measure of credibility that countries are implementing the governance reforms they claim to be. It can provide real-time, on-the-ground evidence about REDD+ implementation and identify and publicly report on systemic failures that undermine the success of REDD+ activities, thus supporting the functioning of implementing and enforcement agencies. IM-REDD may need to be implemented by a range of actors, of which empowered local civil society organizations are key as IM-REDD opens up space for meaningful engagement and participation. It adds credibility and robustness to the overall system by providing independent information to national control structures, international implementing and oversight institutions, and funding providers.


In many ways, independent monitoring is also analogous to election observation: both have a strong focus on the rule of law rather than technical skills, both can and should be done by local and international actors according to the circumstances, both are mandated by a host government organization and have clear reporting protocols, and both are best carried out by a value-driven, as distinct from profit-driven, organization. Like IFM, IM-REDD would work under a contractual arrangement with a state authority, which would include ten key principles: 1. independence; 2. an official mandate; 3. terms of reference; 4. a transparent recruitment process; 5. appropriate technical capacity and resources; 6. unhindered access to information; 7. unhindered access to forest locations; 8. a public profile and accessibility; 9. a multi-stakeholder reporting panel; and 10. the right to publish. These are fully described in the briefing document [Principles for Independent Monitoring of REDD+](#). Further background information is available from [www.globalwitness.org/ifm](http://www.globalwitness.org/ifm)

## Relevant non-forest initiatives

- **The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative**

The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) process evolved from a first statement of Principles at the EITI Conference in 2003. It is a coalition of governments, companies, civil society, investors and international organizations with a participatory approach to decision making at both international and national level. The Initiative recognizes that countries rich in natural resources such as oil, gas, metals and minerals have tended to underperform economically, have a higher incidence of conflict, and fail to develop the necessary accountable governance structures to ensure that citizens benefit from their resources. It therefore aims to mitigate these impacts by encouraging greater transparency in the way that resources are managed by government and the private sector. Specifically, the initiative requires countries wishing to join to establish a stakeholder-endorsed national action plan in order to disclose and reconcile information about the value and scope of resource extraction rights and activities in the country on a regular basis. Implementation is overseen

---



internationally by a multi-stakeholder board and at national level by a multi-stakeholder group, both including civil society. Thirty one countries are currently implementing the EITI with another three in negotiations to join. For more information, including the Guidelines for Validation, see [www.eitransparency.org](http://www.eitransparency.org)

- **Low-tech enforcement in the fisheries sector in Guinea**

A number of low-tech marine enforcement initiatives have proved successful in the fisheries sector in the last decade. In Guinea, in 2000, with United Kingdom funding for two years, staff from the National Centre for Fisheries Surveillance and Protection (CNSP), which could only afford to make six or seven patrols month, trained local fishermen to use GPS and radios. Paying their own fuel costs, the fishermen took turns to patrol the coastal zone. When they spotted trawlers, they would call one of the surveillance stations to send a patrol boat to carry out an arrest. Despite limited capacity (the patrol boats could not go out at night when most incursions occur) the project had a significant deterrent effect. By 2002, illegal incursions by industrial trawlers into inshore fishing grounds covered by the project dropped by 60 percent. Collisions and loss of life and equipment all decreased. The project also fostered more trust between the fishermen and the CNSP, and resulted in more efficient searches at sea. Its entire budget was only US\$20,000.

- **African Peer Review Mechanism**

The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) is unusual in that it opens countries to outside scrutiny, challenging issues around sovereignty. Part of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), it was launched in 2003 by the African Union (AU) to improve governance in countries that sign up voluntarily. Thirty African countries have now signed up, 12 have been through the first review, and seven (Algeria, Benin, Ghana, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa and Uganda) have presented implementation progress reports on their national plan of action. Of these, Ghana, Kenya and Uganda are engaged in REDD+ through the UN-REDD Programme and/or the FCPF. Countries agree to adhere to a set of principles in ways that are measurable and to engage in self-assessments, national programmes of action (POA), peer reviews by a fellow state, and further self-assessments to monitor implementation of POAs. Performance is assessed in four thematic areas: 1. democracy and political governance; 2. economic governance and management; 3. corporate governance; and 4. socio-economic development. The POA is intended to fix governance gaps identified in the self assessment report. The APRM requires broad public participation, presenting an opportunity for civil society and business to contribute to evidence-based policy making. The initial self-assessment is based on a detailed questionnaire. Created to ensure consistency across countries, it includes environment, agriculture, land and property rights. The assessments therefore provide a source of information and lessons learned for REDD+ governance initiatives. The questionnaire is currently being improved and modalities elaborated to enhance participation of civil society. In some countries (Benin, Ghana and Kenya), participatory monitoring of the implementation of POAs has been conducted at district and regional level along with opinion surveys to gauge public perceptions of the success of the APRM.



## ANNEX C

# RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THIS GUIDANCE AND THE 'FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING AND MONITORING FOREST GOVERNANCE'

The Guidance for the Provision of Information on REDD+ Governance (hereafter the *Guidance*) and the Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance developed by FAO and the World Bank (hereafter the *Framework*) are intended for use as complementary tools using a common core structure and language.

### The foundation: a common definition of good governance

Both documents are founded on the same working definition of good governance. This definition is based on 3 pillars:

- Policy, legal, institutional and regulatory frameworks;
- Planning and decision-making processes;
- Implementation, enforcement and compliance;

and 6 cross-cutting principles to be applied to all three pillars: accountability, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, participation and transparency (see Figure 1).

### REDD+ governance and forest governance

The Guidance is concerned with REDD+ governance, understood as the oversight of institutions, policies and processes in place within a country to implement REDD+, while the Framework is centred on the governance of the forest sector.

The two concepts – REDD+ governance and forest governance – are interlinked, forest governance being an essential component of REDD+ governance (see Figure 3).




FIGURE 3: The interconnectedness of REDD+ and forest governance



## Complementary objectives and uses of the Guidance and Framework

Building on the common pillars and principles of good governance:

- the *Guidance* presents a basic structure and guidance to assist with designing a system to provide information on REDD+ governance with a view to improving governance iteratively over time and fulfilling international requirements for the provision of information on REDD+ governance safeguards;
- the *Framework* provides an analytical framework which can be used by a broad range of actors as a basis for developing indicators to systematically diagnose, assess and monitor forest governance.

One of the REDD+ governance safeguards is the need for transparent and effective forest governance structures. Under the REDD+ agreement, parties are expected to provide information on how this safeguard is addressed and respected.

Thus the provision of information on forest governance is part of the system for providing information on REDD+ governance. The Framework can be used as a specific tool to enable the provision of information on forest governance within a broader system for providing information on REDD+ governance and other safeguards.

While the Guidance and Framework are both relevant for use in a complementary way in countries engaging in REDD+, the Framework is also a stand-alone tool that can be used in countries that are not engaging in REDD+ and where there is a will to diagnose, assess and monitor the state of forest governance.

## Complementary focus of the Guidance and Framework

The Guidance and Framework focus in a complementary way on different aspects of the information provision process.

The Framework concentrates on *what* information to provide, elaborating the 3 pillars into 'components' and 'sub-components' of forest governance, and provides guidance on *how* to develop indicators to assess and monitor these components and sub-components.

The Guidance addresses all three questions: *what* information to provide on REDD+ governance; *how* to provide this information; and *who* should be involved in providing it. Its focus, however, is on *how* and *who*. While the Guidance defines 'elements' of REDD+ governance based on the 3 pillars, it does not go into the same level of detail as the Framework.

While there is a significant overlap between the elements of REDD+ governance and the components and sub-components of forest governance, the Guidance and Framework also include features solely relevant to REDD+ and forest governance respectively.





**TABLE 3: Similarities and differences between sub-components and elements**

Elements of REDD+ governance	Sub-components of forest governance
Transparency of, and stakeholder participation in, MRV and monitoring processes	-
Clarity and coherence of policies, laws and regulations <b>related to REDD+</b> (forest, land use climate, trade and investment, freedom of information, etc.)	Clarity and coherence of policies, laws and regulations <b>governing forest use and management</b>
Consistency of <b>policies related to REDD+</b> with national development plans and strategies	Consistency and coordination of national development plans and strategies with <b>forest policies</b>
Clarity, consistency and coherence of <b>mandates across all levels of government</b>	Extent to which <b>forest-related mandates</b> of national and sub-national governments are clear and mutually supportive
-	Adequacy, predictability and stability of forest agency budgets and organizational resources

The components and sub-components of the Framework can be used to help with elaborating the elements described in the Guidance into a more detailed and comprehensive structure for defining the *what* for the provision of information on REDD+ governance. Table 4 presents an example of an element and component where the four sub-components could be used to help further define the element.

**TABLE 4: An example of element and component**

An element of REDD+ governance	A component of forest governance and its sub-components
Existence of legal framework supporting and protecting land tenure, carbon ownership and use rights, including customary and traditional rights of indigenous peoples and local communities.	Legal framework to support and protect land tenure, ownership and use rights <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent to which the legal framework recognizes and protects forest-related property rights, including rights to carbon</li> <li>• Extent to which the legal framework recognizes customary and traditional rights of indigenous peoples, local communities and traditional forest users</li> <li>• Consistency between formal and informal rights to forest resources</li> <li>• Extent to which the legal framework provides effective means of resolving disputes by due process</li> </ul>

Neither the Guidance nor the Framework prescribes specific indicators, as these can only be developed at country level. The Guidance includes lessons learnt from existing processes for the development of indicators, while the Framework provides more detailed advice for indicator development. This advice can be applied to developing indicators for the provision of information on REDD+ governance as well as forest governance. It could for instance be used to assist with indicator development under UN-REDD’s Participatory Governance Assessments for REDD+.