



The REDD Alert is a resource for civil society engaged in the global REDD+ process, with a special focus on the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility. The alert brings you the latest information available on the FCPF process, other REDD initiatives such as UN-REDD and the Forest Investment Program, and other related news from around the world. REDD Alert is a project of Bank Information Center with contributions from other civil society groups working to make REDD a more participatory, transparent and equitable process. Also, be sure to check out [BIC's Forests page](#) for regular updates on REDD+ and country-specific documents.

In this edition of REDD Alert

- 1 PC10 Agenda
- 2 Update on R-Package
- 5 FCPF Carbon Fund Operational
- 7 Update on the Common Approach
- 8 Country Updates
 - Central African Republic
 - Democratic Republic of Congo
 - Colombia
 - Mexico
 - Indonesia
 - Cambodia
 - Vietnam
- 17 CSO Victories

10th Meeting of the Participants Committee of the FCPF (PC10)

The PC10 meeting of the FCPF will be held in Berlin, Germany from October 18-19, 2011. R-PPs have been submitted for formal assessment by the [Central African Republic \(CAR\)](#) and [Colombia](#), while R-PPs from [Guatemala](#) and [Mozambique](#) will be up for informal assessment.

Issues in draft agenda for PC10

Multiple Delivery Partners. Following the approval of the Common Approach at PC9, the FMT will provide an update on the Multiple Delivery Partner arrangement.

Readiness Package (R-Package). Progress on the R-Package draft will be presented along with a discussion of potential content.

Carbon Fund. There will be a discussion of methodological framework and pricing and the valuation approach.

The agenda for PC10 will be updated and can be found [here](#).



Update on the FCPF Readiness Package (R- Package)

I. What is the R-Package?

It is generally agreed that REDD+ implementation should follow a phased approach to enhance chances of success. During the first phase, countries prepare REDD+ strategies at the national level and initiate processes to ensure social and environmental soundness (including reference levels, safeguards, an implementation framework), generally called the Readiness phase. The second phase is a period when REDD countries begin the implementation of strategies and enabling processes, as well as undertake policy and legal reforms and the execution of demonstration activities. These two phases, taken together, will hopefully ensure that REDD countries are ready to receive performance-based payments— which is the third phase.

The Readiness package (or R-Package) is produced by countries at the end of the first phase, and is a collection of documents required by the World Bank’s Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) at the end of the readiness phase. The development of the R-Package is in fact a critical moment to build confidence in the process, as countries will need to have their R-Packages reviewed if they want to submit an emissions reductions programs to the FCPF Carbon Fund. R-Package assessment by the Participants Committee (PC) is voluntary, so if a country does not want to access the Carbon Fund, they do not have to be assessed if they don’t want to.

As presented in PC9, the contents of the R-Package consists of 5 core elements: 1) a REDD strategy; 2) an Implementation framework; 3) a Monitoring Reporting and Verification (MRV) system; 4) a Reference Level scenario (REL); and 5) safeguards, although some countries are proposing clarifications or modifications.

There are a lot of unanswered questions regarding the R-Package, for example:

- What are the standards that country progress will be measured against? What are the assessment criteria that will be used? What roles will independent experts and national and local civil society play?
- How to ensure compliance with established standards and what happen when an R-Package is weak and does not meet standards?
- Can the R-Package also be seen as a piloting “system” for providing information on safeguards?

There appears to be agreement on the currently proposed principles for assessing R-package, which is to focus on progress, feasibility, relevance and consistency, with many emphasizing the need for consistency with emerging UNFCCC guidance.

II. Why is it important?

The R-Package is important because it is a critical step to build confidence in the REDD mechanism, as it will perhaps mark the end of the readiness phase and the beginning of the implementation phase. The R-Package will determine the structure and contents of mid-term progress reports, and be the major international



assessment of country REDD readiness efforts, determine or influence access to the FCPF Carbon Fund and other REDD+ financing, and will influence how countries respond to the Cancun Accord mandate to create information systems for safeguards.

Since it is not likely that most countries will be fully ready for REDD at time of preparation of the R-Package, the R-Package can provide orientation to donors for scaled up financing in the second phase. This includes demonstration programs and projects in the Carbon Fund, but critically also investments in institutional capacity building of government, civil society and indigenous actors, and the needed policy reforms to make REDD+ workable. The R-Package can provide confidence that REDD programs and measures are taking place in at transparent, participatory and accountable governance framework.

It should also provide clarity that countries can mitigate social and environmental risk and maximize social and environmental benefits to ensure sustainability. This will entail a detailed assessment of the quality and results of the strategic social and environmental assessment (SESA) process, and how those results have been incorporated into the national REDD strategy and the institutional arrangements for REDD. It will also require an assessment of not only the quality and completeness of the (required) Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) but also a review of how those principles, criteria and processes are enshrined in national law and policy. Civil society and Indigenous peoples' organizations need to be involved in both of these processes.

It is also likely that whatever decision made by the Participants Committee at the FCPF on mid-term and R-package reporting for REDD readiness will influence UNFCCC discussions on safeguard information systems and the preparation of guidance for the application of the Cancun Accord safeguards.

III. Process moving forward

Proposed FCPF timeline

A PC decision on the R-Package is expected during the PC11 meeting in March 2012. A working group has been put in place with the purpose to start and advance discussions on the R-package ahead of the PC11 meeting. At this point, discussions focus on the content and assessment criteria and on how to prepare a presentation and/or a session for PC10 in Berlin in October 2011. The working group is composed of representatives from donor countries, FCPF participant countries, the FCPF Facility Management Team (FMT) and NGO and IP observers. A first teleconference by the group was held in early August 2011 and launched the discussion on devising the R-Package contents and review criteria. The group will have two additional conference calls before PC10 with the goal of having an "outline" of the R-package contents at PC10 (October 2011) for discussion and an "advanced draft" of the R-package and assessment criteria at PC11.

No process for post-PC10 has yet been discussed, although there was the mention of trying to organize a meeting on the outskirts of COP 17 in December in South Africa, and using the World Bank's global distance learning network to facilitate other discussions.



Civil Society Organizations' Issues

CSOs are concerned that the criteria and indicators for the evaluation of the R-Package will not be strong or specific enough to distinguish between countries making good progress and countries that are not, and further, that there may be no provisions for what happens in cases of non-compliance with standards. There is also concern that there will not be a clear role for civil society and indigenous peoples to participate and validate what their governments say about progress on REDD readiness. Given its importance to the readiness process and as a basis for future investment, as well as the speed with which the Carbon Fund is advancing, the PC needs to lay out a clear process for reaching decisions on mid-term and R-package reporting, and one that includes opportunities for public comment.

Opportunities to influence the process

Discussions on devising R-package contents and review criteria are ongoing. The Working Group established for this purpose is an important point of engagement for inputs in discussions and on influencing the process, but equally important is direct engagement with both the World Bank and governments represented in the FCPF Participants Committee. These R-Package discussions are an important aspect of the FCPF rules that will determine what and how countries need to report on their progress at mid-term and the end of the R-PP implementation, who else will be involved in that process, and what will happen when there is insufficient progress or non-compliance with standards or safeguards. Discussions are likely to go on through March 2012, when a PC decision is expected.

Additional information

The FMT presentation on R-package at PC9 is available [here](#), as well as the presentation of early ideas from [DRC](#), [Costa Rica](#), and [Nepal](#).

The World Resource Institute's [Forest Governance Indicators Framework](#) and the World Bank/FAO's [Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance](#) are useful resources.

To get additional information on the R-Package discussion process or to get involved, please contact Joshua Lichtenstein, BIC's Forest Campaign Manager at jllichtenstein@bicusa.org



FCPF Carbon Fund Operational

The FCPF Carbon Fund was launched in May of 2011 when the FCPF secured two private sector companies to invest (British Petroleum and the French investment firm CDC Climat), bringing the total capitalization to about US\$175 million. The Carbon Fund (CF) was part of the initial design of the FCPF in 2007-8, and is supposed to pilot “performance-based payments” for REDD+, which means providing a stream of payments over several years based on a country accomplishing reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the forest sector. These performance-based payments will take the form of emission reduction payment agreements (or ERPAs), such that countries will have to generate carbon credits (one credit per ton of carbon avoided or removed).

Box 1: Donors to the FCPF Carbon Fund (in millions US\$)

Norway	\$50
Germany	\$46.1
UK	\$17.9
Australia	\$12.7
USA	\$10
Switzerland	\$6
European Commission	\$6.7
The Nature Conservancy	\$5
CDC Climat	\$5
British Petroleum	\$5

The CF is slated to fund about four or five emission reduction programs, probably for a five to seven year period, with the possibility that some of the funds can be given to the country up-front. It is possible that the CF can enter into an agreement with sub-national, or even non-state entities, i.e. a regional government, private company, or conceivably an NGO, but these actors would need governmental approval as well as meeting other conditions.

The World Bank staff running the CF (the Facility Management Team, or FMT) plan on going to the WB Board of Directors to raise the capitalization limit of the CF, so it is possible that more ERPAs will be funded if more money is raised.

Governance

The CF has a governance structure that is different from the Readiness Fund—only CF Participants, in this case the donors (see box) are included—so there is no formal developing country participation in decision making on the fund, with a few exceptions where the Participants Committee of the Readiness Fund (which has a balanced governance structure of 14 developing countries and 14 donors) has some say, notably including decisions on the methodological approach to pricing and valuation. This does not include decisions about the price for carbon credits, or the overall amounts for individual ERPAs. Unlike the Readiness Fund, the WB is the only delivery partner for the CF. The governance arrangements at the CF make provisions for one observer from civil society and one observer from Indigenous Peoples organizations, who have voice, but not vote, in the meetings. It is important to note that the current proposal for the rules of procedure will exclude observers from the tranche meetings where decisions about ERPAs are made.

What is also important about the governance structure of the CF is that the donors divided themselves into two groups (called tranches)—with one group of all public (governmental) donors in a “restricted” tranche



who will “retire” the carbon credits they receive through the CF (i.e. not use, sell or trade them), while the other tranche, including the private sector companies, the US government and The Nature Conservancy (TNC) are in an “unrestricted” tranche that can use their credits for compliance purposes, i.e. to offset GHG pollution in the north. It is not clear where or how the US government would use those credits given the lack of a cap and trade regime in the United States.

Unresolved Issues

There are many issues still unresolved for how the CF will function and what they will do, given the recent launch, and that much of the methodological work is just beginning. Civil society organizations, however, have been critical of the early launch of the CF, arguing that it will divert human resources both within tropical forest countries and the FMT away from REDD readiness and towards carbon transactions. Additionally, while the FCPF, in line with the commitment not to “get ahead” of the UNFCCC negotiations has not taken a formal position on market-based financing for REDD, the fact is that the CF is on track to produce “compliance grade” emission reduction credits that can be sold, traded or used to offset pollution in the north by private sector companies like BP. This raises grave concerns among many who are critical of market-based approaches to REDD. CF methodological work on reference levels may also end up leading or influencing the international climate negotiations.

With respect to safeguards, the CF is committed (by the FCPF Charter) to abide by all World Bank operational policies and procedures, including the social and environmental safeguards, the Access to Information policy, and the WB’s accountability mechanism—the Inspection Panel. What is not entirely clear is how other safeguards included in the Cancun Accord, for example on permanence and leakage, will be dealt with. ERPAs are also, in practice, excluded from public disclosure by the WB because of business confidentiality concerns. The charter-mandated gateway to the CF is the so-called Readiness package (or R-package) which is a series of documents produced by tropical forest countries participating in the FCPF. It includes the national REDD strategy, a description of the institutional arrangements for implementing REDD, a credible reference scenario, a functioning monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) system, as well as a completed strategic environmental and social assessment (SESA) and an environmental and social management framework (ESMF). What is not yet clear are the details of what, exactly, will need to be included in the R-Package, and how these country submissions will be assessed by the Participants Committee, the WB and/or other delivery partners, and more critically, the level of rigor in applying quality standards and public participation in these assessments.



Update on the Common Approach

At their 9th meeting in June, the FCPF Participants Committee approved the Common Approach to social and environmental safeguards for multiple delivery partners, ending several months of intensive negotiations among the World Bank (WB), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), civil society and Indigenous Peoples over the safeguard standards that will be applied to agencies other than the WB who channel readiness grants to tropical forest countries under the FCPF. In the end, the Common Approach represents a step forward in the fight for high standards for REDD, although it falls short of everything that CSO and IP observers had hoped to achieve.

At present the Common Approach will cover five countries where readiness grants will be administered by another agency. These countries are Peru, Guyana and Paraguay (through the IDB) and Cambodia and Panama (through the UNDP). At PC9 it was decided that an additional five countries would be added to this pilot phase of multiple delivery partners, but thus far we only have information that Guatemala has requested the IDB as a delivery partner.

Among the important advances on the Common Approach are:

- Delivery partners must adhere to all FCPF specific requirements, including the guidelines for stakeholder engagement, and the standards contained in the R-PP template
- Delivery partners must achieve “substantial equivalence” with World Bank operational policies and procedures, i.e. the outcomes achieved must be the same as those that would have been achieved if the World Bank were channeling the finance
- A strong disclosure regime was agreed to for all FCPF grants, requiring timely disclosure of almost all of the relevant documents
- Delivery partners must have a functioning accountability or grievance redress mechanism that is independent, transparent, effective and accessible to affected peoples and that covers the Common Approach, such that affected communities can file a complaint with an independent international entity if they are harmed, or at risk of being harmed, by an FCPF-financed project
- The UNDP agreed to create an institution-wide accountability mechanism, and pilot its use through FCPF grants
- Delivery partners who have a higher standard than the WB (as with the UNDP on FPIC, for example) must follow the higher standard
- The Common Approach is a “living document” that can be revised by changes in UNFCCC guidance or WB policies, among other things

Among the weaknesses are:

- World Bank policies were used as a “ceiling” and not just a “floor,” hindering any ability to raise standards beyond what the WB has already agreed to



- DP achievement of substantial equivalence with the WB standards is untested in practice and potentially places a heavier burden on affected communities who feel that a WB-financed REDD project is negatively affecting their rights or livelihood
- Substantial equivalence with the WB's full Access to Information and Supervision policies was not required of Delivery partners
- The process to design the Common Approach did not provide opportunities for public comment, and effectively excluded non-English speakers because all of the documents were in English

To read the Common Approach (now available in English, Spanish and French), and the background analysis of Delivery partner policies, please see the [FCPF website](#).

Country Updates

The Central African Republic

The Central African Republic (CAR) once had the third largest rainforest in Africa. But today, mainly degraded by logging, forests cover only 36 per cent of the national territory, representing almost 28 million hectares. The forest sector contributes to 4 per cent of the GDP, and the deforestation rate is estimated at 0.14 per cent. Like all the Congo Basin countries, CAR is a FCPF participant country, while also engaged with the European Union (EU) FLEGT process to combat illegal logging. The FLEGT Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) signed with the EU in December 2010 is expected to enter into force in two years.

The REDD process in CAR was officially launched on September 3rd, 2010. After a four-month formulation process, the country's draft Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) was submitted to the FCPF's Facility Management Team (FMT) for informal assessment during the Participants Committee 8th meeting (PC8) in Vietnam. Local civil society organizations (CSO) criticized the draft R-PP for the following, amongst others: lack of consultation; weak coordination of REDD+ and national laws with other processes such as FLEGT and the implementation of the then newly ratified ILO Convention 169; overestimation of deforestation and degradation by local and indigenous communities while downplaying the significant industrial logging in the South-West of the country; not recognizing industrial logging as a direct cause of deforestation and degradation; lack of focus on the social and environmental impacts; and the lack of recognition of local and indigenous peoples' rights to forests.

After government-led consultations and revisions following PC8, the CAR R-PP was submitted by the government to the FMT on August 1, 2011. Having had access to the document for a very limited time period (a week before submission to FMT), the local REDD+ CSO platform was not able to provide inputs. Moreover, while recognizing some improvements in the R-PP, CSOs are



A CSO workshop funded by BIC to analyze and validate CSO inputs to the Republic of Congo's revised R-PP (Brazzaville, October 22-23, 2010)



concerned that several crucial issues remain unaddressed, such as the expansion of industrial logging in the South-East, the lack of strong and clear coordination between the country REDD+ and FLEGT processes, lack of clarity in the role and full engagement representation of CSOs and indigenous Peoples, the non recognition of industrial logging as a direct cause of deforestation and degradation, and the lack of effective mechanisms to ensure communities' access to a fair share of REDD+ benefits. After gathering in a two-day workshop in Bangui from August 23-24 to analyze the version of the R-PP submitted to the FMT, CSOs are hoping to present their points during the next PC10 meeting in Berlin in October 2011.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

In the DRC, REDD+ has rightly become a major national strategic issue, considering the vast extent of its forests. In many ways, the REDD+ process in DRC has advanced further than virtually any other country in the Congo Basin, or even the continent, though some argue that the process for consultation on these initiatives has been uneven. While the DRC has been at the forefront of many REDD initiatives globally, and is among the early pioneers of the FCPF, UN-REDD and Forest Investment Program (FIP) processes, successful implementation will require substantial advances in its technical and institutional capacity. This includes the ability to coordinate and harmonize land use policies with the view of mitigating future impacts on forest cover, while ensuring that benefits from forests flow to forest-dependent communities and indigenous peoples.



CSO workshop funded by BIC to assess CSO participation in the REDD+ process in DRC (Kinshasa, Nov 16-17, 2010)

The Country R-PP implementation grant of USD3.4 million was signed in March 2011, and is under disbursement. Thematic Coordination Groups (TCG) covering 30 sector-based and cross-cutting options to fight deforestation and forest degradation were constituted and are working to inform the development of the National REDD+ Strategy. The study on the drivers of deforestation is underway as the Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the benefit sharing mechanism have been developed, and an overseeing committee created to lead the work on the Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) process.

After a 6-month period of consultations, the SESA process will produce the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which will be applied during the Readiness-Package implementation stage. National civil society has led, with UNEP support, a consultative process to establish social and environmental standards for REDD+ in DRC. However, the successful implementation of REDD safeguards in the country remains to be seen. As noted by the FCPF in the DRC R-PP Assessment Note: “the DRC institutional capacity for the monitoring and implementation of REDD+ safeguards is very weak, at all levels (national, provincial and local) and across Ministries (environment, agriculture, mines, and land issues).” The body mandated by Ministerial decree to review and approve the evaluation of social and environmental impact assessments, the Groupe d'Études Environnementales du Congo (GEEC), has neither human nor technical resources to effectively carry out its mandate. A new law - Loi



Cadre sur la Gestion et la Protection de l'Environnement - is presently being discussed in Parliament and, inter alia, mandates the creation of a National Environment Agency “Agence National de l'Environnement (ANE)”, which would replace the GEEC as the national agency with overall responsibility for social and environmental impact assessments.

In the meantime, the DRC has prepared a USD 60 million FIP Investment Plan which was approved in July 2011 by the FIP Subcommittee. The plan is supposed to promote sectoral (biomass energy and community forestry) and enabling activities (land tenure securitization, land management, support to business development) around three key deforestation hotspots (the supply area of Kinshasa, Kisangani and Mbuji May/ Kananga), as well as support private sector engagement in REDD+ activities and promote small-scale promising REDD interventions throughout the country.

Addressing technical and institutional difficulties-- which are compounded by ongoing governance challenges in the forest sector, the lack of secure land tenure, and lack of clarification of the role of local and indigenous communities in the design, implementation and monitoring of REDD initiatives-- is key to any successful implementation of REDD+ and FIP processes.

Colombia

The PC10 meeting in Berlin, Germany on the 18-19 of October marks an important milestone for the REDD Strategy in Colombia. It is then that signs of goodwill and the fulfillment of commitments made by the Colombian government with various forest-dependent communities during the course of the year will be defined. After presenting a fourth version of the R-PP during PC9 in Oslo, Norway, the Colombian government announced that it would present its formal version for approval during PC10.

In parallel to the work done by the Colombian government in the preparation of the R-PP, the Common Agenda (Agenda Común) and the Inter-Ethnic Forum of Solidarity of Chocó (FISCH) of the Afro-Colombian communities of the Pacific region held three events this year around the [Workshop on climate change, financial mechanisms for emissions reductions, and the role of communities](#) (February 23-24, May 26-27 and September 29-30).

The first workshop involved the participation of the Climate Change Mitigation group of the Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development (MAVDT) and the World Bank, amongst others, and provided an opportunity to understand the situation around the financial mechanism REDD+ and the studies on its implementation in the country. The second workshop was convened with the goal of strengthening the capacity of community leaders to participate in the construction of the R-PP in international negotiations with the Participants Committee of the FCPF. As a result of these workshops, communities were able to bring their [concerns, comments and proposals](#) on the R-PP to the MAVDT on various occasions.

After analyzing the fourth version of the R-PP presented in Oslo and after not receiving signals or responses from MAVDT to the proposals made by Afro-Colombian communities, Agenda Común delivered a [new, concrete proposal for the R-PP](#), and organized a third workshop. This workshop was attended by about fifty people from different communities of the Pacific region, as well as the new Ministry of Environment and



Sustainable Development (MADS), represented by Lucio Andres Santos and Adriana Lagos, who coordinate the REDD process, and Andres Ricardo Morales of the environment arm of the National Planning Department (DNP).

At this workshop it was once again agreed that the R-PP serves as a navigation chart to guide the preparation process of the country's REDD Strategy, and should therefore be clear and concrete in certain key aspects to ensure an effective REDD Strategy. Several commitments were made during the workshop: i) the incorporation of proposals drafted during the workshop into the R-PP before PC10 that relate to drivers of deforestation, territory and participation; ii) a National SESA workshop to be held in 2012; and iii) a Regional SESA Workshop to be held in the Pacific, also in 2012.

With regard to *drivers of deforestation*, it was observed that the R-PP should explicitly highlight the need to guarantee inter-sectorial coordination and synchronization of the REDD Strategy with the current National Development Plan (PND). This implies a solid analysis of the impacts of the main sectors of growth (Locomotoras de Crecimiento) within the PND that were also identified as principal drivers of deforestation within the R-PP. An active role of the National Planning Department is clearly critical for such coordination, but their presence has been almost inexistent in the process thus far. Regarding the issue of *territory*, the importance of the R-PP's clear stance on several issues was brought to attention: the need to work on and resolve issues of legalization and organization by possession in collective titling; the problem of overlaps between national parks or mining titles and collective territories; the regulation of chapters IV, V, VI and VII of Law 70; and the moratorium or legal actions for protection against unlawful contracts signed for voluntary markets by communities. On the topic of *participation*, it was discussed that the R-PP should explicitly reflect guarantees for the participation of communities in decision-making, planning, implementation and monitoring with voice and vote throughout the preparation of the REDD Strategy and the SESA process. This implies that the R-PP include elements that can later be captured to ensure the participation of communities in developing the Decree of Operating Regulations for the National System for Climate Change (SNCC) that is to be approved in January of 2012.

It is within this context that PC10 will be a critical moment for the REDD Strategy in Colombia. At the moment, Colombia has been characterized as an exemplar of good practices with regard to the early participation of actors and forest-dependent communities in the preparation of the R-PP, but there remains to be an inclusion of the concerns and proposals from civil society in the R-PP. Berlin offers an opportunity for the government to demonstrate signs of goodwill and to reinforce political will for transparency and participation, through the fulfillment of commitments made not only at the third workshop in Buga but through the entire course of the year.



Mexico

Process of constructing a National REDD+ Strategy (ENAREDD+)

Mexico will be the first Latin American country to receive funding from the FCPF. The preparation process for implementing the REDD+ mechanism will cost the country US\$39.8 million, comprising contributions from the Mexican government (US\$27.2 million); the FCPF (US\$3.6 million); and other donors (US\$9 million).

Mexico presented its R-PP in March of 2010 before the Participants Committee of the FCPF, and the revised version was disclosed in May. The first regional SESA workshop was held in Bacalar in April of 2011, followed by the first national SESA workshop in May, and both will provide key inputs for the development of the SESA Action Plan. A [due diligence mission of the FCPF](#) made a field visit to Mexico in May to discuss comments to the R-PP and to attend several meetings with public entities and social organizations. From the outcomes of the due diligence mission, the FCPF recommended the approval of the US\$3.6 billion at the beginning of June. Currently, the World Bank and the Mexican government are finalizing the grant agreement document so as to begin disbursement of the approved amount.

During the design phase of the REDD strategy, the National Forest Commission (CONAFOR) is to develop the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which is required by the World Bank to ensure compliance with safeguards. According to estimations by CONAFOR, the [National REDD+ Strategy \(ENAREDD+\)](#) should be complete in December of 2011, and the Mexican government has expressed its intention to attend the Meeting of the Conference of the Parties in Durban (28 of November till 9 December) with an ENAREDD+ proposal, legitimized by communities and social organizations. However, it appears more likely that the consultation process will only start in the first few months of 2012 and that ENAREDD+ will be finalized in March of 2012. Subsequently, intermediate evaluations are expected every 5 years, tentatively for 2017 and 2022.

Progress in relation to the Forest Investment Program

Mexico was selected as one of eight countries invited to participate in the [Forest Investment Program \(FIP\)](#) as part of a pilot experience. Through the FIP, the involvement of entities such as the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Financial Corporation (IFC) (both are branches of the World Bank), and the Inter-American Development Bank are being sought. The investments will be channeled towards broadening the technical capacity of communities, strengthening forest governance for territorial management, the harmonization of public policy, and promoting the profitability of forest conservation. [Early Actions](#) will be executed in the geographical areas as laid out in the Early Action document. It is expected that total financing from the FIP will reach around \$40-\$60 million. A decision on the final amount and the distribution of funds through the multilateral banks will be made during the summer of 2011.

A FIP scoping mission visited Mexico in March, and another joint mission of the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank was held towards the end of August. This mission had the objective of reviewing comments to the FIP document published in the middle of the month, but as yet a final version has not been disseminated.



Early Actions

On the 9th of August, CONAFOR published “REDD+ Early Action in Mexico: A Framework for its Development and Guiding Criteria.” Early actions will be implemented in 5 sub-national areas: Jalisco, Chiapas, and the Peninsula of Yucatán (Campeche, Yucatán and Quintana Roo). The early actions represent an opportunity to develop lessons towards improving the ENAREDD+.

The draft produced by CONAFOR highlights as a strength of the early actions the creation of a space for institutional coordination and for governance mechanisms that seeks to bring coherence to public policies around forest governance. However, it lacks a results and indicators framework that will allow impacts from the above to be measured. Without such a framework, how will it be determined that institutional coordination within forest governance is effective, or that an early action is ready to be scaled to the regional or national level? Another issue of concern is the management of consultation processes in the context of early actions, which seems to be directed exclusively towards local authorities of the areas where they are to be implemented—without the consultation of local communities themselves.

Rural and Indigenous Organizations Get Organized

The Tourism Indigenous Network of Mexico (RITA), the Mexican Network of Rural Forest Organizations (RedMOCAF), the National Board of Rural Organizations (CONOC), the Organization of Ejidos Forestry Producers of the Mayan Zone (OEPF-ZM), and the National Union of Autonomous Regional Rural Organizations—National Coordinator (UNORCA-CN), with the support of SAKBE Communication and Defense, Greenpeace Mexico and the Mexican Center of Environmental Rights (CEMDA), formed a concerted campaign “Communities Matter” (“Las Comunidades Cuentan”), which has the goal of strengthening dialogue and the effective participation of local communities and indigenous people within the framework of the design of Mexico’s National REDD+ Strategy. These organizations have expressed their concern that the REDD+ mechanism does not fully respect the mechanisms of information, participation and consultation nor the environmental and social safeguards in the definition of ENAREDD+, and that this could further deepen poverty and inequality in Mexico.

Indonesia

Designing Indonesia’s strategy: progress and concerns

Indonesia is advancing with its REDD+ National Strategy development, which will guide the governance of finance and initiatives for REDD in the country. Around 40 pilot and demonstration activities supported by multilateral agencies, bilateral, conservation NGOs and the private sectors are underway. The design of REDD Strategy draws from the partnership agreement between Indonesian and Norwegian governments to undertake measures to reduce emissions from deforestation and degradation. With Norway committing a \$1 billion support package, the agreement also provides for the enforcement of a two year moratorium on forest concessions. A presidential Task Force was formed to develop the REDD+ National Strategy. Civil society



organizations are engaged through the inclusion of their representatives in the Technical Team, which succeeded in inserting safeguards provision and FPIC principles in the draft Strategy.

In May 2011, Indonesian President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono issued a Presidential Decree requiring a two-year moratorium on the issuance of new licenses to convert 64-72 million hectares of primary forests and peat lands into plantations and other industrial activities. Civil society and indigenous peoples groups slammed the decree for not including secondary forests that store high carbon and important biodiversity. The moratorium decree also fails to cover those existing permits that have been responsible for forest loss, degradation and social unrest. The Civil Society Coalition for the Rescue of Indonesian Forest and the Global Climate produced a briefing paper detailing its [critique](#) on the moratorium's failure to address the causes of deforestation in Indonesia.

The mandate of the Task Force that formulated the REDD+ National Strategy ended in June 2011. On September 8, 2011, President Yudhoyono signed a new decree to establish a new Task Force with the mandate to develop the institutional arrangement, including the function, scope and operational requirements for a REDD+ Agency which will effectively take over the mandate of the Task Force. For now, "the new Task Force for REDD+ Agency will continue to ensure the coordination of all activities related to REDD and will report directly to the President," said Kuntoro Mangkusubroto, Chairman of the Task Force. The main roles of the REDD+ Task Force are to: 1) set up the REDD+ Agency; 2) coordinate the preparation of REDD+ National Strategy; 3) set up funding instruments and mechanism for REDD+ finance flow; 4) set up the MRV system; 5) implement activities in the first REDD+ pilot province (Central Kalimantan); and 6) monitor the implementation of Presidential Instruction No. 10, 2011 concerning the suspension of new forest concession permits.

Hullabaloos around FCPF and FIP activities in Indonesia

On June 23, 2011, the Ministry of Forestry launched the FCPF program in Indonesia. Around 200 representatives from donor agencies, government ministries, CSOs and the media were present. Indonesia was amongst the first countries to submit a REDD Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) to the World Bank through FCPF. The R-PP was approved in August 2009, and the \$3.6million grant agreement was signed in June 2011. This incentive is meant to assist Indonesia to develop a National REDD+ Strategy and design national and sub-national scenarios and MRV systems. The Forest Ministry manages the fund. The launch was met with criticisms. The revision process did not seek full and effective public participation, which could have provided a space to verify if recommendations formally articulated by civil society earlier had been considered. In response, the World Bank and the Forest Ministry passed the task of designing the SESA and ESMF to the National Forestry Council. This Council is an independent body consisting of governments, NGOs, communities, business, and academics. From civil society's standpoint, the Council provides an opportunity to consult multiple stakeholders in framing or reframing the design and implementation of the REDD safeguards.

On the Forest Investment Program (FIP) front, the FIP team comprising of WB, ADB and Forest Ministry representatives did its first joint mission on July 12-22, 2011 to hold consultations in several Indonesia cities. The



mission was marred with setbacks. Consultations were done poorly, with neither background documents nor agenda provided prior to the meeting, and without any formal invitation.

Indonesia seeks a \$50-70 million grant under FIP and the government’s Investment Plan is slated for submission in October 2011. Issues regarding the process of stakeholder engagement and government preparedness, however, have caused the delay in submitting the Plan only in the middle of 2012.

Cambodia

Cambodia has one of the highest proportions of forest cover in the region (approximately 56.94% forest cover or 10,339,826 hectares)¹. However, imminent threats to these existing forests remain high and almost at a critical level owing largely to the conversion of forest land into large-scale agricultural plantations through the unabated issuance of Economic Land Concessions (ELCs).

The Cambodian government supports REDD and embraces it as a tool to halt deforestation, mitigate risks of climate change and as an incentive for protecting and conserving forests. The Forestry Administration (FA) endorsed the first REDD demonstration project in Oddar Meanchey in May 2008. Since January 2010, the government has developed a National REDD Strategy and a Task Force to coordinate the design and eventual implementation of the strategy, and it is expected to be approved by the Council of Ministers. This is to develop the country’s REDD roadmap. Meanwhile, an Interim Task Force was created to help in the formulation and finalization of the R-PP. The FA also coordinated consultation meetings in 2010. However, according to the CSO groups, although they have been invited to the consultation meetings, the process was constrained by a tight timeline and insufficient debate on the governance-related concerns and the principles that should ground REDD readiness and piloting. Moreover, consultations were mainly conducted only at the national level.



PC8, Da Lat, Vietnam, Mar 23-25 2011

In March 2011, Cambodia’s R-PP was submitted and approved. It is one of the pilot countries for Multiple Delivery Partners under the FCPF, with the UNDP acting as delivery partner.

Cambodian CSOs and indigenous leaders have engaged with their government through meetings and consultations run by the Forestry Administration. While REDD R-PP consultations in Cambodia were considered more open to civil society than previous country policy processes, local NGOs and indigenous peoples groups argue that outreach and consultation were limited, hindering them from contributing meaningfully to the contents of the R-PP.

¹ Forest Cover 2010, Forestry Administration, Forest Cover is decreased more than 2% compared to forest cover 2006. This data was presented by FA during 29th Technical Working Group on Forestry and Environment (TWG-FE) meeting on 1st September 2011 at FA office.



In their [comments to the R-PP](#), local NGOs and Indigenous Peoples groups argued that the government is not up to the REDD task given the current state of forest governance and policy enforcement, which are plagued with conflicts (often with the use of armed force) as well as overlaps in land use and resource management. They note: “REDD will not succeed if the government still grants more ELCs.” They then advanced their collective recommendations that, in revising the R-PP and increasing its potential for wider stakeholder support, the government should comply with the following: have a clear and robust legal framework for community tenurial and resource use rights; identify specific drivers of deforestation and cancellation of ELCs; practice meaningful consultation and participation; and provide clear and strong safeguards for forest-dependent communities.

These comments and recommendations highly informed the Participants’ Committee Resolution, and were adopted as “preconditions” before a readiness grant is approved. This productive civil society intervention provided them additional momentum to remain active in discussions about local REDD initiatives. As of this writing, the R-PP of Cambodia has not been finalized, but the groups will monitor how the FCPF will be implemented using the through the UNDP. The groups also plan to link the REDD monitoring initiatives to build local-level capacity to push for the protection of land, forest and natural resources and IP rights.

Vietnam

A sizable portion of Vietnam’s roughly 13 million hectares of forest area is being identified and piloted for REDD programs. Vietnam is lined up to receive REDD funding from FCPF, UN-REDD and other REDD+ programs that are financed by bilateral and private sector donors. Vietnam emerged as the first country to undertake formal preparations for field-based REDD+ activities. Vietnam’s R-PP was approved in March 2011, although with required revisions. However, CSOs commented that the documents are highly technical, and thus pose a challenge for the CSOs to meaningfully provide substantive inputs. Moreover, CSOs observed that the consultations with local stakeholders were done quickly. Organizations working with indigenous people and forest-based communities do not see full compliance with the FPIC principle and process. At the same time, however, the CSOs recognize that there is space for advocacy within the FCPF process. The government demonstrated some goodwill in consulting CSOs and ethnic minorities.

Civil society groups from northern, central and southern Vietnam intervened in the R-PP process, such as through organizing a workshop and in an online exchange pertaining to their comments on the R-PP. They submitted their [comments and recommendations](#) to the Government’s REDD Focal Person, the FCPF-FMT, the PC and the World Bank in time for the PC 8 decision. They recommend the following:

- Increase the living standards and uphold the rights of indigenous peoples who have been traditionally dependent on their forest. Ethnic minorities are key stakeholders in sustainable forest management and must be regarded as the first and highest beneficiaries of REDD+ mechanisms
- Quickly translate full R-PP document into Vietnamese and other local dialects and make them available via website(s) and in other popular education materials

At present, the Vietnam R-PP has not been finalized.



CSO VICTORIES

CSOs of Cambodia and Vietnam played a significant role in influencing the substance and language that was adopted in the Annex to the PC Resolution on the R-PPs.

	CSO Comments	Adopted in PC Resolution*
CAMBODIA		
Cambodian Civil Society: The NGO Forum on Cambodia; Cambodian Human Rights Action Committee	Provide legal framework for community tenurial and resource use rights, resolve conflict and include redress mechanisms	Review of the implementation of existing national laws and policies to address land tenure, resource rights and forest land conflicts
	Identify explicitly the direct drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; cancel Economic Land Concessions	Clearly identify ELCs as a driver of deforestation in the R-PP; elaborate on possible strategies to reduce rates of deforestation caused by ELCs
	Provide for meaningful consultation and participation, include ToRs in REDD management	Information sharing and consultations among stakeholders; enhancing capacity of participants based on consultation principles
VIETNAM		
CSOs and IP-focused groups in north, south and central Vietnam. Department of Ecology-Institute of Tropical Biology and Center for Sustainable Development in Mountainous Areas	Uphold the rights of indigenous peoples, regard ethnic minorities as key stakeholders and highest beneficiaries	Explicitly acknowledge the role of ethnic minorities as important actors and beneficiaries of REDD+ programs
	Translate full R-PP document into Vietnamese and local dialects, make available through popular media	Include translation of the final R-PP into Vietnamese as part of the outreach and communication strategy

*[Cambodia](#), [Vietnam](#)

If you have any questions or comments on the REDD Alert, please contact Joshua Lichtenstein, REDD campaign Manager at jlichtenstein@bicusa.org.