



**Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/19
10 February 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH AND
SPANISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC,
TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Sixteenth meeting

Montreal, 30 April – 04 May 2012

Item 7.1 of the provisional agenda*

**SUBMISSIONS FROM PARTIES ON REDD+ SAFEGUARDS AND ASSESSMENT OF
IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY**

Note by the Executive Secretary

1. The Executive Secretary is circulating herewith, for the information of participants in the sixteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, submissions received from Parties and international non-governmental organizations on relevant safeguards in reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (REDD+) in response to notification No. SCBD/STTM/JM/TC/JSt/74726, which was circulated by the Executive Secretary on January 2011 as a follow-up to decision X/33 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention.

2. Submissions are reproduced in alphabetical order and in the format and language in which they were received by the Secretariat.

* UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/1.

CBD PARTIES

ECUADOR

Cuestionario para la presentación de puntos de vista con respecto a las medidas preventivas pertinentes REDD-plus

Experiencias nacionales con REDD-plus

¿Cuál es la estructura nacional para la planificación de REDD-plus?

La estructura nacional para la planificación de REDD-plus se sustenta en las herramientas legales y políticas públicas en relación a temas ambientales y de cambio climático vigentes en el Gobierno del Ecuador. La Constitución del Ecuador, aprobada en el año 2008, incluye mandatos específicos para proteger la biodiversidad (Art. 400–Art. 403), mitigar el cambio climático (Art. 414) y regular los servicios ambientales (Art. 74). Reconoce como uno de los principios ambientales, que el Estado garantizará un modelo sustentable de desarrollo, ambientalmente equilibrado, el cual conserve la biodiversidad y la capacidad de regeneración de los ecosistemas, asegurando la satisfacción de las necesidades de las generaciones presentes y futuras. También, contempla la aplicación de políticas ambientales de manera transversal, siendo de cumplimiento obligatorio para todas las personas naturales y jurídicas a nivel nacional.

El Plan Nacional del Buen Vivir (2009-2013) constituye el eje orientador de la política nacional para alcanzar el “Buen Vivir”. Para ilustrar se mencionan los objetivos del PNBV y los objetivos más relevantes para cambio climático. El objetivo 4 plantea “Garantizar los derechos de la naturaleza y promover un ambiente sano y sustentable”. A través de este objetivo, se busca asumir las responsabilidades con la naturaleza, dejando de ver a los elementos de la naturaleza como recursos supeditados a la explotación humana sino como patrimonio estratégico del país. Para el cumplimiento de este objetivo se formula, entre otras, la política 4.1 que establece “Conservar y manejar sustentablemente el patrimonio natural y su biodiversidad terrestre y marina, considerada como sector estratégico.” Adicionalmente, para cada política planteada se formulan metas, en relación a la política 4.1 y considerando aspectos relevantes para REDD+ las metas a considerar son: 4.1.1: “Incrementar en 5 puntos porcentuales el área del territorio bajo conservación o manejo ambiental al 2013” y meta 4.1.3 que establece “Reducir en un 30% la tasa de deforestación al 2013”.

El Ministerio del Ambiente es la autoridad ambiental nacional, y la institución a cargo de la gestión ambiental en el Ecuador. El MAE, a través de la Subsecretaría de Patrimonio Natural (SPN), se encarga de la gestión y el manejo sustentable de los bosques en el Ecuador. También, desde octubre de 2009, el MAE tiene las competencias sobre cambio climático. A través de la Subsecretaría de Cambio Climático (SCC), el Ministerio es la institución encargada de facilitar el diseño de políticas y la implementación de medidas de mitigación y adaptación al cambio climático. El esquema institucional se lo presenta en el Gráfico 1.



Grafico 1: Esquema simplificado del MAE y las subsecretarías encargadas de la ejecución de la Estrategia Nacional REDD+ del Ecuador (Fuente y Elaboración: MAE 2010)

La planificación y preparación de los arreglos institucionales que facilitarán la implementación del mecanismo REDD+ están a cargo del Ministerio del Ambiente, específicamente de la Subsecretaría de Cambio Climático, en coordinación con la Subsecretaría de Patrimonio Natural.

Además, se ha iniciado la coordinación de políticas de cambio climático, incluyendo la planificación de REDD+ con otros sectores estratégicos del Estado a través del Comité Interinstitucional de Cambio Climático (CICC), esta nueva institucionalidad congrega a los Ministerios y Secretarías Nacionales de los sectores estrechamente vinculados con el cambio climático, el cual fue creado mediante Decreto Ejecutivo en octubre de 2010 para facilitar la gestión del cambio climático a nivel nacional desde una perspectiva transversal y multisectorial.

¿Cuál es el estado de los preparativos de REDD-plus, incluyendo la participación en las actividades piloto y de demostración?

El Ecuador se encuentra en la fase avanzada de “Readiness”, es decir preparatoria para la implementación del mecanismo REDD+. Ha venido proactivamente trabajando en este objetivo y articulando con otras Partes y actores locales a nivel nacional e internacional para este fin. Desde el año 2008, el Gobierno de Ecuador ha estado participando activamente en las negociaciones internacionales de REDD+ y, a la vez, ha llevado a cabo actividades a nivel nacional para construir los cimientos para implementar este mecanismo en el país. Ecuador ha realizado un progreso impresionante en preparación para REDD+, con avances significativos como los que se muestran a continuación:

Desde septiembre de 2008, a través del Ministerio del Ambiente, se implementa una política de incentivos para la conservación de los bosques nativos, el Programa Socio Bosque; esta iniciativa busca complementar las políticas de “comando-control” usualmente aplicadas al sector forestal en el país, tratando de conciliar la conservación de los bosques con el desarrollo. Hasta la fecha se han firmado convenios de conservación por 630.000 hectáreas. También, desde el año 2009, iniciaron dos proyectos relevantes para el levantamiento de la información: el mapa histórico de deforestación y la evaluación nacional forestal con el fin de levantar toda la información técnica relevante para el sector forestal con el enfoque de cambio climático.

Adicionalmente, el MAE se encuentra liderando el proceso de desarrollo de la Estrategia Nacional REDD+. Dicha Estrategia será el marco de referencia para la implementación de actividades REDD+ en el Ecuador. Actualmente se han identificado los componentes clave de la Estrategia, los mismos que se desprenden del Modelo de Gobernanza Forestal y los lineamientos marco establecidos en la política pública del Gobierno del Ecuador. En el marco de esta Estrategia, existen actividades específicas, actualmente en implementación, que forman parte del proceso de preparación para la implementación del mecanismo REDD+ en el país. Entre las actividades en implementación están: el desarrollo del marco legal, financiero e institucional necesario para implementar REDD+ en el país, el asegurar los beneficios múltiples a ser potenciados por REDD+, la coordinación inter-institucional, el diseño del programa de involucramiento de la sociedad civil en el tema y sus actores más relevantes, entre otros. Además, los proyectos de levantamiento de información, y la experiencia que se adquiere a través de la implementación del PSB forman insumos importantes para la construcción de la Estrategia Nacional REDD+.

¿Cómo se puede cumplir con las obligaciones de las medidas preventivas en actividades piloto y de demostración de REDD-plus, por ejemplo, en el marco de la FCPF o REDD de las Naciones Unidas? ¿Cuáles son sus experiencias con estas medidas preventivas?

Para el Ecuador es clave el cumplimiento de las salvaguardas ambientales y sociales acordadas a nivel internacional en el marco de la CMNUCC. Desde la perspectiva de nuestro país, el asegurar el cumplimiento de dichas salvaguardas, es un tema de suma importancia buscamos que haya una generación de beneficios adicionales, sociales y ambientales a raíz de la implementación de REDD+.

Para cumplir con las obligaciones de las medidas preventivas en actividades piloto y de demostración de REDD-plus, consideramos que es importante tomar en cuenta las distintas herramientas e iniciativas

desarrolladas a nivel internacional para apoyar a los países en el cumplimiento de las salvaguardas. El Ecuador se encuentra trabajando con algunas de éstas iniciativas.

En cuanto a las experiencias con medidas preventivas, se puede mencionar que desde el año 2009, el Ecuador es uno de los cinco países piloto de la iniciativa de los “Estándares Sociales y Ambientales REDD+”. La iniciativa busca desarrollar y aplicar a nivel piloto los Estándares REDD+, los cuales buscan asegurar que la implementación de un mecanismo REDD+ traiga beneficios sociales y ambientales adicionales. Dichos Estándares constituyen una herramienta para que el país cumpla con las medidas preventivas planteadas en la decisión 1/CP.16 e ir más allá, asegurando múltiples beneficios, sociales y ambientales, de la implementación del mecanismo REDD+.

Adicionalmente, el Ecuador es parte del Programa ONU-REDD y actualmente se está realizando un análisis de complementariedad entre los SES y los Principios y Criterios sociales y ambientales desarrollados por ONU-REDD para de esta manera, utilizarlas como herramientas adicionales que pueden apoyar al Ecuador a cumplir con las salvaguardas y asegurar múltiples beneficios.

¿Cómo están implicados los expertos en diversidad biológica?

A nivel nacional, los expertos en diversidad biológica se identifican en la Dirección Nacional de Biodiversidad (DNB), parte de la Subsecretaría de Patrimonio Natural en el Ministerio. La Dirección busca contribuir al desarrollo sustentable del país mediante la conservación de la diversidad biológica, el uso sostenible de sus componentes u la participación justa y equitativa de sus beneficios. Para coordinar con estos expertos, la Subsecretaría de Cambio Climático mantiene reuniones frecuentes y se han identificado actividades puntuales que se van a impulsar en conjunto para la implementación del mecanismo REDD+, de manera que se aseguren múltiples beneficios. Este trabajo, está siendo fortalecido al interior de la institución durante la fase de preparación para la implementación de REDD+.

¿Cómo están implicadas las comunidades indígenas y locales?

Las comunidades indígenas y locales están involucradas a través del Programa de Involucramiento para REDD+ en actividades de información, consulta, capacitación e involucramiento. Se prevé trabajar con las comunidades locales y Pueblos Indígenas para que se capaciten en temas de REDD+ y pueden involucrarse en el proceso de diseño e implementación de la Estrategia Nacional REDD+.

Además, los titulares de los conocimientos tradicionales, comunidades indígenas y locales están siendo ya involucrados en la fase de preparación de REDD+, a través de un programa de involucramiento de actores clave. Este es un proceso que se ha iniciado, Sin embargo, específicamente para temas relacionados a biodiversidad, las comunidades no han sido aun implicadas. De todas maneras, se ha previsto que durante la fase de preparación de REDD+ se pueda levantar información relevante para asegurar el cumplimiento de salvaguardas y establecer un sistema de información y monitoreo de múltiples beneficios. Los titulares de conocimientos tradicionales serán involucrados en este proceso.

Por otro lado, a través de la iniciativa de los Estándares Sociales y Ambientales REDD+, el Programa Socio Bosque y las actividades de preparación para REDD+ en el país, los titulares de los conocimientos tradicionales están siendo involucrados, sin embargo es necesario profundizar su involucramiento, en particular en temas específicos.

¿Existen experiencias del mercado voluntario de carbono que está usted aprovechando?

No existen experiencias en el mercado voluntario de carbono que se han aprovechado. La Constitución del Ecuador, en su Art. 74, llama al Estado a regular la producción, prestación, uso y aprovechamiento de los servicios ambientales (SA). Las actividades REDD+ del Ecuador serán reguladas por la normativa que debe ser creada para definir la aplicación del Art. 74 en el país. El MAE se encuentra trabajando en el marco legal para la futura implementación de REDD+ en el país. Es necesario contar con dicho marco legal previo a la implementación de actividades REDD+. Por lo tanto, a pesar que hay iniciativas REDD+ que están en desarrollo, todavía no existen en el país experiencias REDD+ en el mercado voluntario de carbono.

Experiencias nacionales con las medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica

¿Existen medidas preventivas¹ pertinentes establecidas para la diversidad biológica a nivel nacional, o se están desarrollando? ¿Cómo se relacionan con las garantías descritas en la decisión 1/CP.16 CMNUCC?

Ecuador como país piloto de la iniciativa de los Estándares Sociales y Ambientales para REDD+ se encuentra trabajando en la aplicación piloto de los Estándares en el país, algo que se lo considera medidas preventivas. Los Estándares, a pesar que son de aplicación voluntaria y se encuentran en una fase piloto, constituyen una herramienta para que el país de cumplimiento a las salvaguardas ambientales establecidas en el marco de la CMNUCC. Los estándares cuentan con salvaguardas para la diversidad biológica y los servicios ecosistémicos descritas en su mayoría en el principio 5 “El Programa REDD+ mantiene y mejora la biodiversidad y los servicios del ecosistema”.

Para dar un mejor contexto e presenta a continuación una tabla comparativa entre las garantías descritas en la decisión 1/CP.16 y los Estándares Sociales y Ambientales.

Decisión 1/CP.16 CMNUCC	Principios Estándares Sociales y Ambientales REDD+
a) Que las acciones se complementan o son consistentes con los objetivos de los programas forestales nacionales y los acuerdos internacionales pertinentes	N/A
b) Transparencia y eficacia de las estructuras nacionales de gobernanza de los bosques, tomando en cuenta la legislación y la soberanía nacionales;	<p>Principio 4: El Programa REDD+ contribuye a las metas generales del desarrollo sostenible, respeto y protección de los derechos humanos y buena gobernanza</p> <p>Principio 8: El Programa REDD+ cumple con las leyes locales y nacionales y los tratados, convenciones y otros instrumentos internacionales aplicables</p>
c) El respeto por el conocimiento y los derechos de los pueblos indígenas y miembros de las comunidades locales, teniendo en cuenta las obligaciones internacionales pertinentes, las circunstancias y leyes nacionales, y observando que la Asamblea General de Naciones Unidas ha adoptado la Declaración de Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas Los pueblos;	<p>Principio 3: El programa REDD+ mejora la seguridad a largo plazo de los medios de vida y el bienestar de los Pueblos Indígenas y las comunidades locales con especial atención a las personas más vulnerables</p> <p>Principio 8: El Programa REDD+ cumple con las leyes locales y nacionales y los tratados, convenciones y otros instrumentos internacionales aplicables</p>

¹ En la decisión 1/CP.16, la Conferencia de las Partes de la CMNUCC se afirma que la ejecución de las actividades de REDD+ debería incluir la promoción y el apoyo de una serie de garantías, incluyendo (a) Que las acciones se complementan o son consistentes con los objetivos de los programas forestales nacionales y los acuerdos internacionales pertinentes; (b) El respeto por el conocimiento y los derechos de los pueblos indígenas y miembros de las comunidades locales, teniendo en cuenta las obligaciones internacionales pertinentes, las circunstancias y leyes nacionales, y observando que la Asamblea General de Naciones Unidas ha adoptado la Declaración de Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas Los pueblos; (c) La participación plena y efectiva de los interesados, en particular de los pueblos, comunidades indígenas y locales (d) Que las acciones sean compatibles con la conservación de los bosques naturales y la diversidad biológica, asegurando que no se utilizan para la conversión de los bosques naturales, sino que son utilizados para incentivar la protección y conservación de los bosques naturales y sus servicios de los ecosistemas, y mejorar otros beneficios sociales y ambientales (e) Acciones para hacer frente al riesgo de inversiones (f) Acciones para reducir el desplazamiento de las emisiones.

d) La participación plena y efectiva de los interesados, en particular de los pueblos, comunidades indígenas y locales	Principio 6: Todos los titulares de derechos y actores pertinentes, participan plenamente y eficazmente en el programa REDD+
e) Que las acciones sean compatibles con la conservación de los bosques naturales y la diversidad biológica, asegurando que no se utilizan para la conversión de los bosques naturales, sino que son utilizados para incentivar la protección y conservación de los bosques naturales y sus servicios de los ecosistemas, y mejorar otros beneficios sociales y ambientales	Principio 5: El Programa REDD+ mantiene y mejora la biodiversidad y los servicios del ecosistema
f) Acciones para hacer frente al riesgo de inversiones	N/A
g) Acciones para reducir el desplazamiento de las emisiones	Principio 5: El Programa REDD+ mantiene y mejora la biodiversidad y los servicios del ecosistema

¿Cuál es la capacidad para el desarrollo y la aplicación de las medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica?

A nivel institucional, existe la capacidad para el desarrollo y la aplicación de las medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica pero necesita ser reforzado, este momento se están discutiendo e identificando las iniciativas para trabajar temas de salvaguardas de diversidad biológica, es necesario crear capacidades técnicas para garantizar el cumplimiento de las medidas preventivas en la futura implementación de REDD+.

¿Cuáles son los principales obstáculos para la inclusión de medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica, si existe alguno?

Los principales obstáculos que se han identificado para la inclusión de medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica, debido principalmente a la necesidad de genera capacidades técnicas y movilizar recursos financieros, para asegurar el cumplimiento de las salvaguardas ambientales y garantizar beneficios adicionales de la implementación de REDD se mencionan:

- (1) Levantamiento continuo de información sobre biodiversidad y servicios eco-sistémicos.
- (2) Construcción de capacidades en temas de diversidad biológica y el vínculo con el mecanismo REDD+.
- (3) Fortalecer la coordinación y trabajo entre la Dirección Nacional de Biodiversidad y la Subsecretaría de Cambio Climático.
- (4) Desarrollar e implementar un sistema de información y monitoreo de salvaguardas ambientales en el país.

¿Cuáles son las necesidades concretas de creación de capacidad con respecto a las medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica (en su caso), y en qué nivel (gobierno, sociedad civil y pueblos indígenas, comunidades locales)?

Es necesario generar capacidades a nivel local sobre diversidad biológica, cambio climático y el vinculo entre ambos temas de manera que exista un involucramiento y apoyo a las actividades de levantamiento de información, monitoreo e implementación de medidas que aseguren el cumplimiento de las salvaguardas en el Ecuador.

Por otro lado, es necesario generar capacidades para que el trabajo realizado por la CBD y la CMNUCC sea articulado y homogenizado de una mejor manera, y esto sea reflejado en los países, a través de la planificación e implementación de políticas.

¿Cuáles son las principales lecciones aprendidas hasta ahora con respecto a las medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica?

Las medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica están todavía en la fase de desarrollo y se empezará la implementación en el transcurso de 2011 por lo tanto no se puede mencionar sobre las mejores lecciones aprendidas que se han podido generar en nuestro país. Se podría sacar lecciones aprendidas a finales de 2011, después de la implementación piloto de los Estándares en el Ecuador. Sin embargo, en el trabajo desarrollado hasta la fecha se ha identificado como uno de los retos el levantamiento de información sobre diversidad biológica, así como también la creación de un sistema para el reporte, seguimiento y monitoreo de las salvaguardas ambientales.

Experiencias nacionales con las medidas preventivas para las comunidades indígenas y locales

¿Cuál es la estructura de las organizaciones de la sociedad civil que representan los puntos de vista de las comunidades indígenas y locales? ¿Cómo se coordinan sus puntos de vista?

El Ecuador está conformado por 14 nacionalidades y 18 pueblos indígenas, afro-ecuatorianos y montubios. En su territorio se hablan 12 lenguas que forman parte de la identidad ecuatoriana y el patrimonio histórico cultural del país. Además, aproximadamente seis millones de hectáreas de bosque están dentro de territorios indígenas. Considerando estos dos factores, las comunidades, pueblos y nacionalidades indígenas, pueblo afro-ecuatoriano, pueblo montubio y comunas son considerados uno de los actores más relevantes para el proceso de preparación y posterior implementación del mecanismo REDD+ en el país. Constituyen los potenciales beneficiarios de la implementación de REDD+, por ser los dueños de los territorios con mayor cantidad de bosque nativo en el país.

En este grupo, se considera tanto al nivel organizativo, tomando en cuenta las organizaciones de segundo y tercer grado, las cuales tienen un nivel de representatividad político en el país, así como también a las bases, quienes constituyen los miembros de las comunidades, propietarios de los bosques y por tanto beneficiarios directos de la futura implementación del mecanismo REDD+.

La coordinación de acciones e involucramiento de este grupo se la realiza a través del Programa de involucramiento de actores en REDD+, el cual busca integrar a actores clave en el desarrollo e implementación de la Estrategia Nacional REDD+ del Ecuador.

¿Cuáles son los mecanismos mediante los cuales se consideran las opiniones de las comunidades indígenas y locales?

El involucramiento de las comunidades indígenas y locales se lo realiza a través de la implementación del Programa de Involucramiento de actores en REDD+ el cual ha iniciado su implementación con la difusión de información sobre REDD+. Además, se prevé establecer una plataforma de diálogo formal que se involucre en el desarrollo e implementación de REDD+, para esto se movilizarán recursos técnicos y financieros para implementar actividades de información, construcción de capacidades, consulta e involucramiento efectivo de actores clave.

Existen al momento iniciativas puntuales en las cuales se han realizado procesos para incluir los insumos de las comunidades en las actividades de preparación para REDD+, entre las relevantes están: el proceso de revisión de la propuesta de programa nacional conjunto de Ecuador, aprobado en marzo por el Programa ONU-REDD y la iniciativa de los Estándares Sociales y Ambientales REDD+, donde representantes de comunidades indígenas y locales participaron en varios talleres donde se realizó la “interpretación nacional” de los estándares y talleres para recibir comentarios a la interpretación propuesta. Los comentarios fueron revisados mediante una metodología establecida e incorporados a la interpretación nacional o tomados en cuenta para la fase de implementación. Con los comentarios recibidos se creará una nueva versión de la interpretación nacional de los estándares, previo a la aplicación piloto de los mismos.

¿Cómo son las preocupaciones relacionadas con los artículos 8j del CDB (respeto de los conocimientos tradicionales) y 10c (apoyo a la utilización consuetudinaria de la diversidad biológica) se refleja en la planificación de REDD-plus y el diseño?

Al momento no se han incluido las provisiones de la CBD en la planificación de REDD+, están actual proceso de estudio. Sin embargo, durante en la planificación de REDD+, el Ecuador busca asegurar el cumplimiento de las salvaguardas ambientales y sociales previstas en los acuerdos de Cancún. En este sentido, los artículos 8j y 10c serían cubiertos en la elaboración de la Estrategia Nacional REDD+ y trabajando coordinadamente dichos temas con las instituciones pertinentes.

Colaboración regional con respecto a las medidas preventivas y la evaluación del impacto

¿Participa usted en los intercambios regionales e internacionales de las experiencias piloto de REDD-plus en relación con las medidas preventivas y los beneficios múltiples? ¿Cuál es el valor de esos intercambios?

Si, el Ministerio del Ambiente participa en intercambios regionales e internacionales en torno al tema REDD+ y en particular intercambios relacionados a las medidas preventivas y beneficios múltiples en el contexto de la CBD, el Programa ONU-REDD y la iniciativa de los Estándares Sociales y Ambientales REDD+.

Dichos intercambios son importantes para generar capacidades en los países implementadores de medidas REDD+ puedan asegurar la inclusión de aspectos de diversidad biológica en las políticas que planteen y en lo posterior se aseguren beneficios múltiples de la implementación de REDD+. Además, el conocer las experiencias, desafíos y lecciones aprendidas de los países que se encuentran en la fase de preparación para implementar REDD+, se puede buscar alternativas para solventar los retos en conjunto y de esta manera avanzar por una meta común para todos los países que buscan implementar REDD+. El Ecuador participa activamente en este proceso.

¿Cuál es el nivel de colaboración regional en REDD-plus, por ejemplo a través de las organizaciones regionales como COMIFAC/OTCA/ASEAN?

Existen varios proyectos del OTCA en Ecuador. Entre los relevantes para REDD+, se están implementando dos proyectos relevantes para REDD+, ambos implementados por la SPN del MAE. El primero es la “Armonización de criterios e indicadores para Manejo Forestal Sustentable en bosques panamazónicos” durante el 2011. El segundo proyecto es el de “Monitoreo de la deforestación y del aprovechamiento forestal en bosques panamazónicos” para un período de dos años empezando en el 2011 y con posibilidad de ampliación por 5 años con fondos de la ITTO.

¿Cuál otro apoyo regional e internacional (además de a la ayuda otorgada por UN-REDD/FCPF/ITTO) sería útil?

Apoyo técnico y financiero para generar capacidades en temas de diversidad biológica y su vínculo con el mecanismo REDD+, y en general aspectos de mitigación y adaptación al cambio climático y apoyo para el levantamiento de información sobre diversidad biológica y el monitoreo de la misma.

Monitoreo de los impactos de REDD-plus en la diversidad biológica

¿Usa usted (o está planeando utilizar) indicadores para medir impactos en la diversidad biológica de REDD-plus?

Si, a través de la iniciativa de Estándares sociales y ambientales REDD+, de la cual el Ecuador es parte, se ha previsto utilizar los indicadores para medir los impactos de REDD+ en la diversidad biológica y los medios de vida de las comunidades indígenas y locales. También, se ha planificado articular la iniciativa de los Estándares con otras herramientas desarrolladas por el Programa ONU-REDD, con las cuales se asegure el cumplimiento de salvaguardas ambientales y sociales.

¿Está planeando en utilizar herramientas de planificación para evaluar/monitorear los impactos de REDD-plus sobre la diversidad biológica y los medios de vida indígenas y locales?

Si. Actualmente, como parte de la iniciativa de aplicación de los Estándares Sociales y Ambientales REDD+, se busca aplicar de manera piloto los Estándares. Para esto, se está trabajando en un plan de monitoreo que incluye para cada indicador del Estándar la información específica, la fuente de información, el método y la responsabilidad del monitoreo. Se establecerá un informe con los resultados de la medición de los impactos en la biodiversidad y los medios de vida para la formulación de medidas para enfrentar los posibles impactos negativos.

También, en el Programa Socio Bosque se realiza un monitoreo de los planes de inversión que elaboran los beneficiarios del programa, en los cuales se establece como los socios gastan el incentivo que reciben y en este sentido, de cierta manera se monitorea los medios de vida y las mejoras en la calidad de vida de los beneficiarios. En cuanto a la diversidad biológica, el PSB iniciará programas piloto de monitoreo de biodiversidad en zonas determinadas.

En la Estrategia Nacional REDD+ se ha considerado diseñar e implementar un sistema de información y monitoreo de los múltiples beneficios, sociales y ambientales, de la implementación de REDD+.

¿Pueden estos impactos ser controlados a través de los programas existentes (como las evaluaciones de los Recursos Forestales de FAO, o los Informes Nacionales del CDB), o se necesitan otros esfuerzos independientes o adicionales? Si es así, en su caso, cuales son las necesidades creación de capacidad?

Si pueden pero necesitan esfuerzos adicionales donde se generen capacidades a nivel local, en particular en las comunidades, para que puedan contribuir con el monitoreo de los impactos, generando así capacidades, empleo, participación, entre otros.

¿Qué posibles mecanismos (a nivel nacional, regional e internacional) existen o pudieran ser desarrolladas para el monitoreo de los impactos de REDD-plus sobre la diversidad biológica y las comunidades indígenas y locales?

Se están desarrollando estándares y guías que contribuyan al monitoreo de los impactos de REDD+ en temas de diversidad biológica y en las comunidades indígenas y locales sin embargo es necesario articular los distintos esfuerzos que se desarrollan a nivel internacional y considerar el contexto nacional de cada país el momento de implementar éstas herramientas. Además, se debería crear alianzas entre países con ecosistemas similares para unir esfuerzos para temas de información y monitoreo de impactos de la implementación de REDD+ en temas de diversidad biológica y las comunidades dependientes de los bosques.

EUROPEAN UNION

The European Union and its Member States are pleased to share with the Secretariat the following views in response to Notification 2011-018:

A well designed REDD+ mechanism will have significant and unprecedented benefits for biodiversity and vital ecosystem services beyond climate change mitigation (such as sustainable supply of wood, food and other non-timber products or water security, as well as adaptation to climate change) and should contribute to improving the rights and livelihood of forest dependent people, particularly of indigenous and local communities. Reciprocally, biodiversity and the voluntary involvement of all stakeholders taking into account the provisions of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples do in turn underpin the resilience of forest ecosystems, hence preventing reversals in emission reductions. Sound participative governance, fair and equitable benefit-sharing and the conservation and sustainable use of forests are essential to secure the full mitigation potential of REDD+. Therefore the EU and its Member States consider sustainable management of forests including good forest governance and conservation/restoration of biodiversity as crucial factor of a successful REDD+ mechanism.

The EU and its Member States recognise that its support for activities to mitigate and adapt to climate change in REDD+ countries should complement and contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of

biodiversity in all ecosystems; the sustained delivery of vital ecosystem services (such as food and water security) and other socio-economic and environmental benefits arising from them; moreover improving and taking advantage of forest law enforcement, governance and trade in legal timber (FLEGT); implementing the CBD Programme of Work on Forest Biodiversity, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets; as well as implementing the Non-Legally Binding Instrument on All Types of Forests and achieving the four Global Objectives on Forests.

In many forest areas, especially in tropical regions there is a positive correlation between biodiversity and carbon density (tC/ha).

Methods available and existing practices to map and monitor biodiversity, forest carbon and other aspects of sustainable management of forests should contribute to REDD+ information systems in order to help holistic decision-making on forest carbon sequestration, the conservation of forest biodiversity and the sustainable management of forests and ecosystem services. Measures should also support the sound and cost effective definition and achievement, of both climate change and biodiversity commitments of UNFCCC and CBD Parties, especially in areas where degradation, conservation or use of forests take place.

Policies or measures to protect and enhance forest carbon stocks through plantations or for preventing deforestation, even if they secure sizeable emission reductions may not necessarily contribute to the conservation of biodiversity or the maintenance of other ecosystem services and the livelihoods of indigenous and local communities. It is therefore of vital importance that payments for emission reductions are designed so they are positive incentives to not convert areas with high biodiversity into less diverse forests with higher carbon stocks. In this regard, at COP 16 of UNCCC (Cancun, 2010), the environmental and social safeguards for REDD+ actions were adopted and they should be further promoted and supported.

To reduce the risks and enhance the potential benefits of REDD+, national or regional standards, operational indicators and independent monitoring mechanisms, reporting and verification (MRV) could be developed without precluding or overburdening the REDD+ agreement. Furthermore, following the provisions of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples would contribute to enhance the social benefits of REDD+ activities.

Given the cross-cutting nature of REDD+ and the need to make best use of synergies between UNFCCC and CBD frameworks, e.g. with respect to monitoring, reporting and verification in the context of REDD+, good cooperation between both conventions is required.

The EU and its Member States therefore consider the consistent implementation of REDD+, guidance and safeguards as well as their monitoring, reporting and verification requirements, as a crucial opportunity for enhancing synergies in the national implementation of the CBD and UNFCCC. The CBD and its Parties can usefully contribute to the development of systems for providing information on the application of safeguards for REDD+ by feeding into the design of operational indicators and monitoring reporting and verification mechanisms for these safeguards.

The EU and its Member States believe that CBD decision X/33 *Biodiversity and climate change* provides useful guidance for the integration of biodiversity considerations in climate mitigation actions, ecosystem-based approaches for climate change mitigation and adaptation activities, including in the forest sector. Subparagraphs 8 (m) to (v) of that decision are particularly relevant for the implementation of REDD+ actions. By adequately addressing the issues mentioned in paragraph 8, REDD+ actions will provide incentives for the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services.

In addition to the guidance already provided in decision X/33, COP11 might wish to encourage Parties to indicate in their REDD+ strategies or action plans how REDD+ actions contribute to achieving the Aichi targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

GUATEMALA

Cuestionario para la presentación de puntos de vista con respecto a las medidas preventivas pertinentes REDD+

Hay que discutir mas sobre REDD+ desde foros publicar, comunicar a todos los niveles.

Profesionales consultados:

1. Ing. MA. Igor de la Roca, CONAP.
2. Ing. César Belteton, CONAP.
3. Alejandro Santos, Rainforest Alliance, RA.
4. Ing. MSc. Oscar Rojas, Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza.
5. Licda. Lorena Córdoba, punto Focal REDD+ Guatemala. Ministerio de Ambiente y Recursos Naturales.
6. Ing. Mario Mancilla, Mesa Nacional de Cambio Climático (opinión solicitada a través de la mesa nacional de Cambio Climático).
7. Mesa Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas y Cambio Climático (se solicito información pero no llegó).
8. Lic. Edgar Selvin Pérez, CONAP / Punto Focal nacional del Comité Intergubernamental del Protocolo de Nagoya. * compilador.

1. ¿Cuál es la estructura nacional para la planificación de REDD-plus?

El punto focal es el Ministro de Ambiente y Recursos Naturales y es quien impulsa el proceso de creación de la Estrategia Nacional REDD+. En principio, el proceso se inicia desde la firma de un Convenio Marco Interinstitucional que respalda la creación de la Estrategia desde la integración de las instituciones de gobierno rectoras de: medio ambiente (Ministerio de Ambiente y Recursos Naturales), áreas protegidas (Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas), agricultura (Ministerio de Agricultura Ganadería y Alimentación), prevención de desastres y el tema forestal (Instituto Nacional de Bosques). Luego del proceso desarrollado por estas instituciones de gobierno, acompañado por organizaciones internacionales, el proceso se abrirá a una mayor participación desde el Estado, es decir, se promoverá el ingreso de organizaciones de base, ONG`s, sector productivo, pueblos indígenas, etc.

2. ¿Cuál es el estado de los preparativos de REDD-plus, incluyendo la participación en las actividades piloto y de demostración?

El Ministerio de Ambiente, junto a delegados gubernamentales de las instituciones firmantes del convenio marco, unido a otros expertos nacionales y Ong`s internacionales (UICN, RA), se ha estado desarrollando el RPP o propuesta para buscar financiamiento en el Banco Mundial y así construir la Estrategia Nacional REDD+. La propuesta anterior, se presentará al Forest Carbon Partership Fund FCPF-GEF en abril del presente año.

Por otra parte, los avances en actividades piloto REDD+ han sido desarrollados dentro del Sistema Guatemalteco de Áreas Protegidas –SIGAP-: Zona de usos Múltiples de la RBM (incluye áreas que han sido concesionadas a comunidades para el manejo forestal), Parque Nacional Sierra Lacandon y Parque Nacional Laguna de Lachua. Para estos proyectos anteriores, se está desarrollando una línea base de emisiones a nivel sub-nacional.

Por otro lado, existe interés de desarrollar otros proyectos piloto en las Áreas Protegidas ubicadas en el nor-orient de Guatemala: RB Sierra de las Minas, PN Rio Dulce, Reserva Protectora de Manantiales Cerro San Gil, Refugio de Vida Silvestre Bocas del Polochic, Reserva de Usos Múltiples Rio Sarstún, entre otros. En la lógica del párrafo anterior, será necesario, desarrollar una línea de base sub nacional para a región.

“REDD+ no existe solo hay mercados voluntarios... todo podría aclararse hasta el 2020”. La lógica de venta de carbono debe tener bases sociales y biológicas bien argumentadas y probadas. La venta de

carbono como créditos debe ser la última fase de un proceso lógico que garantice la disminución de pérdida de diversidad biológica e inclusive su recuperación y los servicios ecosistémicos vinculados desde el punto de vista biológico y socioeconómico (implicaciones y análisis de dinámicas sociales y económicas). Algunos arreglos previos deben ser:

- Agregar la hojarasca y madera cortada como parte de estos estándares internacionales.
- Aprobación de acuerdos-convenios de cooperación con comunidades del parque
- Aprobación de fase prueba de mecanismo de incentivos en comunidades con acuerdos de cooperación en función de planes de ordenamiento territorial. Debiera haber un proceso de “poli – incentivos” para diversidad biológica y servicios ecosistémicos.
- Apoyo en la implementación del proyecto.

Empezar con proyectos de “*reducción de la deforestación*” para luego aplicar a créditos, primero se debe demostrar que la reducción es *posible*; solo de esta manera lo socioeconómico estable permitirá un modelaje de reducción de deforestación más validado y legitimado socialmente. Es importante evaluar los procesos socioeconómicos del cambio de uso del suelo, el valor de la tierra en el mercado productivo; se debe garantizar que los incentivos permitirán el mantenimiento del bosque serán suficiente para vivir bien. Lo anterior hace obligatorio la cadena de incentivos para vivir de la productividad natural del bosque.

“Acción demostrativa” COP 16. CCC. El gobierno podría probar que un modelo a futuro funciona por lo menos en una escala temporal viable (4 años).

- Político legal (seguimiento a desalojos, presencia institucional y aplicación de la ley).
- Seguimiento a los procesos de incentivos (fase prueba).

Recientemente, la municipalidad de San Andrés y San Francisco, del Departamento del El Petèn, Reserva de la Biosfera Maya, han firmado un acuerdo de inversión por US\$250,000.00 para desarrollar prospección en créditos de carbono. En este caso Rainforest Alliance es el intermediario más no el responsable de que esta responsabilidad pueda ser cumplida por ambos gobiernos locales.

Guatemala debe decidir, sobre la propiedad el carbono pero lo mas importante debe ser la institucionalidad del tema, es decir las reglas o normas del juego...

3. ¿Cómo se puede cumplir con las obligaciones de las medidas preventivas piloto y de demostración de REDD-plus, por ejemplo, en el marco de la FCPF o REDD de las Naciones Unidas? ¿Cuáles son sus experiencias con estas medidas preventivas?

En el diseño de Construcción de la Estrategia Nacional REDD+, que será planteada al Banco Mundial, se incluye un amplio proceso de consulta a todos los sectores involucrados incluidos pueblos indígenas y comunidades locales (implementación de lo establecido en el convenio 169 de OIT, CDB y Protocolo de Nagoya).

Las experiencias piloto están siendo desarrolladas para atender el mercado voluntario de carbono. Con lo cual, los proyectos están siendo elaborados para cumplir con los siguientes estándares:

- a) CCB (carbon, communities and Biodiversity) precisamente por su alto valor estratégico de vincular las áreas protegidas con el bienestar humano de las comunidades dentro o cerca de las mismas, es decir la aplicabilidad del tercer objetivo del CDB.. “ *la distribución justa y equitativa de beneficios...* ”.
- b) VCS= Voluntary Carbon Standard. Créditos de carbono FCPF, en el Mercado voluntario o desde el CDB - REDD+.

En todos los casos de negociación, lo que busca el país es mantener o mejorar los servicios ecosistémicos de la diversidad, que no sea un mecanismo perverso y finalmente reducir al máximo el desplazamiento de emisiones hacia otras áreas fuera de los proyectos.

En caso de que en un futuro mediato, hubiese fondos desde la convención de Diversidad Biológica, se espera que los estándares anteriores –unidos o por separado–, los proyectos nacionales pudieran acceder fácilmente a estos beneficios derivados del multilateralismo.

Como una visión de salvaguarda, se propone que el Estado de Guatemala por ejemplo, sigue siendo el propietario de todo lo referente a REDD+, inclusive en áreas que son concesiones comunitarias. Lo anterior, se debe a que en el caso de la fijación de carbono, éste en términos legales *es un bien que se adhiere a otro otorgado* (el aprovechamiento forestal del bosque natural) y por lo tanto no se puede otorgar si no hay un acuerdo. En todos los casos, el compromiso del estado es distribuir los posibles y futuros beneficios derivados de REDD+.

El grupo de trabajo nacional interinstitucional, pretenden desarrollar los estándares en CCB pero aplicados a lo nacional, es decir, la creación de los estándares nacionales para el mercado voluntario. Este estándar pretende ser desarrollado por organizaciones del consorcio nacional.

4. ¿Cómo están implicados los expertos en diversidad biológica (incluyendo los titulares de los conocimientos tradicionales)?

Desde el nivel nacional, no existe una fuerte vinculación entre las tres convenciones de Río, sin embargo, se está trabajando en la integralidad de procesos y propuestas de país. Es importante mencionar que tanto las instituciones de gobierno relacionadas a conocimientos tradicionales como las autoridades indígenas con alta representatividad; existe por ejemplo la Mesa Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas y Cambio Climático, instancia que busca la plena participación en los procesos.

A nivel de proyectos, los actores expertos en diversidad biológica están representados por las instituciones gubernamentales impulsoras de la estrategia y a nivel de cada proyecto se cuenta con la participación de co-administradores de áreas protegidas, cooperativas, concesionarios, organizaciones de base y pueblos indígenas. Una ventaja adicional de este modelo es que debido a que se trata de Áreas Protegidas, ninguna propuesta o proyecto debe contravenir la normativa legal y el contenido de los Planes Maestros de cada área protegida donde se desarrollen proyectos REDD+.

Para el caso de San Andrés, es posible que integre un proceso de valoración e integración del conocimiento tradicional.

5. ¿Cómo están implicadas las comunidades indígenas y locales?

La respuesta aquí se relaciona con la pregunta anterior, existe la Mesa de Pueblos indígenas y Cambio Climático y que aglutina una amplia gama de organizaciones de base y de ong`s. Quizá lo más importante sea mencionar que desde la representatividad o desde las ong`s ambientalistas y de derechos humanos y pueblos indígenas se observa una mejor articulación en cuanto a sus demandas y a participar en los procesos de toma de decisiones que tengan que ver con sus intereses y territorios.

6. ¿Existen experiencias del mercado voluntario de carbono que está usted aprovechando?

A nivel nacional ha habido experiencias de venta de carbono en el mercado voluntario desde una experiencia de un grupo bancario privado guatemalteco (Banco de Occidente, FIDOSA) en la comercialización de créditos de carbono desde plantaciones de hule (*Hevea brasiliensis*). Es importante en estos casos, tener el detalle del final de la cadena productiva de este negocio verde, es decir, el destino final de la vida útil del árbol productor del caucho: leña, madera, subproductos maderables y no maderables?

Por otra parte, se han tenido charlas de expertos internacionales con experiencias exitosas en mercado voluntario de carbono, a saber: Global Carbon Group, Merrill Lynch, Carbon Desitions International, Cooperación Alemana GTZ, Oro Verde, entre otros.

Experiencias nacionales con las medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica

1. ¿Existen medidas preventivas pertinentes establecidas para la diversidad biológica a nivel nacional, o se están desarrollando? ¿Cómo se relacionan con las garantías descritas en la decisión 1/CP.16 CMNUCC?

En el marco de la implementación del convenio de Diversidad Biológica y Cambio Climático, se denota una debilidad nacional; ello se debe específicamente a que hasta el año 2009 y 2010 se construyeron dos políticas públicas nacionales: La política de Cambio Climático y la Política Nacional de Diversidad Biológica. Se pretende que estas políticas promoverán una mejor participación del Estado y un mayor balance entre políticas y participación social.

Por otra parte, la articulación de políticas públicas en diversidad biológica y cambio climático deben resolver a nivel nacional las prioridades para adaptación al cambio climático, mantenimiento de los servicios ecosistémicos y el potencial el desarrollo sostenible. Lo anterior, debe estar acompañado de los recursos humanos y financieros necesarios.

El marco de política pública anterior, los instrumentos de política (estrategias, leyes, normas y procedimientos) deben garantizar el cumplimiento de las garantías emanadas desde la COP 16 de CC y COP 10 del CDB.

A nivel de iniciativas piloto, la utilización de estándares que consideran la conservación de la diversidad biológica y el beneficio social, más allá de los créditos propios de carbono, lo que se busca como fin es mejorar las relaciones de gobernabilidad, sostenibilidad y resiliencia socio ambiental ante el cambio climático.

2. ¿Cuál es la capacidad para el desarrollo y la aplicación de las medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica?

La implementación de las políticas públicas de diversidad biológica y cambio climático, pretende desarrollar en el mediano plazo, procesos de monitoreo de bienestar socio ambiental incluido el monitoreo de línea base de REDD+. En este sentido, el monitoreo nacional será integrado a otros indicadores relacionados al tema y a la implementación de las 3 convenciones de Río. MRV= monitoreo reporte y verificación.

3. ¿Cuáles son los principales obstáculos para la inclusión de medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica, si existe alguno?

El principal obstáculo es la no valoración estratégica de la Diversidad Biológica representada en este caso por los bosques; a nivel de gobierno y sociedad, es decir, el Estado. En ese sentido y desde la visión de Estado, no se encuentra claramente identificadas las vinculaciones sociales -servicios de agua potable, agua para riego, hidro energía -, adaptación al cambio climático / disminución de la vulnerabilidad socioambiental, comercio exterior y demás servicios ecosistémicos del bosque y diversidad biológica en general.

4. ¿Cuáles son las necesidades concretas de creación de capacidad con respecto a las medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica (en su caso), y en qué nivel (gobierno, sociedad civil y pueblos indígenas, comunidades locales)?

Desarrollar y crear capacidades nacionales a tres diferentes niveles: a) Alto nivel –Gabinete de Ministros: responsables de un balance y coherencia entre las políticas públicas, como: Política agrícola, política Forestal, Política de Cambio Climático, Política minera, Política energética (cambios en cobertura de bosques por biocombustibles), entre otras. B) Nivel Técnico Institucional: necesario establecer y crear capacidades en establecer un Sistema Nacional de Monitoreo Integrado. En este sentido, debe constituirse en una herramienta eficiente para la toma de decisiones. C) Nivel Social Participativo: este nivel debe estar conformado por actores y sectores informados y conscientes del valor estratégico del bosque y diversidad biológica como las bases ambientales del desarrollo y adaptación al cambio climático.

5. ¿Cuáles son las principales lecciones aprendidas hasta ahora con respecto a las medidas preventivas de diversidad biológica?

Guatemala es de los primeros países más vulnerables del mundo, desde la geología y su posición de istmo, ha tenido impactos fuertes en la economía y vulnerabilidad socioambiental. Con los recientes embates del cambio climático (Mitch 1998; Stan 2005, Agatha 2010), Guatemala ha invertido alrededor de 8 *billones* solamente en recuperación de infraestructura para mantener activo el país en términos

económicos. Muchos afectados en áreas rurales continúan en una recuperación lenta por su vinculación con el bosque como su medio de vida (SEGEPLAN 2010).

El informe Geo Ambiental y el IV Informe Nacional de Diversidad Biológica, recomiendan desde el análisis una inversión precautoria con mejores dividendos en costo-beneficio en conservación y restauración ambiental. Lo anterior, debe garantizar, mejorar y/o asegurar los medios de vida rural y en extrema pobreza, el crecimiento económico, la infraestructura y la consecuente disminución de vulnerabilidad socioambiental.

Experiencias nacionales con las medidas preventivas para las comunidades indígenas y locales

1. ¿Cuál es la estructura de las organizaciones de la sociedad civil que representan los puntos de vista de las comunidades indígenas y locales? ¿Cómo se coordinan sus puntos de vista?

La Ley de descentralización del Estado (2002) la cual estructura legalmente la participación social de “*abajo hacia arriba*” para todos los guatemaltecos y guatemaltecas. Sin embargo, no ha sido del todo implementada y esto ha imposibilitado el empoderamiento desde la sociedad civil en general. Debido a la riqueza cultural guatemalteca, en algunos casos, esta Ley no reconoció ni articuló a las autoridades indígenas y sus sistemas propios de gobernanza.

La ley estructura la participación en 4 niveles: a) COCODES: consejo comunitario de desarrollo que es el nivel organizativo rural-local, conformado por miembros/líderes comunitarios; estos canalizan sus demandas hacia el nivel siguiente que es el COMUDE “Consejo Municipal de Desarrollo” conformado por los representantes de los COCODES y la corporación municipal (representada por partidos políticos del gobierno local). Desde este nivel, ambos debieran incidir y decidir sobre la inversión pública a nivel municipal o gobierno local. Seguidamente el CODEDE “Consejo Departamental de Desarrollo”, que articula a representantes de los COMUDES y gobiernos locales, debieran incidir en los fondos de inversión pública a nivel departamental.

En algunos territorios indígenas funcionan –en acuerdo o desacuerdo-, varias estructuras de poder y toma de decisiones y son los COCODES, Autoridades indígenas, parcialidades, y otras formas consuetudinarias de organización.

2. ¿Cuáles son los mecanismos mediante los cuales se consideran las opiniones de las comunidades indígenas y locales?

Actualmente funciona la “Mesa Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas y Cambio Climático” conformada por indígenas profesionales, a menudo en representación de organizaciones sociales y no gubernamentales. La anterior es una instancia representada más no representativa de pueblos indígenas (mayas, garífunas y xincas). La representatividad y autorepresentación en este caso, debe mejorarse a través de la implementación del Convenio 169 y el CDB.

Por otra parte, se está trabajando con la “Asociación Nacional de Comunidades Forestales”, comunidades y organizaciones de base, mas ligadas al uso, manejo y aprovechamiento del bosque. La ANCF, incluye a comunidades indígenas y mestizas del país.

Para el caso de la legitimidad social de algunas acciones de explotación de recursos mineros, existe una serie de organizaciones indígenas, sociales y religiosas que han demostrado su descontento por no desarrollar consultas sobre determinados proyectos. En un futuro mediato, estos movimientos sociales debieran ser consultados en el caso de REDD+ y sus demandas canalizadas al más alto nivel.

3. ¿Cómo son las preocupaciones relacionadas con los artículos 8j del CDB (respeto de los conocimientos tradicionales) y 10c (apoyo a la utilización consuetudinaria de la diversidad biológica) se refleja en la planificación de REDD-plus y el diseño?

Guatemala como país Megadiverso, multilingüe y multicultural contempla un complejo nivel social de integración, producto de un conflicto armado interno y de un irrespeto –en reiteradas ocasiones- a los derechos de los pueblos indígenas. Con lo anterior, el abordaje de temáticas con altas expectativas como

REDD+, deben en principio definirse desde el Estado, entendido este como el gobierno, los marcos políticos y legales y la participación social representativa.

En un principio, como política de Estado debe definirse a quien pertenece o quien decide sobre los mercados de carbono. Guatemala aún no ha definido este proceso y puede generar o amplias expectativas o dejar en un vacío los procesos de negociación futura.

Como país, se está desarrollando acciones para la conformación de la Estrategia Nacional REDD+ como un documento y experiencias aprendidas que luego deben ser legitimadas desde la participación social.

A la fecha existen también, dos procesos importantes que pretenden articular e informar a la sociedad guatemalteca; estos son la Política Nacional de Cambio Climático y la propuesta de Política Nacional de Diversidad biológica, ambas en el entendido de implementar a nivel de país las convenciones de Cambio Climático y la de Diversidad Biológica.

En el marco de la Política Nacional de Cambio Climático, se respetan y valoran los conocimientos, prácticas e innovaciones derivadas del conocimiento tradicional.

Desde la propuesta de Política Nacional de Diversidad biológica, se contempla el respeto, valoración y protección de las innovaciones, prácticas y el conocimiento tradicional; en pleno apego al 8j, 10c y Protocolo de Nagoya. Reconociendo la importancia y complejidad del tema el Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas ha creado un departamento de Pueblos Indígenas y Sociedad civil, con el fin de orientar y facilitar la gobernabilidad de las áreas protegidas y del uso sostenible de la diversidad biológica.

Colaboración regional con respecto a las medidas preventivas y la evaluación del impacto

- 1. ¿Participa usted en los intercambios regionales e internacionales de las experiencias piloto de REDD-plus en relación con las medidas preventivas y los beneficios múltiples? ¿Cuál es el valor de esos intercambios?**

Si Guatemala forma parte de estos intercambios mas no pude acceder ala información las capacidades nacionales en este sentido.

- 2. ¿Cuál es el nivel de colaboración regional en REDD-plus, por ejemplo a través de las organizaciones regionales como COMIFAC/OTCA/ASEAN?**

No accedimos a esta información.

- 3. ¿Cuál otro apoyo regional e internacional (además de a la ayuda otorgada por UNREDD/FCPF/ITTO) sería útil?**

En este tema la vinculación directa es a través de la CCAD y sus Comités Técnicos. La ITTO desarrolla programas específicos como el ITTO-CITES, que ha apoyado especialmente al Cono Sur, en temas de bosques tropicales. La ITTO trabaja con cooperantes y apoya directamente esta relación directa entre el comercio de especies CITES , mercado de maderas tropicales, y las demandas del mercado.

Monitoreo de los impactos de REDD-plus en la diversidad biológica

- 1. ¿Usa usted (o está planeando utilizar) los indicadores para medir impactos en la diversidad biológica de REDD-plus? Está planeando en utilizar herramientas de planificación para evaluar/monitorear los impactos de REDD-plus sobre la diversidad biológica y los medios de vida indígenas y locales?**

Si el modelo de país a desarrollar pretende integrar estas variables en la experiencia de país.

- 2. ¿Pueden estos impactos ser controlados a través de los programas existentes (como las evaluaciones de los Recursos Forestales de FAO, o los Informes Nacionales del CDB), o se necesitan otros esfuerzos independientes o adicionales? Si es así, en su caso, cuales son las necesidades creación de capacidad?**

La creación de capacidad debe ser dirigida preferiblemente desde el CDB, los expertos que nacionalmente llegan, generalmente no tienen como fin el desarrollo de capacidades nacionales con todas las variables. El desarrollo de capacidades nacionales debe estar dirigido por entes que no tienen intereses particulares; la mayoría de los que nos visitan son consultores “punta de lanza” en este tema y obviamente su finalidad es estar siempre vinculados a estos procesos (ser necesarios o indispensables).

3. ¿Qué posibles mecanismos (a nivel nacional, regional e internacional) existen o pudieran ser desarrolladas para el monitoreo de los impactos de REDD-plus sobre la diversidad biológica y las comunidades indígenas y locales?

Preferentemente una integración nacional y regional (centroamérica) de programas y modelos de monitoreo de la diversidad biológica y REDD+

PROMEBIO: Programa de monitoreo biológico de Centroamérica a través de CCAD.

IABIN: Inter American Biodiversity Network. OEA –CCAD.

4. ¿Cómo son los esfuerzos nacionales vinculados a los esfuerzos de la diversidad biológica regional y a sus evaluaciones?

Se integran generalmente desde instituciones que dependen de financiamiento (PROMEBIO - CCAD) en donde los productos no necesariamente crean desarrollo de capacidades nacionales ni entes que acopien, verifiquen y analicen las bases de datos a nivel nacional y regional.

JAPAN

National experience with biodiversity safeguards

What are the main lessons learned so far regarding biodiversity safeguards?

Ministry of the Environment (MOE) of Japan sorted out information on lessons learnt from the implementation of REDD-plus measures, which aim to achieve both reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and conservation of biodiversity based on experiences related to the projects which Japan have been involved in.

The following are the outline of such information:

Overdependence on forests through farmland utilization and timber production by local residents, including illegal activities, is considered as a part of drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. Activities, which lead to persistent forest conservation, including environmental education for youth in local communities, are considered effective as countermeasures against poverty, which underlies such overdependence.

While promoting the sustainable forest management with local residents, supply of timbers and woods for fuels from planted forests in markets would reduce dependence on natural forests.

If local communities do not perform well economically, forest conservation activities might move backward, and therefore, profitability and financial aspect of forest management activities are important, and keeping a certain level of flexibility of the concept of conservation is important.

Forests with rich biodiversity show a high degree of resilience from disturbance and they ensure the stability and sustainability of carbon stocks. It is important to prevent conversion from natural forests to mass plantation of fast-growing alien species

In implementing activities, domestic laws and plans the conservation of biodiversity including NBSAP of the country concerned should be observed. Seeking the opinion as necessary on the conservation of biodiversity from experts is also useful.

It is important to maintain a proper continuity in terms of effective conservation of ecosystem services and biodiversity taking into consideration the whole picture of land use. In addition, the establishment of

protected areas, planting, and sustainable management of forests should be conducted in an integrated manner in view of the landscape management.

There is a risk that sustainability of carbon stocks and biodiversity conservation are not ensured after the completion of short-term activities. Therefore, it is important to define a proper project period taking into account that it takes time to see the results of the activities.

In designing REDD-plus activities, it is necessary to make decisions, sharing information among stakeholders, and taking into consideration the values of ecosystem services for local residents and the priorities in government policies.

REDD-plus activities in the areas with rich and unique biodiversity and endangered species have a higher potential of co-benefits for biodiversity, while they have a higher risk in case they do not take into consideration biodiversity aspect, and therefore effective. Measures to conserve biodiversity should be taken.

Monitoring impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity

Do you use (or are you planning to use) any indicators for measuring biodiversity impacts of REDD-plus?

Ministry of the Environment (MOE) of Japan recognizes the importance of REDD-plus activities in view of utilization of multiple functions of forests including biodiversity, and believes that conservation of forest biodiversity through REDD-plus activities is crucial and negative impacts by those activities on the environment should be avoided or minimized. In this regard, MOE of Japan sorted out the points to be included in the consideration of indicators for measuring biodiversity.

As biodiversity assessment indicators are diverse and unlike the indicators for carbon which can be measured with an universal unit, methods for biodiversity monitoring have not been internationally established. Bearing in mind the need to improve the above-mentioned situation, the points to be considered are as follows:

Unlike carbon, biodiversity is closely connected to the location and it is unevenly-distributed in space.

Therefore, the details of the biodiversity monitoring should be designed for each project, taking into account the following:

Decide indicators and items to be monitored envisaged impacts and changes to be caused by the REDD-plus activities:

Ensure continuous assessment of changes in biodiversity caused by implementation of activities;

Ensure feasibility of implementation with realistic costs;

Take into consideration availability and accessibility of monitoring results; and

Consideration of biodiversity should not create disincentive for the implementation of REDD-plus activities.

In view of saving costs required for monitoring, it is recommended to make a preferential use of measurable indicators for carbon monitoring in biodiversity monitoring.

MYANMAR

Summary of input from Myanmar

1. Views, experiences and expectations with regards to relevant safeguards in REDD

Myanmar have limited experience with safeguards since demonstration Myanmar has not started the REDD-plus project, but it is stated that all actions under Myanmar forest management plans are in line

/...

with the safeguards outlined in the UNFCCC decision on the outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working group on long term cooperative action under the convention at COP 16. The main obstacles for developing and applying biodiversity safeguards is insufficient legal status and financial resources as well as lack of systematic HR development in biodiversity conservation and in general a comprehensive master plan. It is also mentioned poverty and lack of education in local communities and that there are insufficient incentives for biodiversity conservation among the public. There are few NGOs involved in biodiversity conservation and climate change issues, so the Ministry of Forestry and National Commission for Environmental Affairs-NCEA mainly plays a cooperation or/and coordinating role in the community-based forest resource and biodiversity conservation projects initiated by the NGOs. The main mechanisms for securing that the views of indigenous and local communities are considered are that Settlement Officers must issue prior notice on constitution of reserved forest so that local communities and indigenous peoples can ask for their rights and privileges if affected.

2. Identify possible indicators to assess the contribution of REDD-plus to achieving the objectives of the CBD

Myanmar has Criteria and Indicators (C&I) for sustainable forest management that contain indicators on biodiversity conservation that could be used in REDD+ projects. The input does however not present these indicators.

3. Views on potential mechanisms to monitor impacts from REDD-plus and other ecosystem based approaches for climate change mitigation measures on biodiversity

The report from Myanmar states that “The impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and Indigenous and local livelihood could be assessed through socio-economic survey, semi-structure interviews, experts’ opinions and resources inventory”. They go on to write that existing programmes, such as FAO FRA or CBD National Reports, are not sufficient to assess/monitor the impacts of REDD and that additional trainings and capacity building programmes are needed. As potential monitoring mechanism, they suggest an “intensive resource inventory in each ecological region for biodiversity conservation and socio-economic survey at sub-national level and national level mechanisms” that should be developed.

Other

Myanmar is not involved in any REDD project yet, but the UN-REDD programme has considered what needs to be prepared for REDD-readiness. There have a legal and institutional framework in place for forest management and they work actively with community based forestry. Biodiversity experts have been involved in REDD+ planning and they have held workshops involving local communities for awareness-raising.

Views with Regards to Relevant REDD-plus Safeguards submitted by the Forest Department, Ministry of Forestry

National Experience with REDD-plus

1. What is the national structure for REDD-plus planning, if any?

Under the circumstance of global climate change, the term REDD-plus become a new mechanism to mitigate the climate change. Myanmar has recognized REDD+ as an innovative concept of adding monetary incentive to forest conservation activities. Forest conservation is an age-old practice for Myanmar. Therefore, Myanmar has well established national structure for sustainable forest management and conservation, which are in line with REDD-plus activities. UN-REDD programme identified five components needed to prepare for REDD-plus readiness as follows:

- Management of the REDD+ readiness process
- Stakeholder participation
- Implementation framework
- Reference scenario
- National monitoring system

In response to the components mentioned above, Myanmar has strong legal framework, forest management system, forest resource based, Institutional arrangement which could contribute to the REDD-plus mechanism.

(a) Legal Framework

- Forest Policy (1995)
- Forest Law (1992)
- Forest Rules (1995)
- Myanmar Agenda 21 (1997)
- Community forestry instructions (1995)
- Protection of wildlife and wild plants and conservation of natural areas law (1994)
- National forestry action plan (1995)
- National code of Practice for forest Harvesting
- Myanmar Environment Policy (1994)

Although Myanmar Forest Policy was officially enacted in 1995, it has originated from the Indian Forest Policy (1894) and has developed in accord with situation. In fact, principle of Myanmar forest policy has been more on conservation of forests and biodiversity than merely production. Myanmar Forest Policy (1995) was formulated with following six imperatives which could in turn support basic requirements for REDD components.

- Protection: natural resources; forest, soil and water, ecosystems, biodiversity
- Sustainability: maintenance and rational use of natural resources
- Basic Needs: providing forest products and services to the people
- Efficiency: harnessing the full economic potential of the forest while controlling socio-environmentally side effects
- Participation: enlisting active participation of people in national and local efforts
- Public awareness: educating communities generally and more particularly the politicians,
- Decision makers and other stakeholders

With respect to the views of ASEAN common position (Submitted to COP 16) on the facts that to take account the social and environmental safeguards, to ensure the rights of forest dependents, etc., Forest Law (1992) has already encompassed in its basic principles as follows;

- to promote the sector of public co-operation in implementing the forestry policy and environmental conservation policy of the Government; (para 3 - a)
- To develop the economy of the State, to contribute towards the food, clothing and shelter needs of the public and for perpetual enjoyment of benefits by conservation and protection of forest; (para 3 - b)

Myanmar Agenda 21 was formulated reflecting to the call of the Earth Summit. It gives special emphasis on sustainable forest resources management and biodiversity conservation in chapter 14 and 15, respectively. The following programme areas to solve forestry related issues could be well adapted to REDD+ components no. 1 and 2.

- Accelerate sustainable development of forest resources (para 14-1)
- Develop the forestry sector to meet basic needs (para 14-2)
- Promote efficiency in the production of forestry goods and services (par 14-3)
- Strengthen forestry policies legislation and institutions (para 14-4)
- Enhance people's participation in forestry development and management (para 14-5)
- Strengthen protected area planning and management (para 15-1)
- Conserve biodiversity (para 15-2)

Under the programme areas required activities are also highlighted comprehensively.

Community Forestry Instruction - CFI (1995) opened a new front for local communities to fully participate in planning and implementing forest activities. Now community forests (CF) are merging throughout the country. About 102,402 acre (41,458 ha) of community forests have already been established and about nearly 40,000 user members involved by the end of 2009 (Planning and Statistics, FD 2010). The essence of grass-root level involvement with bottom-up approach starting from drawing up planning and drawing management plan through implementing the activities until harvesting and benefit sharing will reflect very well to the REDD+ requirements on component no. 2 and 3.

With regard biodiversity conservation also, Myanmar has long traditional history and systematically practice with the help of Wild Life Protection Act (1936). It was replaced by Protection of wildlife and wild plants and conservation of natural areas law (1994) according the prevailing condition.

(b) Forest Management System

- Myanmar Selection System
- Forest Management Plan
- Elephant Logging

Myanmar Selection System, MSS in short, has been the principle forest management applied in managing the natural forests in Myanmar since 1856. Under the MSS, prescribed girth limit, annual allowable cut and 30-year felling cycle are control measures to ensure harvesting timber in sustainable basis. The MSS with the essence, harvesting only increment and leaving the capital without being compromised, is very in line with REDD+.

Myanmar is a single country being practicing elephant logging. The use of elephant in skidding and rafting in transportation of logs are the common practices. About 3000 elephants are working for timber harvesting throughout the country. As a result, the Myanmar's timber harvesting practice of elephant logging has been recognized as the system that contributes the negative least impact to the environment. On the other hand, it is recognized as a Reduced Impact Logging System.

Forests in Myanmar have been managed with short-term and long-term plans. Forest districts are formed as forest management units and managed with Management Plan or Working Plan which are revised in every 10 year. Altogether 62 forest districts are managed under respective management plans. Forests in a district, in order for effective management, are formed into working circles; production working circle, plantation working circle, local supply working circle, watershed working circles and non-wood forest working circle.

(c) Institutional Arrangement

There are four institutions under the Ministry of Forestry, which have been implementing the Myanmar forest policy.

- Planning and Statistic Department (PSD)
- Forest Department (FD)
- Myanmar Timber Enterprise (MTE)
- Dry Zone Greening Department (DZGD)

In order for enhancement of capacity building, the following educational institutions have already established. Those institutions have been producing human resources in a wide range of skills from technical level to high academic degree level in various fields. Those institutions have much potential supporting capacity enhancement in particular field of REDD+ programme.

- University of Forestry
- Forest Research Institute
- Myanmar Forest School
- Central Forestry Development Training Centre
- Training Schools of Myama Timber Enterprise
- Extension Division of the Forest Department

(d) Forest Resource base

In Myanmar, reserved forests (RF), protected public forests (PPF) and protected areas system (PAS) constitute permanent forest estate (PFE). Under the Myanmar Forest Law (1992), RF and PPF enjoy almost equal legal status and PAS is administered in accordance with the Protection of Wildlife and Wild Plants and the Conservation of Protected Areas Law.

Legal classification	Area (Km²)	% of land area
Reserved forest	114,995	17.00
Public protected forest	26,799	3.96
Protected area system	31,945	4.72
Unclassified forest area	173,739	25.68
Total	180,008	26.60

Source: Forest Department, 2006

1.2. Reforestation and Afforestation

Plantation forestry has always been a supplement to the natural forest management in Myanmar. It is asserted in the 1995 Myanmar Forest Policy that existing natural forests will not be substituted with forest plantations. Due to the rapid deforestation, large scale plantation forestry began in 1980s although small-scale forest plantations started as early as late 1850s in Myanmar (Tint.2002). Basically, there are four types of forest plantations under the annual plantation programme of about 30,000 ha. This extensive annual forest plantation programme would be a potential to be integrated into REDD+ programme.

- (1) Commercial plantation – using commercially valuable species for timber production
- (2) Industrial plantation – using fast growing species for pulp & paper industries
- (3) Watershed plantation – to protect watershed areas of dams and reservoirs
- (4) Village supply plantation – to provide timber, poles and posts to local people.

Under the reforestation programme, not only artificial regeneration activity but natural regeneration activity also included even among 13 major forest activities. Detail instructions are stated in management plan. All those activities are considered to improve forest conservation in general and contribute to enhancement of carbon sequestration in REDD+ programme.

2. What is the status of REDD-plus preparation, including participation in pilot and demonstration activities?

Forest Department established a Core Unit for REDD-plus and AR CDM aiming at to formulate REDD-plus readiness proposal.

In order to be ready for REDD-plus implementation, Forest Department and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) jointly organized two National Level Workshops in Nay Pyi Taw.

First workshop was held in April 7, 2010 and attended representatives from line ministries, FAO, UNDP, UN-REDD programme and local NGOs. Second REDD workshop was also held along with the disaster risk reduction workshop in December 19-20, 2010 in Nay Pyi Taw.

Although Myanmar has not started yet REDD pilot project, assessment on readiness of major components of REDD-plus has been conducted in cooperation with UNDP and local NGOs.

COMPONENTS OF REDD⁺ READINESS, AND TYPICAL ACTIVITIES FOR MYANMAR

1 = VERY HIGH, 2 = HIGH, 3 = MEDIUM, 4 = LOW, 5 = VERY LOW

Management of the REDD⁺ Readiness process	Status	Remarks
Establishment of multi-stakeholder information network	3	Already established, needs to strengthen and sustainability
Establishment of coordination mechanism	4	Already established, but weak, needs to strengthen and sustainability
Preparation of a REDD ⁺ readiness roadmap	4	Two national workshop already held, need to prepare Roadmap
Analysis of sectoral approaches to REDD ⁺ (eg. Timber industry; agricultural sector)	5	Needs to conduct research, NCEA conducted some stages eg. INC report
Other		
Stakeholder Engagement		
Awareness raising – government agencies	4	Only few officials aware about REDD
Awareness raising – communities	5	Low level of awareness opportunities
Awareness raising – other (industry, armed forces, etc.)	4	Only few officials aware about REDD
Preparation / application of FPIC procedures	5	Not yet started
Other		
Implementation Framework		
Mainstreaming REDD ⁺ into planning (land use and socio-economic development)	2	Forest Policy and FD management plan is very inline with REDD, easy to integrate with management plan
Design of benefit distribution system (including establishment of REDD ⁺ fund)	4	Have experiences in CF but needs to explore more
Strengthening forest governance – community or social forestry development	2	CFIs 1995, Forest Policy 1995, Forest Law 1992, Myanmar Agenda 21, CITES, UNFCCC,
Strengthening forest governance – law enforcement and reduction of corruption	3	Forest Law 1992, Wildlife Law 1992, Code of Timber Harvesting, C&I for SFM, needs to follow FLEG-T (of Asean) and Lacey Act
Application of social and environmental safeguards	3	Forest Law 1992, Wildlife Law 1992, Code of Timber Harvesting, C&I for SFM, needs to follow FLEG-T (of Asean) and Lacey Act
Other	5	Not yet started
REDD⁺ Strategy Setting		
Analysis of drivers of deforestation and degradation	3	Have reliable data and information, suggestion to conduct for specific area to explore major drivers
Analysis of opportunities to enhance forest carbon stocks (reforestation, rehabilitation, etc.)	1	Reforestation, Afforestation across the country by Govt. and private, annual planting rate of 32000 ha. per year
Identification of options	2	Many forest rehabilitation and conservation

		activities including PAS (5.57% of total area)
Preparation of National REDD ⁺ Strategy, including consultation process	5	Not yet started, urgently needed
Other		
Reference Scenario		
Analysis of past trends in forest cover and forest quality	2	Available RS/GIS images and experts in FD, needs specific image for specific area (potential pilot project area)
Estimation of biomass equations (allometric equations)	4	Have experimental scale, and some experts but need for comprehensive study for each and every forest types of Myanmar
Scenario setting for future trends in forest development	4	Needs more discussion and consultation to set scenario
Estimation of interim reference scenarios	3	Available for generalized reference scenario
Other		
National Monitoring System		
Strengthening the national forest inventory process	2	Already have but needs to strengthen
Establishment/capacity building for remote sensing	3	Have some experts but needs new generation for long term
Development of participatory monitoring techniques	3	Already established CF and needs to develop the capacity of rural community, have CF training centres and training regularly basis
Data management/capacity building for reporting (link to National Communications)	3	Needs more experts and more new generation for the future
Other		

Note: Subjective assessment (by REDD core unit, unpublished)

3. How do you comply with safeguard requirements of REDD-plus pilot and demonstration experiences, for example in the framework of the FCPF or UN REDD? What are your experiences with these safeguard requirements.

Myanmar has not started the REDD-plus project so that demonstration experiences are very limited. However, Forest Department has a lot of experiences in sustainable forest management, reforestation/afforestation, forest conservation and organizing local people to participate in forest management through community forestry, which are eligible activities of REDD-plus. Forest Department has been managing natural forests under Myanmar Selection System, which is a system of sustainable forest management, for over 100 years. For social aspect, Community Forestry Instructions (CFIs) was launched in 1995 so that Forest Department has over 15 years working experiences of community forestry. These experiences could be strong basic for the implementation of REDD-plus mechanism.

4. How are biodiversity experts involved (including holders of traditional knowledge) in national REDD-plus planning? How are indigenous and local communities involved?

Forest Department has established REDD-plus Core Unit to undertake REDD-plus related matters. Core Unit is composed of experts from various fields such as biodiversity conservation, forest management, silviculture, forest ecology, community forestry etc. By this way, biodiversity experts involve the core unit as well as national REDD-plus planning.

Utilizing the existing forest user groups of community forest, Forest Department invited the local communities from potential pilot project sites to attend REDD National level workshop held in 2010 for awareness raising. By this way, indigenous people and local communities involved REDD-plus planning.

5. Are there experiences from the voluntary carbon market that you are drawing from?

There is no experience from the voluntary carbon market. However, Myanmar forest officers often have chances to attend international seminar, workshop and meetings related with global and regional carbon markets. These experiences could support Myanmar when REDD-plus mechanism is commenced.

2. National Experience with Biodiversity Safeguard

Forest Department has been initiated and implemented various nationwide and localizes forest management plans such as;

All actions under Myanmar forest management plans are in line with the safeguards outlined in the UNFCCC decision on the outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working group on long term cooperative action under the convention at COP 16.

Biodiversity conservation in Myanmar especially wild flora and fauna in their natural habitats and ex-situ conservation has been implementing basing on The Protection of Wildlife and Conservation of Natural Areas Law and Rules Relating to the Protection of Wildlife and Conservation of Natural Areas.

In addition, Myanmar has actively participated in international biodiversity conservation related agreements such as CITES, CBD, etc.

Rights of indigenous people in the vicinity of Protected Areas are due considered by establishing buffer zone (zoning management system).

Ecosystem services are not given full attention in biodiversity conservation due to insufficient information and technology & methodology and strong policy commitment.

Actions to address the risk of reversals and actions to reduce the displacement of emission are not described under the Protection of Wildlife and Conservation of Natural Areas Law.

2.1 National capacity for developing and applying biodiversity safeguards

- Legal status (NBSAP, Environmental Law)
- Human resources (Government and local community level)
- Financial resources (Sustainable financing)
- Technology and management aspects (Risk assessment, Risk mitigation measures, etc...)

2.2. Main obstacles

- Lack of systematic HR development in biodiversity conservation (quantity, quality and expert areas)
- Insufficient legal status (Inconsistent and unpredictable policy issues, lack of National Landuse Policy, NBSAP, EL)
- Insufficient financial resources (mostly centralize budget allotment system, PAs entirely depend on external resources)
- Lack of comprehensive master plan

2.3. Required concrete capacity building

- Experts for drawing up comprehensive Master Plan (HR requirement)
- Continuous and expeditious Environmental Awareness Program in government and local level (Finance and Experts in EAP)

2.4. Main lessons learned

- Understanding the ecology and physiology of important (key) species, their distribution (Global and national), species population (either viable population or not)
- Insufficient Long term financial support including field equipments and accessories
- Weak law enforcement
- Insufficient well trained persons
- Poverty (minimum income per person)

- Low educational standard of local community (mostly)
- External pressures (subjective decisions by concerned authorities)
- Insufficient incentive for biodiversity conservation among public

3. National Experience with Safeguards for Indigenous and Local Community Views

3.1. What is the structure of civil society organizations representing indigenous and local community views? How are their views coordinated?

There are some Non-government Organizations (NGOs) which are working on community-based natural resource management, biodiversity conservation and climate change issues. However, the number of such organizations is still very few. Ministry of Forestry and National Commission for Environmental Affairs-NCEA mainly plays a cooperation or/and coordinating role in the community-based forest resource and biodiversity conservation projects initiated by the NGOs. Stakeholder consultative meetings and workshops organized by the projects are the major platforms through which the views of all stakeholders could be exchanged and coordinated if in need.

3.2. What are the mechanisms through which the views of indigenous and local communities are considered?

Since long time before, Forest Department acknowledged the rights and privileges of local communities. Thus, it has also been clearly mentioned in the section 6(b) of the existing Forest Law (1992) as follows:

The Minister shall in respect of constituting a reserved forest appoint a forest Settlement Officer to inquire into and determine in the manner prescribed the affected rights of the public on the relevant land and to carry out demarcation of the reserved forest."

In line with this legal stipulation, Settlement Officer must issue prior notice on constitution of reserved forest so that local communities and indigenous peoples can ask for their rights and privileges if affected. They can put forward their claims to the Settlement Officer through the respective Township Forest Office.

The next mechanism or instrument, through which the views of the local communities and indigenous peoples are considered, is Community Forestry Instructions-CFIs (1995). According to CFIs, local communities are permitted to establish community forests with 30-year period of land. They have to develop management plan on their own, with the technical support of Forest Department and manage their forests themselves.

Also, there is Local Supply and Community Forests Working Circle in Forest Management Plans. These working circles are formed aiming at providing basic needs of forest product to local communities and indigenous peoples.

3.3. How are concerns related to CBD Articles 8j (respect for traditional knowledge) and 10c (support customary use of biodiversity) reflected in REDD-plus planning?

Myanmar has enabling conditions for implementing REDD-Plus, such as policy, legal framework and long-lasting sustainable forest management system. Although typical REDD plus has not been initiated yet, Myanmar acknowledges customary use of biodiversity by indigenous and local community and has already incorporated these concerns in forest management planning as mentioned before.

4. Regional collaboration regarding safeguards and impact assessment

4.1. Do you participate in regional and international exchanges of REDD-plus pilot experiences regarding safeguards and multiple benefits? What is value of such exchanges?

Myanmar has no REDD-plus pilot project so that experiences regarding safeguards and multiple benefits are limited. But Myanmar often participates UN-REDD regional level workshops and meeting from which Myanmar gained those experiences to some extent.

4.2. What is the level of regional collaboration on REDD-plus eg. through regional organizations such as COMIFA/ACTO/ASEAN?

Myanmar is a member of ASEAN so that Myanmar always participates ASEAN level REDD-plus workshops, meeting and seminars. Accordingly, Myanmar supports ASEAN common position on REDD-plus implementation.

4.3. What regional and international supports (in addition to support provided by UN-REDD/FCPF/ITTO) would be useful?

Myanmar has not received any supports from UN-REDD and FCPF yet. Supports from these organizations would be very useful for successful implementation of REDD-plus in Myanmar. Probably, GEF supports also would be very useful not only for REDD-plus but also for biodiversity conservation in Myanmar.

5. Monitoring impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity

5.1. Do you use any indicators (or planning to use) for measuring biodiversity impacts of REDD-plus?

Myanmar already has Criteria and Indicator (C&I) for sustainable forest management. Some criteria and indicators are for biodiversity conservation. Therefore, it is possible to use these criteria and indicators for measuring biodiversity impacts of REDD-plus.

5.2. Are you planning to assess/monitor the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and indigenous and local livelihoods? If so, how?

The impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and Indigenous and local livelihood could be assessed through socio-economic survey, semi-structure interviews, experts' opinions and resources inventory.

5.3. Can such impacts be monitored through existing programme or are separate or additional efforts required? If any?

Existing programmes such as FAO FRA or CBD National Reports are not sufficient to assess/monitor the impacts. Additional trainings and capacity building programmes are needed.

5.4. Which potential mechanisms (at national, regional and international level) exists or could be developed for monitoring the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and indigenous and local community?

Intensive resource inventory in each ecological region for biodiversity conservation and socio-economic survey at sub-national level and national level mechanisms should be developed.

5.5. How are national efforts linked to regional biodiversity efforts?

Myanmar has already established 34 Protected Area System (PAS) which constitute 5.7% of total land area throughout the country. In legal standpoint, Myanmar has the following legal background and international agreements related with biodiversity conservation, which contributes to the national as well as regional biodiversity efforts:

- Protection of wildlife and wild plants and conservation of natural areas law (1994)
- Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) in 1997.
- UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CDB) in November 1994

NORWAY

Norway welcomes this opportunity to expand the knowledgebase of the various roles and applications of safeguards relevant to reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, forest conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries. We believe that the work undertaken will lead to an increased understanding within both the CBD and UNFCCC of safeguards. Work undertaken by CBD can provide important insight regarding safeguards relevant to REDD plus. In many countries, National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) already contain elements relevant for biodiversity risks and relevant safeguards, and could be an important policy tool for incorporating biodiversity conservation measures in REDD-plus activities. Reciprocally, the development of REDD plus activities can contribute to improved, more comprehensive implementation of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans. Norway welcomes opportunities for synergistic activities and increasing coordination between the Rio Conventions.

A sound and well functioning REDD+ mechanism within the UNFCCC will have multiple positive effects on biodiversity and the robustness of forest ecosystems beyond their ability to sequester carbon, such as their role within the water cycle and provider of food and other non-timber products as well as wood/timber materials for various purposes. In many forest areas, including those in tropical regions, there is a positive link between biodiversity and carbon density in the forest. In addition, a REDD plus mechanism cannot be regarded as sustainable without respecting knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities and also promoting their full and effective participation in relevant REDD plus activities. Halting the loss, conserving, and restoring biodiversity of forests and engagement of indigenous peoples and local forest dependent communities, as noted in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People and described by relevant articles (art 8j and 10c) and

decisions in the CBD, will help secure healthy and robust ecosystems for the future.

In line with the above, Norway would like to underline that we regard the issues currently described as safeguards as crucially important factors for the longer term sustainability of emissions reductions and increased removals in forests. Norway believes these are issues that all REDD+ implementing countries will have to focus on and address. Hence, Norway supports and participates in, and encourages both developing and developed nations to participate in, initiatives aimed at capacity building, exchange of experiences and the provision of technical assistance to countries requesting this. Some examples are:

- **The UNREDD-programme** that builds on the convening power and expertise of FAO, UNEP and UNDP. The Programme supports processes for REDD+ readiness and contributes to the development of national REDD+ strategies. The Programme provides technical advice on REDD-related work areas where the UN-agencies have their key strengths, including, engagement of indigenous peoples, local communities and other relevant stakeholders, ensuring multiple benefits of forests and REDD+ and REDD+ as a catalyst for transformations to a green economy.
- **The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)** hosted by the World Bank. The FCPF assists tropical and subtropical forest countries in preparing for REDD+ and provides them with performance-based payments for emission reductions. Particular emphasis is put on establishing a thorough and inclusive process to analyse potential environmental risks related to potential elements of the future REDD+ strategy.
- **The Forest Investment Program (FIP)** of the World Bank. The FIP supports developing countries' efforts to reduce deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) and promotes sustainable forest management that leads to emission reductions and the protection of carbon reservoirs. The FIP supports investments that build institutional capacity, forest governance and information, investments in forest mitigation efforts, including forest ecosystem services; and investments outside the forest sector necessary to reduce the pressure on forests such as alternative livelihood and poverty reduction opportunities. Protection of biodiversity and improved livelihoods for indigenous peoples and local communities are explicit goals of the program.

Some lessons regarding the usefulness, efficiency and effectiveness of safeguards or information indicators on biodiversity relevant to a future REDD plus regime within the UNFCCC may already be available for analysis and reflection by the CBD Parties. Examples may include:

- the CBD national report guidelines, in particular number 5, the most recently published guidelines (covering *inter alia* changes in the status and trends in biodiversity, main threats to biodiversity, impact of changes in biodiversity on ecosystem services),
- the reporting framework to FAOs Forest Resources Assessment, (covering *inter alia* forest ownership, special designation and management categories, forest characteristics (extent of natural and planted forests), disturbances affecting forest health and vitality, area of forest affected by woody invasive species), or
- certain parts of the CDM mechanism within the Kyoto Protocol related to afforestation and reforestation project activities (in particular decisions related to the use in afforestation and reforestation activities of potentially invasive alien species and genetically modified organisms).

Norway would welcome a discussion of the benefits of these various approaches as perceived by CBD Parties.

The Cancun decision on REDD+ includes a request for developing country parties to develop "a system for providing information on how the safeguards referred to in appendix I to the decision are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of REDD+ activities". Furthermore, the UNFCCC SBSTA is requested to develop guidance related to this request. Norway is convinced that the CBD, by mobilizing its network of international and national experts, can provide helpful insights towards the design of such a system for providing information on the safeguards on which the CBD has relevant competence, without pre-empting any future decision taken under the UNFCCC. In particular, Norway sees great merit in the CBD providing input to the development of indicators, preferably simple ones, that allows parties to provide information documenting 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*".

In addition, Norway would like to emphasise the importance of transparency in the formulation and application of safeguards. One of the key functions of safeguards is to allow for interested stakeholders to gain access to information that would otherwise not have been readily available. We would thus see merit in receiving other Parties' views on how safeguards can be best designed and applied to achieve this purpose.

SURINAME

Questionnaire for the submission of views with regards to relevant REDD-plus safeguards

National experience with REDD-plus

What is the national structure for REDD-plus planning, if any?

The Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment is the focal point for the UNFCCC.

The REDD+ part within the UNFCCC is the responsibility of the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management. During the formalization of the R-PIN within the forest carbonship partnership program (FCPF-world bank) the minister of RGB formed a core group from several ministries and organizations for the formulation of the R-PIN.

For the formulation of the R-PLAN a National REDD+ committee was established.

The main task of the present National REDD+ Committee, coordinated by the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management (RGB) was to develop Suriname's RPP. The National REDD+ Committee consists of representatives of a wide variety of Ministries (Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management (RGB); Labor, Technological Development and Environment (ATM); Natural Resources (NH); Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries, (LW); Finance (FIN); Regional Development, (RO);

/...

Public Works,(OUD; Planning and Development Cooperation (P LOS), the Cabinet of the President of the Republic of Suriname (CABPRES); the Foundation for Forest Management and Production Control (SBB) and two observers (i.e. Conservation International Suriname and Tropenbos International Suriname).

The current National REDD+ Committee will be transformed and expanded into the National REDD+ Working Group (NRWG), which will consist of one representative of each several entities. The Foundation of Forest Management and Production Control (SBB) is the technical work arm of the Ministry of RGB, which is coordinating the REDD + activities.

What is the status of REDD-plus preparations, including participation in pilot and demonstration activities?

Mostly participation in UNFCCC meetings, FCPF and REDD + Partnership. Because of a change in Government in Suriname 2010, preparations were slightly delayed.

Some REDD + Readiness preparation includes the following:

- Increased national discussions on the way forward in finalizing the RPP of Suriname
- Development of an MRV. A forest Cover Map has been developed by the Ministry of RGB with the technical assistance of CI and financial assistance of KFW.
- Implementation of a 3 year project "Capacity improvement of SBB for Efficient Forest Carbon Stock Assessment" by the Ministry of RGB. Goal of the project is to strengthen the capacity of SBB and relevant stakeholders to conduct forest carbon assessment (FCA), the monitoring, verification and reporting in order to support the GoS. The following objectives are to be achieved:
 - i) Institutional strengthening of SBB and relevant stakeholders, including human resources, and infrastructure to conduct forest carbon assessment and execute the monitoring including sustainable forest management;
 - ii) Elaborate on and select a suitable methodology to design, select and establish a network of monitoring plots of the forest types of Suriname in order to collect data on forest carbon

At this moment only the training aspects have been carried out. Transects design, data gathering with financial assistance of WWF and Tropenbos also have been done. For the next phase funds are needed.

- No demonstration pilot and demonstrating activities have been carried out yet. The Eco Resort Bergen Dal is initiating a demonstration activity, plot to achieve carbon credits.
- The Organization of indigenous people in Suriname (OIS) in cooperation with COICA and several international NGO's organized a one week workshop on REDD+ and training in measuring Forest Carbon.

How do you comply with safeguard requirements of REDD-plus pilot and demonstration activities, for example in the framework of the FCPF or UN REDD?

What are your experiences with these safeguard requirements?

As we have not started yet with the implementation of demonstration projects we don't have experience in complying with safe guard requirements.

During the formulation of the RPP it was obvious that the extend and scope of "safeguard" is not clear. Especially about the involvement of indigenous and tribal communities e.g. Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and FPIC.

How are biodiversity experts involved (including holders of traditional knowledge) in national REDD-plus planning? How are indigenous and local communities involved?

During the formulation of the RPP all stakeholders including representatives of the indigenous and tribal communities were trained and informed about REDD + and RPP to ensure that the level of information to all the stakeholders is the same.

The formulation of the REDD+ strategy, outrage and consultation plan and the implementation of the RPP, REDD + Strategy will be carried with the involvement of all stakeholders.

During the formulation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and the National Forest Policy all stakeholders have been involved. It is also common that in formulating policy papers a consultation team have been involved consisting of experts from and with different expertise.

Are there experiences from the voluntary carbon market that you are drawing from?

As indicated before no significant pilot or demonstration project has been carried out yet in Suriname.

National experience with biodiversity safeguards

Are relevant biodiversity safeguards for the national level in place, or being developed?

How do they relate to the safeguards outlined in the UNFCCC decision on the Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention at COP 16²?

All activities carried out by the government are based on the Multi Annual Development Programme and other policy documents such as National Biodiversity Strategy, National Forest Policy and laws such as the Forest Management Act, the Nature Conservation Act, etc.

The policy of the government is to ensure that a company or organization that engages in (economic) activities which might have a significant environmental and/or social impact must carry out an adequate Environmental and Social Impact Study. This study must include a mitigation plan and involvement of local communities.

A framework environmental law is already drafted and it is envisaged that this will be approved by the Parliament in the coming period.

What is the national capacity for developing and applying biodiversity safeguards?

A capacity need assessment has been carried out by the Ministry of ATM and SBB. The overall outcome of this assessment is that increased capacity on all levels both the public and private sector, institutional, legal, human and financial is necessary.

Which are main obstacles for including biodiversity safeguards, if any?

What are concrete capacity building needs regarding biodiversity safeguards (if any), and at which level (government, civil society/ indigenous peoples, local communities)?

1. Clear and uniform understanding of the safeguards are needed
2. The implementation of safeguards
3. Setting up a safeguards mechanism

What are main lessons learned so far regarding biodiversity safeguards?

So far we experience that there are different interpretations / understanding of safeguards

² In the decision on the outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention, the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC, at its sixteenth meeting (COP 16) affirms that the implementation of REDD-plus activities should include the promotion and support of a number of safeguards, including:

- (a) That actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international agreements;
- (b) 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;
- (c) The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders in particular indigenous peoples and local communities;
- (d) That actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that they are not used for the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forest and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits;
- (e) Actions to address the risk of reversals;
- (f) Actions to reduce the displacement of emissions.

National experience with safeguards for indigenous and local communities

What is the structure of civil society organizations representing indigenous and local community views? How are their views coordinated?

During the formulation of policy documents all relevant organizations including those representing the indigenous and local people were involved. In addition some groups such as indigenous and local people are categorized as focus groups and in that regard special additional meetings, besides the overall stakeholders meeting, were organized for consultation with these focus groups.

What are the mechanisms through which the views of indigenous and local communities are considered?

Through stakeholders meetings using the government and traditional structures. In the RPP it is indicated that during the implementation of the RPP these mechanisms will be further developed.

How are concerns related to CBD Articles 8i (respect for traditional knowledge) and 10c (support customary use of biodiversity) reflected in REDD-plus planning?

Regional collaboration regarding safeguards and impact assessment

Do you participate in regional and international exchanges of REDD-plus pilot experiences regarding safeguards and multiple benefits? What is the value of such exchanges?

Yes, the value of these exchanges is to gather more knowledge, information and experiences. It was noticed that each country has their own circumstances and that there is no "one fits all solution".

What is the level of regional collaboration on REDD-plus e.g. through regional organizations such as COMIFAC/ACTO/ASEAN?

Within the ACTO there is good regional cooperation on the ministerial level and on the technical level.

Regional projects have been carried out within the ACTO and there are regional plans and project being developed

What regional and international support (in addition to support provided by UN-REDD/FCPF/ITTO) would be useful?

Support in capacity strengthening development of a robust MRV. Support in institutional strengthening and institutional arrangement. Finalizing the formulation of the RPP.

Monitoring impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity

Do you use (or are you planning to use) any indicators for measuring biodiversity impacts of REDD-plus?

In the formulation of the RPP the development of indicators are included.

Are you planning to assess / monitor the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and indigenous and local livelihoods? If so, how?

In the formulated second draft RPP it is indicated that during the implementation of the RPP methodology of monitoring and assessment will be developed.

Can such impacts be monitored through existing programmes (such as the FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment or the CBD National Reports), or are separate or additional efforts required? If so, what are your capacity building needs, if any?

Additional efforts are needed and the development of a robust MRV.

Which potential mechanisms (at national, regional and international level) exist or could be developed for monitoring the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and indigenous and local communities?

The MRV, institutional arrangements, and a financial mechanism should be developed to monitor the impacts.

How are national efforts linked to regional biodiversity efforts and assessments?

- There should be a clear and common understanding of safeguards
- Additional, robust and adequate financial mechanism must be in place to develop and implement safeguards

SWITZERLAND

REDD+ in the frame of the Convention on Biological Diversity CBD

At COP 10 in Nagoya 2010, the parties have requested the Executive Secretary to prepare for approval at COP 11

- advice on REDD+ including application of relevant safeguards for biodiversity, so that actions are consistent with the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and avoid negative impacts on and enhance benefits for biodiversity
- identify – in collaboration with CPF members – possible indicators to assess the contribution of REDD+ to achieving the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and assess potential mechanisms to monitor impacts on biodiversity from these and other ecosystem-based approaches for climate change mitigation measures.

These items will be further discussed and developed in the next CBD SBSTTA meetings (Nov. 2011 and May 2012).

The parties have further requested the Executive Secretary to include biodiversity considerations related to REDD+, when conveying a proposal to develop joint activities between the three Rio conventions.

REDD+ in the UNFCCC

The Bali Action Plan defines REDD+ as “policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries”.

By definition, the primary objectives of REDD+ are emissions reductions and forest conservation and management. However, it is clear that REDD+ is much more than carbon management because the mechanism directly affects the forests and the people who depend on them for their livelihoods. Carbon objectives must be embedded into local circumstances and realities, guided by safeguards and harmonized with development objectives for REDD+ to be successful.

Safeguards built into REDD+ in the UNFCCC

In Cancun Decision 1/CP.16 (Section C, p. 12), REDD+ is linked directly to the UNFCCC objectives, particularly Article 2, which is to stabilize the GHG concentration in the atmosphere without threatening food production and enabling economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner.

Safeguards are defined here as to prevent and mitigate undue harm to people and their environment in the process of developing and implementing REDD+ strategies. REDD+ safeguards have been dealt with particularly in paragraphs 68 to 72 and Annex 1 of the Cancun decision. Particularly, paragraph 71 (d) mandates a system for providing information on how the safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of the activities, while respecting sovereignty.

Annex I of 1/CP.16 (p. 26), which gives detailed guidance on safeguards, makes clear that any action taken under REDD+ should:

- lead to reduced poverty
- be consistent with the national sustainable development and adaptation goals
- promote sustainable management of forests.

- incorporate local priorities and traditional knowledge
- lead to tangible improvement of livelihoods and equitable distribution of benefits.

In the Cancun decision SBSTA is also asked to develop modalities to develop guidance for providing information on safeguards for COP 17 in Durban.

Promoting safeguards in practice

Experience in developing countries is already demonstrating that if not secured and supported locally, and without increased resource flows to rural areas, REDD+ will not work and will be undermined and overthrown. REDD+ is an enormous investment for all involved – developing and developed countries, the private sector, and civil society. To ensure that safeguards are respected is to secure these investments and to guarantee a due return. Ensuring and promoting safeguards should be seen as an opportunity to take advantage of REDD+ to resolve social and environmental issues that are both crucial to forest-dependent people and a priority of other stakeholders.

REDD+ must address and complement new or existing efforts in forest development and poverty alleviation. Safeguards are not a program themselves, rather are guidance within REDD+ programs that will prevent a variety of problems and the costs of correcting them.

The complexity and novelty of REDD+ methodology and implementation, the substantial financial flows involved, combined with immediate action to avoid more deforestation bears the risk of straining relations between stakeholders. Safeguards are essentially to head off and reduce the risks implicit in REDD+ actions.

Swiss position on safeguards

Before this background Switzerland supports the promotion of safeguards to diminish the risks inherent in REDD+, while at the same time recognizes the potential and urgency of REDD+ action for sustainable development in forested areas. Switzerland's experience and knowledge on how to translate social and environmental issues into the REDD+ objectives is based on a number of lessons and recommendations of programmes and projects that are further elaborated in the annex to this submission.

Switzerland has the following general priorities in the implementation of REDD+ principles and safeguards. REDD+ programs should address them in a step-wise approach according to the specific local and national conditions:

- improve forest sector governance at all levels, ensure forest tenure security and promote sustainable forest management and trade in sustainable forest products.
- ensure full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as an appropriate diversity of stakeholders
- promote the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of forest products and services, e.g. through certified forest management
- not support to the conversion of natural forests to tree plantations, agro-business nor otherwise lead to degradation of natural forests by unsustainable management practices
- improve MRV capacity at all levels and encourage ground truthing with the participation of local stakeholders
- take into account the need to make forests more resilient to the effects of climate change and climate variability and consider the role that forest play in climate change adaptation when managing forests and planting new forests
- take into account the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and contribute to social benefits and the alleviation of poverty particularly for forest-dependent people in developing countries

Respect for safeguards will, on the one hand incentivize the financing of REDD+, while on the other will require financial incentives and rewards to ensure their promotion.

Focus on safeguarding conservation of biodiversity and forests in the CBD and UNFCCC

The Executive Secretary of the CBD, in its Notification 2011-018, has requested by April 30, 2011:

- “views, experiences and expectations with regards to relevant safeguards in reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries” (REDD+).

Parties are invited to identify:

- “indicators to assess the contribution of REDD-plus to achieving the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, as well as to submit your views on potential mechanisms to monitor impacts from REDD-plus and other ecosystem based approaches for climate change mitigation measures on biodiversity”.

For Switzerland, as a developed Party to the Framework Convention according to Article 4(3), a commitment exists to provide funds for meeting the agreed incremental costs in promoting sustainable management, conservation and enhancement of sinks and reservoirs including biomass, forests and other terrestrial ecosystems. As Party to the CBD, similarly, Switzerland is committed to “enhance the benefits for, and avoid negative impacts on biodiversity from REDD+” within the aforementioned activities. However, in order for REDD+ to attain its objectives, actions and means of implementation must be scaled-up, leading to a performance-based system. Switzerland considers the respect for and promotion of safeguards a fundamental criterion of performance and a guarantee for the investments made.

From a donor’s perspective, there are many open questions regarding provision, delivery and governance of financing REDD+ . The strategic decisions regarding how the funds can be optimally utilized to incentivize and reward systems of behaviour that benefit forests and the people who depend on them, promote safeguards and specifically the conservation of biodiversity are an evolving challenge. The following table provides a general view of Swiss priorities for safeguards within the UNFCCC on the left and on the right how incentives could be invested to promote actions that favour biodiversity in particular.

Table 1: Safeguards in REDD+ - Swiss views

<p>REDD+ safeguards (Swiss priority within UNFCCC)</p>	<p>Operationalization of safeguards: focus on biodiversity</p>
<p><u>Forest governance</u> Improving forest governance as a key element for promoting safeguards (transparence, accountability, decentralization...)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REDD+ programs developed to generate and provide resources for biodiversity conservation and protection/promotion of ecosystem services • Tractable advancement in forest tenure rights and access rights to ecosystem services; determining who can use and trade what resource, products and services, including carbon; security of resource access and stability of the legal environment, thus encouraging a more permanent commitment of local populations to promote and recuperate biodiversity and permanence of forests and REDD+ programs • Governance that promotes sustainable generation of income and local distribution of benefits from forests, for example through the promotion of community forest activities and businesses, promotion of non-timber forest products (NTFPs), bio trade, etc • Promoting governance that enhances environmental benefits, for example, payment for environmental services

<p>REDD+ safeguards (Swiss priority within UNFCCC)</p>	<p>Operationalization of safeguards: focus on biodiversity</p>
<p><u>Sustainable Forest management</u> As a key element for implementing safeguards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REDD+ program design and monitoring with priority on the conservation of protected areas and the sustainable management of production forests with emphasis on enhancement of biodiversity and ecosystem services (including hotspots and corridors) • <u>Primary forests</u>: Incentivize protection and conservation activities as management objective • <u>Intervened primary forests/Secondary forests / enhancement of carbon stocks</u>: management including traditional forest-related knowledge: focus on traditionally managed forests with close-to-nature succession • <u>Degraded forests / enhancement of carbon stocks</u>: Management including traditional forest-related knowledge: focus on traditionally managed forests with close-to-nature restoration • Recuperation activities of degraded forest lands with emphasis on genetic, species and structural diversity, as well as size and connectivity of forest areas • <u>Plantations</u>: Maintain stand and landscape complexity using multi-purpose tree plantations as models, avoid conversion of natural forests into tree plantations • Planting mixtures of native and locally adapted species, promoting forest resistance, resilience and adaptive capacities to climate change and climate variability effects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote adaptation of forest to CC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote ecosystem-based approaches for mitigation and adapted to climate change • Planting mixtures of native and locally adapted species, promoting forest resistance, resilience and adaptive capacities to climate change and climate variability effects
<p>Participation of indigenous peoples, local communities and other interested stakeholders</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REDD+ Programs assessed for their environmental and social impacts with local participation • Forest dependent people as landscape managers, including the conservation of biodiversity in management model • Promoting community forestry models • Biodiversity component of traditional livelihoods enhanced
<p>MRV improvement in terms of how to include the processes for safeguarding biodiversity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • including appropriate biodiversity criteria in MRV (Measurement, monitoring, reporting, evaluation, verification, mapping), • Include local population, particularly indigenous peoples and local communities, in designing and implementing MRV and take into account landscape level monitoring

<p>REDD+ safeguards (Swiss priority within UNFCCC)</p>	<p>Operationalization of safeguards: focus on biodiversity</p>
<p>REDD+ mechanism is consistent and in harmony with with national and international conventions, treaties, policies, and standards to conserve biodiversity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBD: advice in collaboration with CPF members, on monitoring biodiversity safeguards based on work of UNFCCC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coordination of finance and implementation of bio-diversity promotion activities and programs ○ Use of indicators to assess REDD+ contribution to the objectives of the CBD, including the Nagoya Protocol on ABS ○ Support for national forest information systems ○ Implementing the recommendations of the <u>national gap analysis</u> studies to establish a global system connecting existing and new protected areas • UN-REDD Global Program and programmatic approach • UNFF: REDD+ in the context of the four core objectives of the NLBI • ITTO: REDD+ coordinated with the approach of Permanent Forest Estate, including the SFM of protection and production forests and the work on C&I • UNDRIP: ensure respect for the rights of indigenous peoples. Assistance with mapping indigenous territories, legal assistance with tenure issues • FLEG and FLEGT: improving forest law enforcement, governance and trade of legal timber • Consideration of existing standards on carbon and biodiversity (CCBA, BioCarbon)
<p>Poverty alleviation, livelihood concerns, social benefits</p>	<p><u>Tackling drivers of deforestation and forest degradation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REDD+ activities competitive enough to avoid conversion of forests to livelihood-based agriculture and continuous degradation of forests that are due to livelihood needs (e.g. firewood, timber theft etc) • Result-oriented investments and technology infusion for enhancing agricultural productivity leading to more food production from less land surface area, promotion of agro-forestry systems, diversification of forest-based income, Explore the links to wider market and financing options for conservation of biodiversity (e.g. PES), financing processing facilities, etc. • Focus on how high biodiversity value forests can help societies adapt to climate change

The Executive Secretary of the CBD, in its Notification 2011-018 has provided the following questionnaire in an Annex for the submission due the 30th of April 2011.

ANNEX - SWITZERLAND

The questionnaire is designed for developing countries to be answered.

Switzerland had already some opportunities to gain experiences on how to translate social and environmental issues into the REDD objectives through a number of projects supported by the two

development agencies of the Swiss Confederation, the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) and the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO).. Switzerland would like to highlight the following points:

- The CDM-A/R tool-boxes dealing with social and institutional issues, environmental impact assessment and financial decision support elaborated in the frame of the ENCOFOR project implemented with the EU, (co-financed by SECO) [National experience with REDD-plus; National experience with biodiversity safeguards; Monitoring impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity]
- The development of various management guidelines elaborated by the International Tropical Timber Organisation (ITTO). In particular the Guidelines on restoring forest landscapes (2006), Guidelines for the restoration, management and rehabilitation of degraded and secondary tropical forests (2002), the revised Criteria and Indicators (C&I) for the sustainable management of tropical forests (2005), which are of particular relevance for aspects related to production forests and the recently elaborated revised guidelines on biodiversity in tropical production forests. This work has been continuously supported by SECO. [Regional collaboration regarding safeguards and impact assessment; Monitoring impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity]
- Field experiences regarding the design of viable financing mechanisms for conservation and sustainable management of forests and ecosystem services that are based on solid safeguard provisions have been gained in the framework of various longer-term development projects, including inter alia the San Nicolas project in Colombia (supported through ITTO by SECO) the regional project on Andean forest management and conservation (ECOBONA) and the Swiss-Nepalese community forestry programme (both projects supported by SDC); these types of projects make special emphasis on social aspects and have successfully developed and implemented inclusive bottom-up processes [National experience with REDD-plus; National experience with biodiversity safeguards; National experience with safeguards for indigenous and local communities]
- Experience gained in the framework of the cooperation with the WB Forest Law and Enforcement and Governance (FLEG) process and the Programme on Forests (PROFOR), from which particular lessons can be drawn about capacity development activities [National experience with biodiversity safeguards; Regional collaboration regarding safeguards and impact assessment; Monitoring impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity]
- More recently, SDC has launched longer-term cooperation programmes with regional organisations (in South East Asia through the ASEAN Social Forestry Network and in Sub-saharian Africa with the African Forestry Forum) that aim at mainstreaming social forestry concepts and safeguard provisions in climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies in the forest and land-use sector, and in particular in REDD+. This meso-level approach can help to improve implementation of internationally agreed safeguard provisions at national and local level [Regional collaboration regarding safeguards and impact assessment; Monitoring impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity]
- Furthermore, Switzerland (through SECO and SDC) supports a number of multilateral pilot programmes that particularly emphasize REDD+ safeguards and co-benefits in national REDD+ development (FCPF, REDD+ Partnership, GEF, UN-REDD).

Questionnaire for the submission of views with regards to relevant REDD-plus safeguards

National experience with REDD-plus

- What is the national structure for REDD-plus planning, if any?

/...

- What is the status of REDD-plus preparations, including participation in pilot and demonstration activities?
- How do you comply with safeguard requirements of REDD-plus pilot and demonstration activities, for example in the framework of the FCPF or UN REDD? What are your experiences with these safeguard requirements?
- How are biodiversity experts involved (including holders of traditional knowledge) in national REDD-plus planning? How are indigenous and local communities involved?
- Are there experiences from the voluntary carbon market that you are drawing from?

National experience with biodiversity safeguards

- Are relevant biodiversity safeguards for the national level in place, or being developed? How do they relate to the safeguards outlined in the UNFCCC decision on the Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention at COP 161?
- What is the national capacity for developing and applying biodiversity safeguards?
- Which are the main obstacles for including biodiversity safeguards, if any?
- What are concrete capacity building needs regarding biodiversity safeguards (if any), and at which level (government, civil society/ indigenous peoples, local communities)?
- What are main lessons learned so far regarding biodiversity safeguards?

National experience with safeguards for indigenous and local communities

- What is the structure of civil society organizations representing indigenous and local community views? How are their views coordinated?
- What are the mechanisms through which the views of indigenous and local communities are considered?
- How are concerns related to CBD Articles 8j (respect for traditional knowledge) and 10c (support customary use of biodiversity) reflected in REDD-plus planning?

Regional collaboration regarding safeguards and impact assessment

- Do you participate in regional and international exchanges of REDD-plus pilot experiences regarding safeguards and multiple benefits? What is the value of such exchanges?
- What is the level of regional collaboration on REDD-plus e.g. through regional organizations such as COMIFAC/ACTO/ASEAN?
- What regional and international support (in addition to support provided by UN-REDD/FCPF/ITTO) would be useful?

Monitoring impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity

- Do you use (or are you planning to use) any indicators for measuring biodiversity impacts of REDD-plus?
- Are you planning to assess/monitor the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and indigenous and local livelihoods? If so, how?
- Can such impacts be monitored through existing programmes (such as the FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment, or the CBD National Reports), or are separate or additional efforts required? If so, what are your capacity building needs, if any?
- Which potential mechanisms (at national, regional and international level) exist or could be developed for monitoring the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and indigenous and local communities?
- How are national efforts linked to regional biodiversity efforts and assessments?

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Center for International Environmental Law, International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests, Kenya Young Greens and Rain Forest Foundation Norway

The following comments are endorsed by the Center for International Environmental Law, the International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests, Kenya Young Greens, and Rain Forest Foundation Norway. In addition to the organizations named above, other organizations contributed to this submission, including Birdlife International (questions VI and VII) and Natural Justice (question V); their comments are limited to those questions.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit views on REDD+ safeguards in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Please find our responses to your questionnaire below.

I. How do you comply with safeguard requirements of REDD-plus pilot and demonstration activities, for example in the framework of the FCPF or UN REDD? What are your experiences with these safeguard requirements?

Safeguards must be consistent with existing international conventions, standards and obligations and help further the United National Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and CBD objectives of achieving sustainable development. Significant progress towards safeguards compliance can be achieved by simply respecting existing obligations at the international level and helping countries meet those obligations at the national level. **Beyond existing international obligations, detailed proscriptive institutional policies, accountability, and a grievance mechanism are all critical elements of an effective safeguards system.**

Proscriptive policies apply at the level of international institutions and clearly state permissible and impermissible activities with clear lines of responsibility for those authorizing activities. Generally, they are detailed policies and procedures that prevent social and environmental harm and maximize public benefit, participation, transparency, accountability, equity, and the protection of rights. The World Bank's safeguards are classic examples of such policies and, while not avoiding all harms, they have often been extremely important in avoiding significant unintended harms associated with international development policies.

In this context, detailed procedures should include the following, based on experiences with the World Bank and other international development banks, UN-REDD, and other international institutions:

- **Environmental and social impact assessment.** Anticipate, analyze, and mitigate social and environmental impacts through environmental and social impact analyses, including analyses on inputs such as water, food, land, gender, and human rights, taking into account broader associated impacts, sufficiently in advance of decision-making to respond to community concerns and incorporate meaningful public input;
- **Indigenous peoples, women and local communities.** Respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples, women, and local communities and involve them in decision-making. Specifically, require the full and effective participation of local communities and Indigenous Peoples and ensure consistency with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), including requirements of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), as well as with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW);
- **Resettlement.** Ensure that local communities and Indigenous Peoples are not forcibly removed from their lands or territories. No relocation should take place without the free, prior and informed consent of the local communities or Indigenous Peoples concerned and without agreement on just and fair compensation and, where possible, the option of return;
- **Natural habitats and cultural sites.** Avoid the destruction of cultures, species, or ecosystems, including areas that are legally protected, officially proposed for protection or recognized as protected by customary practices or indigenous or local communities;

- **International obligations.** Comply with and support existing international obligations, including on human and gender rights, labor standards, including but not limited to the respect of ILO Core Labor Standards, and multilateral environmental agreements;
- **Land tenure and conflicts.** REDD+ activities depend upon clearly defined land tenure, which is often difficult to determine. Clear policies need to state that traditional rights will be respected in accordance with international obligations and where land and resource tenure is unclear or in dispute, REDD+ activities cannot negatively affect rights and interests until the property rights have been clarified;
- **Transparency and governance.** Ensure fiscal transparency, along with improvements in governance of both forests and other areas relevant for adaptation, which are necessary preconditions to ensure the application of the social and environmental safeguards;
- **Information disclosure.** CBD safeguards framework should include provisions on information disclosure that are based on internationally recognized norms related to access to information; and
- **Financial intermediaries.** CBD safeguards should clearly apply to those entities receiving money downstream of initial approvals and allocations for REDD-related activities, such as project developers, contractors and sub-contractors.

Accountability and grievance mechanisms. As safeguards are generally understood to be international institutional policies that are proscriptive in nature, institutional accountability is key to an effective safeguards system. Independent international-level grievance and recourse mechanisms are necessary to ensuring compliance with safeguard policies. An example of such a mechanism is the World Bank's Inspection Panel.³ Additionally, human rights mechanisms have specific bodies that investigate and issue findings on rights related to particular cases. In the spirit of a "One UN" system, the CBD should respect the findings of other mechanisms in matters related to REDD+ activities. For example, if the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples finds that a particular community's traditional indigenous land tenure is not recognized, resulting an inequitable benefit sharing scheme related to forest biodiversity, it would be important that the CBD respect that decision and take action to ensure more equitable benefit sharing.

Monitoring and Reporting. Standardized and regular reporting requirements (including participatory monitoring) must also be developed regarding how safeguards are addressed and respected throughout the design and implementation of activities. Please see below for further information on this topic.

II. Are relevant biodiversity safeguards for the national level in place, or being developed? How do they relate to the safeguards outlined in the UNFCCC decision on the Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention at COP 16?

Safeguards as classically defined are institutional policies and procedures at the international level. At the national level, the notion of a "safeguard" may be distinct from the international level, as international safeguards are complementary to—and *not* a substitute for—binding laws and obligations. The bulk of safeguards protections can be found in existing international obligations already applicable at the national level for countries receiving international support for REDD+ activities. As such, one key step to complying with safeguard requirements is helping countries meet their existing obligations under the CBD (such as Article 8j), UNFCCC (such as the convention's ultimate objective of reducing emissions via sustainable development and the newer REDD+ safeguards adopted at COP 16), and the human rights system (see attached table for an example of how some of these instruments apply at the national level). Additionally, as REDD-related activities will be undertaken in particular places, national-level monitoring and reporting are key to an effective safeguards system. In sum, at the national level, it is incumbent on the international institution to apply and enforce its safeguards. International financing to assist with safeguards compliance can help substantially with this process, as will maintaining national laws and means of recourse that are consistent with international safeguards and other legal obligations.

³ For more information, see www.worldbank.org/inspectionpanel

As for the safeguards requirements in the COP16 UNFCCC decision on the Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on long-term Cooperative Action, it is clear that national level guidance for monitoring and reporting on safeguards will be developed by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). An effective national level reporting requirement can significantly contribute to the international safeguards system.

III. What are the mechanisms through which the views of indigenous and local communities are considered?

To protect the rights and interests of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, the CBD must recognize, protect, and promote the participatory rights set forth in relevant international human rights instruments, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, UNDRIP, and the Aarhus Convention, among others.

These rights will be realized if the CBD develops safeguard policies that promote the full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples in decisions that “directly or indirectly affect their lifestyles, traditional lands and territories, their cultural integrity as indigenous peoples with collective rights, or any other aspects of their lives, considering the principle of free, prior and informed consent.” More specifically, CBD policies must ensure that Indigenous Peoples and local communities: have access to all relevant information that is fully understood by them; have sufficient time and resources to engage in all stages of relevant decision-making processes in a manner consistent with their cultural and social traditions; are engaged in a process by which they have given free, prior and informed consent before measures are adopted and/or implemented; and have opportunities for redressing grievances when rights and interests are impacted.

The UN-REDD Programme is an example of a mechanism that recognizes these rights through its efforts to support the participation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in international and national decision-making processes. At the international level, while perhaps not always perfectly executed due to funding and other capacity limitations, Indigenous Peoples are nevertheless represented on the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board (“Policy Board”) by the Chair of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues or by his/her designate as a full voting member, with three additional Indigenous Peoples observers representing each of the three regions under the UN-REDD Programme. Similarly, civil society has four representatives to the Policy Board. While it has been criticized as insufficient in proportion to needs, the UN-REDD Programme nevertheless provides financial and other forms of support to Indigenous Peoples members and observers to the Policy Board so they can carry out their duties and responsibilities.

At the national level, the UN-REDD Programme’s Operational Guidance provides that REDD-related decision-making and coordinating bodies at the national level must include Indigenous Peoples representatives. The Operational Guidance also requires countries to fully and effectively involve Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent communities in all stages, including program design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation, of the National Programme consultation and engagement strategy. While the lack of proscriptive policies and procedures associated with these guidelines has at times led some to question the effectiveness of national level participation, the guidelines themselves are critical and may be helpful to CBD safeguards considerations.

The World Bank has developed environmental and social safeguard policies regarding the participatory rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, specifically at the local level. With respect to public consultation during the environmental assessment process, project-affected indigenous peoples and local communities must be involved, as early as possible, in the preparation process to ensure that their views and concerns are considered and addressed by decision-makers. Project-affected peoples and communities must also be consulted throughout project implementation to address environmental assessment-related issues that affect them. Further, the borrower must disclose relevant material, including the draft environmental assessment, in a timely manner prior to consultation and in a form and language that is understandable and accessible to key stakeholders.

Another key safeguard is the standard of FPIC, which must be applied to local activities that can significantly impact the lands, territories, resources, and culture of traditional communities whose livelihoods are dependent on the sustainable use of forest resources. While FPIC is most relevant to Indigenous Peoples, in certain circumstances, FPIC could also apply to other local communities (see, e.g., case of the Saramaka People v. Suriname in the Inter-American Court of Human Rights). The UN-REDD Programme is about to publish detailed FPIC guidelines that have benefited from two years of work and regional consultations. It would be helpful for the CBD to consider applying these or similar guidelines in the context of its REDD+ activities.

IV. What are concrete capacity building needs regarding biodiversity safeguards (if any), and at which level (government, civil society/ indigenous peoples, local communities)?

There are a number of capacity building needs that require attention at all levels (government, including local authorities; civil society; and Indigenous Peoples and local communities). Meeting these capacity building needs are vital to effective implementation of safeguards. In the context of financing, the costs of implementing safeguards must be considered and provided as part and parcel of international support for REDD+ activities. Providing support to train in-country decision-makers and key staff at international institutions on the application of safeguards is key to ensuring their effectiveness. Moreover, providing support to countries in helping them meet their existing obligations will help significantly in the administration of safeguards systems. Finally, at a very early stage in the decision-making process, potentially affected communities need to be informed of safeguard policies and means of recourse so that they have the capacity to help monitor and assist in reporting related to REDD+ safeguards.

V. How can concerns related to CBD Articles 8j (respect for traditional knowledge) and 10c (support customary use of biodiversity) be reflected in REDD-plus planning?

In other words, we must ask: How can REDD+ be developed to a) not infringe Articles 8(j) and 10(c) and b) to support their broad aims?

Articles 8(j) and 10(c) call on each state Party:

- Subject to its national legislation, [to] respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of the holders of such knowledge, innovations and practices and encourage the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge, innovations and practices (Article 8(j)); and
- [To] protect and encourage customary use of biological resources in accordance with traditional cultural practices that are compatible with conservation or sustainable use requirements (Article 10(c)).

To support these articles, the CBD has developed a number of guidelines that focus on the interaction between Indigenous Peoples and local communities (communities), and outside interests, including:

- Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising out of their Utilization;
- Akwe Kon Guidelines - the voluntary guidelines for the conduct of cultural, environmental, and social impact assessments regarding developments proposed to take place on, or which are likely to impact on, sacred sites and on lands and waters traditionally occupied or used by indigenous and local communities; and
- Tkaríhwaié:ri Code of Ethical Conduct on Respect for the Cultural and Intellectual Heritage of Indigenous and Local Communities Relevant for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity.

Although they are voluntary in nature they speak to a number of principles that are gaining acceptance as indispensable conditions to the implementation of Articles 8(j) and 10(c). At the heart of each document and their crosscutting principles is the right to prior informed consent by communities, broadly put, relating to any activities or forms of access planned for their territories, genetic resources or traditional

knowledge. This broad-based right is supported by the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Conventions (ILO Convention 169), UNDRIP, and recently affirmed by the CBD's parties in the Nagoya Protocol on ABS.

In the discussion of biodiversity and social safeguards relating to REDD+, the work towards implementing Articles 8(j) and 10(c) suggest that the most fundamental “biocultural safeguard” is the right to FPIC (free, prior and informed consent, as defined above).

The aims of Articles 8(j) and 10(c) will be better achieved where communities are empowered to the extent that they are able to fully understand the issues surrounding any REDD+ project, view it within the wider context of their development plans, and on that basis:

- Either reject the scheme if they feel it will be detrimental to their “knowledge, innovations and practices relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity” or “customary uses of biological resources . . . that are compatible with conservation or sustainable use requirements”, or
- Negotiate mutually agreed terms with a variety of actors towards being fully involved in the project in ways commensurate with their ways of life.

A recent publication by RECOFTC provides a good background to the key issues relating to “FPIC in REDD.” The same publication raises practical challenges communities face when engaging with frameworks as complex as REDD+. It makes clear that for FPIC to be meaningful; a new generation of work is required, undertaken in partnership with communities, to develop new means of maintaining the principle's integrity.

To ensure that REDD+ is developed in a way that does not infringe Articles 8(j) and 10(c), the right of communities to FPIC must be respected in all REDD+ projects. As a corollary, to address the inherent challenges communities face with the complexities of the issues, there should be an increased community-based focus on developing appropriate means to engage with the issues.

REDD+ will be developed to support Articles 8(j) and 10(c) where communities and NGOs, among other parties are fully and effectively involved in the overall design of REDD+ and where communities are included from the start of any individual REDD+ scheme. To this end, a placeholder was inserted into the output of Working Group I of the CBD's Asia Regional Consultation on REDD+. Under the heading of "Respect Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities" it reads (at p.26 of the report):

“This safeguard should address, in the light of Annex 1 para. 2 (c) and (d) and CBD articles 8(j) and 10(c), at least the four risks identified by the Nairobi workshop [see UNEP/CBD/WS-REDD/1/3]. Work on how to implement this safeguard should take account of, but not be limited to:

- CBD decisions and guidelines including work on indicators
- UN-REDD Programme draft guidelines for monitoring impacts of REDD+
- World Bank policy on indigenous peoples and stakeholder engagement
- Other guidelines including those developed by CCBA/CARE, RECOFTC, SFC, etc.
- UNDRIP and other human rights instruments.”

In the context of what is written above, such a review and consolidating exercise would be a useful basis for future CBD-hosted regional consultations on REDD+ towards providing a comprehensive response to CBD decision X/33. Such a review would also feed into the new CBD-UNESCO Joint Programme of Work on Biological and Cultural Diversity.

VI. What indicators can/should be used for measuring biodiversity impacts of REDD-plus?

The biodiversity impacts of REDD+ need to be considered in all phases of REDD+ activities – from planning and readiness through to implementation and monitoring. Robust data and indicators are needed to measure impacts on biodiversity (both risks and benefits) and should be recognized and drawn from governments, NGOs, and indigenous and local communities. Processes to develop and apply indicators should be transparent and inclusive - full and effective stakeholder engagement is paramount and must

include biodiversity experts including holders of traditional knowledge, and indigenous and local communities.

REDD+ should be consistent with the objectives of the CBD, avoiding negative impacts on biodiversity and contributing positively to biodiversity and ecosystem services, thus delivering multiple benefits. Safeguards and indicators should address biodiversity risks, risks to Indigenous Peoples and local communities and enhancing biodiversity and social benefits. Monitoring the biodiversity impacts from REDD+ is essential for the implementation of safeguards.

Indicators addressing both the direct and indirect risks to biodiversity risks should cover:

- Conversion of natural forests to plantations or other land uses of low biodiversity value;
- Loss of habitat connectivity;
- Indicator, endangered, and threatened species;
- Indirect land use change through displacement of forestry or agricultural activities (either nationally or internationally);
- Intensification of land use methods harmful to biodiversity such as inappropriate forest management that enhances carbon stocks but damages biodiversity e.g. afforestation with non-native species;
- Increased pressure on non-forests ecosystems;
- Quantitative and qualitative impacts to forest-dependent livelihoods; and
- Number and nature of land tenure conflicts.

Indicators to measure biodiversity benefits need to address:

- Reductions in rates/halting of deforestation and degradation;
- Enhanced management of forest habitat for biodiversity;
- Enhanced forest resilience and adaptive capacity;
- Improved habitat connectivity;
- Quantitative and qualitative impacts to forest-dependent livelihoods; and
- Presence of indicator, endangered, and threatened species.

Data used to populate these indicators should include the following:

- Analysis of areas of high biodiversity value and pressures on the forest. Extensive spatial data exist including priority setting approaches such as key biodiversity areas, high conservation value areas and areas identified in national gap analysis for the CBD;
- Data and models on the ecosystem services provided by forest areas is also key, but at this stage less complete;
- Measurements of forest cover and changes in forest cover including clarification on definitions of forest type;
- Biodiversity baseline data - species distributions and numbers;
- Extent and use of traditional territories;
- Socio-economic data – modelling of socio-economic costs and benefits of REDD and their implications for land use and biodiversity;
- Monitoring data on all of the above over time; and
- Mainstreaming of biodiversity into broader landscape level planning.

To aid national governments in their application and implementation of biodiversity safeguards and standards it would be helpful to compare and undertake some harmonisation/cross referencing of existing and emerging guidance on criteria and principles for assessing and applying REDD+ standards including UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles, FCPF Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment Framework and the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards.

VII. Which potential mechanisms (at national, regional and international level) exist or could be developed for monitoring the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and indigenous and local communities?

Long-term participatory monitoring of impacts and implementation of safeguards is essential. Generally, monitoring will need to happen nationally and locally in accordance with appropriate guidance and advice provided at the international level. In addition, there should be robust and transparent reporting systems at both national and international levels. Furthermore, redress mechanisms or processes to address complaints raised by affected people should be developed at national and international levels.

Monitoring the impacts of REDD+ on biodiversity and indigenous and local communities should be fully integrated into national biodiversity targets and the review, update and revision of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) by 2014 in line with the Strategic Plan. The revised and updated NBSAPs should be used as effective instruments for the integration of biodiversity targets into national development and poverty reduction policies and strategies. Forest-related national policies and legislation may contribute to/form the basis for relevant biodiversity safeguards and the assessment of biodiversity impacts nationally.

Four of the Aichi targets are also relevant to REDD+ and the indicators developed to measure these targets need to incorporate all aspects of risks and opportunities to biodiversity as outlined above. This should be considered at the forthcoming CBD Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators for the Strategic Plan in June 2011. The four most relevant targets are: Target 5 - to at least halve deforestation and where feasible bring it close to zero; Target 7 to manage all areas under forestry sustainably; Target 11 to conserve at least 17% of terrestrial and inland waters areas by 2020; and Target 15 to restore at least 15% of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.

In the context of the UNFCCC, there are opportunities for developing mechanisms to effectively monitor impacts of REDD+ activities, however due to the status of negotiations specific processes are yet to be negotiated and agreed upon. Two potential opportunities are:

- **Forest monitoring within the REDD+ process.** In the Cancun Agreements Parties agreed to develop robust and transparent forest monitoring systems, including “[a] system for providing information on how the safeguards referred to in annex I to this decision are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of the activities referred to in paragraph 70, while respecting sovereignty.” Cancun Agreements 71 (c) and (d). SBSTA is tasked with developing guidance on these elements this year with a view to reporting to COP-17.
- **Green Climate Fund Safeguards and Monitoring.** As yet, it remains unclear whether and to what extent the Green Climate Fund (GCF) will provide funding for REDD+ activities. However, assuming there may be funding potential in the GCF, accountability processes designed for GCF financial flows should play a role in monitoring impacts. A Transitional Committee is tasked with developing social and environmental safeguards for the fund this year; a monitoring system to track implementation of safeguards and impacts will be important to a successful design.

In both cases, participatory monitoring systems, where affected individuals and communities can provide input, should be developed. As a general matter, the UNFCCC reporting process will be key to obtaining data on impacts, assuming guidance is developed to require reporting on impacts of activities undertaken in furtherance of UNFCCC obligations.

Beyond REDD+ activities, other mitigation activities and adaptation measures may have implications for biodiversity. Close cooperation between on the UNFCCC and CBD with respect to these other activities would be desirable.

WWF Germany

General remarks:

WWF Germany runs projects with a partly focus on REDD. However experiences are rare on REDD biodiversity safeguards due to the fact that the projects have started recently and experiences are not evaluated until now.

Questionnaire for the submission of views with regards to relevant REDD-plus safeguards

National experience with REDD-plus

What is the national structure for REDD-plus planning, if any?

What is the status of REDD-plus preparations, including participation in pilot and demonstration activities?

WWF Germany is involved in biodiversity conservation projects with a partly focus on REDD

How do you comply with safeguard requirements of REDD-plus pilot and demonstration activities, for example in the framework of the FCPF or UN REDD? What are your experiences with these safeguard requirements?

Biodiversity safeguard requirements need to be taken into account. Experiences need to be evaluated after the project is finalized.

How are biodiversity experts involved (including holders of traditional knowledge) in national REDD-plus planning? How are indigenous and local communities involved?

No information available until now.

Are there experiences from the voluntary carbon market that you are drawing from?

National experience with biodiversity safeguards

Are relevant biodiversity safeguards for the national level in place, or being developed? How do they relate to the safeguards outlined in the UNFCCC decision on the Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention at COP 16⁴?

⁴ In the decision on the outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention, the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC, at its sixteenth meeting (COP 16) affirms that the implementation of REDD-plus activities should include the promotion and support of a number of safeguards, including

- (a) That actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international agreements;
- (b) 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;
- (c) The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular, indigenous peoples and local communities
- (d) That actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that they are not used for the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forest and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits
- (e) Actions to address the risk of reversals
- (f) Actions to reduce the displacement of emissions

What is the national capacity for developing and applying biodiversity safeguards?

Which are the main obstacles for including biodiversity safeguards, if any?

What are concrete capacity building needs regarding biodiversity safeguards (if any), and at which level (government, civil society/ indigenous peoples, local communities)?

What are main lessons learned so far regarding biodiversity safeguards?

National experience with safeguards for indigenous and local communities

What is the structure of civil society organizations representing indigenous and local community views?

How are their views coordinated?

What are the mechanisms through which the views of indigenous and local communities are considered?

How are concerns related to CBD Articles 8j (respect for traditional knowledge) and 10c (support customary use of biodiversity) reflected in REDD-plus planning?

Regional collaboration regarding safeguards and impact assessment

Do you participate in regional and international exchanges of REDD-plus pilot experiences regarding safeguards and multiple benefits? What is the value of such exchanges?

WWF Germany participated in workshops to exchange experience in REDD+ pilot projects within Germany

What is the level of regional collaboration on REDD-plus e.g. through regional organizations such as COMIFAC/ACTO/ASEAN?

What regional and international support (in addition to support provided by UN-REDD/FCPF/ITTO) would be useful?

Monitoring impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity

Do you use (or are you planning to use) any indicators for measuring biodiversity impacts of REDD-plus?

No

Are you planning to assess/monitor the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and indigenous and local livelihoods? If so, how?

Can such impacts be monitored through existing programmes (such as the FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment, or the CBD National Reports), or are separate or additional efforts required? If so, what are your capacity building needs, if any?

Which potential mechanisms (at national, regional and international level) exist or could be developed for monitoring the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and indigenous and local communities?

How are national efforts linked to regional biodiversity efforts and assessments?
