

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
Global Action Plan Follow-Up Workshop
Washington, DC, February 11-12, 2013**

FMT Summary

Background

This workshop is the first activity of the Global Action Plan (GAP) of Indigenous Peoples, which emanated from the Doha Dialogue in December 2012, to be implemented by the FCPF. The GAP had called for the “FMT to convene a workshop of indigenous leaders on the Carbon Fund, R-Package Assessment Framework and draft M&E Framework ... to strengthen the engagement of indigenous leaders in related processes.”

As both the M&E and the R-Package Assessment Frameworks were up for discussion and approval at PC14, and the design process for the Carbon Fund Methodological Framework is well underway, the workshop was held in early February to ensure feedback from the deliberations to be reflected in ongoing preparatory processes.

The meeting brought together some 40 indigenous and local community leaders and experts, representatives from the delivery partners and the FMT, and the proceedings were organized in plenary sessions and regional break-out groups. The detailed agenda and other workshop documentation can be found at <https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/node/815>.

Draft M&E Framework

The FMT presented the Draft M&E Framework, with a focus on recent developments and main outstanding issues that would benefit from indigenous and CSO inputs. Some of the recent changes in the framework included: Frequency of reporting reconsidered resulting in an annual report cycle *with* semi-annual updates instead of a semi-annual report cycle; a strengthened country reporting system with improved alignment with existing data resources; some indicators were made more ambitious (in terms of both targets and timelines), and further clarified with specific details; the evaluation of the Common Approach was included as part of program evaluation in 2015; some indicators related to IP & CSO capacity building further broadened and aligned to CB program; a visual traffic light system was added to relevant indicators. Particular feedback was sought on: Suggestions on indicators for biodiversity and livelihood aspects; and on whether certain reporting requirements are more suitable under the M&E or the R-Package Assessment Framework.

The FMT presentation was followed by an overview of key concerns and suggestions by an indigenous leader, who highlighted the need to review the M&E Framework against the backdrop of the discussions on safeguards, benefit-sharing and non-carbon benefits, and broader principles underlying the engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities. Some additional indicators were proposed for further consideration such as: Number of countries demonstrating actual improvement in livelihoods; number of countries recognizing and protecting indigenous peoples' full ownership rights to lands and resources; including through law reform, land titling and demarcation; number of countries who have increased their institutional capacity for land demarcation and indigenous peoples' rights protection; number of countries who have increased resources to identify and manage human rights risks related to REDD processes.

Following the presentations and general discussion the workshop broke into three regional groups to deliberate further on possible improvements to the M&E Framework. Key issues and recommendations discussed were presented in the plenary and include the following:

- Inclusion of IPs/CSOs in SESA and other REDD+ processes as important benchmark for monitoring;
- Need to support IP/CSO monitoring of national REDD+ activities as part of capacity-building assistance;
- Integration/Refinement of biodiversity and traditional knowledge indicators, given the dependence of indigenous and local communities on biological resources;
- Importance to monitor safeguard compliance effectively;
- Focus on measurable impacts to include improved local livelihoods, and improvements in forest governance;
- Indicators should reflect international commitments such as ILO 169 and UNDRIP, with a special emphasis on recognition of collective land and resource rights;
- Carbon "ownership" is an important benchmark for equitable REDD+ schemes.

Readiness Package Assessment Framework

The topic was introduced by the FMT, which provided a general overview of the role and content of the draft Assessment Framework, with a focus on assessment criteria in the following subcomponents: Consultation, Participation and Outreach; Assessment of Land-Use, Land Use Change Drivers, Forest Law, Policy and Governance; REDD+ Strategy Options; Implementation Framework; Social and Environmental Impacts; and Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards. This was followed by a presentation by an indigenous leader, which offered additional and alternative criteria and emphasized the importance of independent assessments by third parties.

The regional group discussions that followed covered in detail the multi-stakeholder self-assessment process at the national level, the process of PC assessment, as well as the Framework's assessment criteria and diagnostic questions. Specific messages that emerged include:

- The R-Package Assessment Framework provides an opportunity for indigenous peoples, forest-dependent communities, civil society and other stakeholders to fully and effectively engage in REDD+ readiness progress assessment.
- The multi-stakeholder self-assessment process should be participatory, inclusive, transparent and credible, consistent with relevant safeguard requirements under the Common Approach and workshop participants called for Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) to apply as a guiding principle for implementing the R-Package Assessment Framework.
- The Framework should be sensitive to the different roles and interests of indigenous peoples, forest-dependent communities and broader civil society (i.e., rights holders and stakeholders), with self-selected representation and respect indigenous processes/traditional organization.
- Workshop participants expressed a desire for clear guidance on what constitutes meaningful stakeholder engagement in the self-assessment process and participants expressed broader concerns relating to the marginalization of stakeholders.
- Priority issues in the R-Package for indigenous peoples and civil Society organizations include: land tenure, use and title; natural resource rights; livelihoods (including traditional/customary livelihoods); governance; community-based participatory monitoring and information systems; use of traditional local indigenous knowledge systems; social and environmental safeguards; FPIC; a human rights approach; full and effective participation and consultation.
- There should be a separate and formal avenue for direct assessment by Indigenous Peoples and civil society in the R-Package Assessment Framework.
- Facilitation and capacity building to further develop REDD+ stakeholder's understanding (of their respective roles, responsibilities and opportunities) and participation in the R-Package Assessment Process is beneficial.

In addition, workshop participants provided feedback on specific assessment criteria and diagnostic question as input into the Readiness Package Assessment Framework.

Carbon Fund

The discussions on the Carbon Fund were introduced by a presentation on the main objectives and functions of the Fund, and by an overview of the status of the development of the Fund's Methodological Framework. The latter explained the design process including the 16 elements for guidance, timelines and the purpose of the three design forums, which will include indigenous and CSO participants. Based on feedback received prior to the meeting and in light of the Second Design Forum in late February, the ensuing discussions were structured around three of the guidance elements: Safeguards, Benefit-Sharing, and Grievance Redress.

Safeguards

Indigenous and CSO recommendations included:

- Ensuring that FPIC is thoroughly conducted, ideally before or after ER-Program Document is approved, with early access to information and adequate time for consultation.

- Use the highest among the different safeguard standards for the Methodological Framework
- Integrate SESA and ESMF with the (UNFCCC) Safeguards Information System (SIS)
- ERPAS can help countries to develop and test the SIS
- Countries should update the SIS regularly
- Reporting format should be broader than Bank safeguards, and feed into other national processes.
- Need to have participation/review of IP/CSOs platform in the development of the ER-PIN and ER Program Document
- Ensure thorough consultation begins at the very start of ERP planning (at/during/before PIN stage?)

Benefit-Sharing

- There should be both minimum standards and a certain level of flexibility for country circumstances in CFMF guidance on benefit sharing.
- The CF should scale up and build up from existing national or local frameworks that already distribute benefits from conservation programs to landowners.
- Ensure that non-carbon benefits are adequately identified and included in benefit-sharing schemes.

Grievance Redress

- Preference for single complaints system which has several levels and options for appeal.
- Must be independent, accessible, and able to initiate effective corrective actions.
- Cases of violation of human rights should go to courts.
- Must ensure due process, so the system has buy-in and legitimacy.

Apart from these recommendations on the three topics of the Second Design Forum, the workshop participants re-iterated the need to strengthen land and resource rights as a fundamental principle of the CF Methodological Framework. This includes respect for customary rights to the benefits from emission reductions (“carbon rights”).

Next Steps

The recommendations from this workshop will, where possible, be incorporated in the revised versions of the M&E and Readiness Package Assessment Frameworks, and guide the further development of the Carbon Fund Methodological Framework. For the latter, indigenous and local CSO representatives will be invited to the Design Forums to provide additional inputs.