

Country-led initiative (CLI) in support of UNFF:

INTERLAKEN+10 - Governing forest landscapes

Lessons learnt from ten years of experience and the way forward post-2015

3rd to 6th February 2015 in Interlaken, Switzerland

Key points from the thematic session 4: Forest governance and safeguards in REDD+ implementation Wednesday 4th February

Objective of the session:

- Taking a look at safeguards work at different levels – what has been done through the UN-REDD's support at the country level, a country-specific example through the Philippines' work in drafting their national SIS, and lastly what lessons can be learned from similar initiatives – specifically looking at work with benefit sharing mechanism
- But also through discussion tease out how UNFF can contribute to the REDD+ safeguards work, and look more closely at what role UNFF can have?

Presentations – key points:

1. **Thais**, UN-REDD Programme

- Took us through the development of the safeguards discourse and decisions related to UNFCCC – since Copenhagen and through Warsaw
- REDD+ offers a good opportunity to address forest governance issues – through safeguards, UNFCCC decisions – forest governance pillars are at THE HEART OF REDD+
- With the position SIS has as one of four Warsaw Framework **elements** (3 other are: NS/ AP, FREL/ REL, SIS and NFMS) – **unique/ strong possibility to leverage and scale up forest governance**
- Example of Mexico and Costa Rica and we heard the benefits and challenges with different approaches, whether REDD+ centred or country specific approach to safeguards
- Continue to **share lessons learned** between countries; **coordinate** between UN-REDD and other initiatives, as well as assist countries in **CLARIYFING** issues around safeguards and their approach to safeguards will be an important part of UN-REDD's safeguards work and support to countries

2. **Malena**, National Commission on Indigenous Peoples in the Philippines

Malena took us through the work-intensive process that the Philippines are currently in as they are drafting their national safeguards information system: experts, literature, stock-taking, arguing, how to structure.

When drafting framework: engaged with relevant stakeholders to see how the framework resonated at the local level? With government

Another important element in this process is that **existing safeguards** the Philippines were taken into account – and not starting from scratch.

In this process, and as part of identifying risks, mitigation was also addressed: **What are appropriate actions for REDD+ implementors: POLICIES, ACTIONS and PROGRAMMES – e.g. creation of multi-stakeholder council – secured seats for IPs,**

3. Maria, CIFOR

Looked at derived lessons from benefit sharing through CIFOR's research– and what are the implications for implementing safeguards

What is clear: need to **operationalize** safeguards: how and where to operationalize safeguards and SIS in national/ subnational REDD+ / and what can we learn from existing experiences???

Determinants of how to operationalize safeguards

- What is the most appropriate benefit sharing mechanism (or bundle of)?
- Governance context: determining what are the governance risks???

LEARNING FOR SAFEGUARDS FROM EXISTING BSM:

- LESSONS derived: reviewed a number of bsms: PES, CF, Conditional Cash Transfers etc – what are the ISSUES?
- **PES lessons: elite capture** is a key risk – and to counteract: intermediaries in cross-scale transactions may mitigate this
-
- Conditional Cash Transfer: indicates that **cash may be more effective than in-kind transfers**, conditionalities bring effectiveness but are **costly**
- VPAs need to plan for time and compromise involved in multi-stakeholder ... and also DISPUTE RESOLUTION MECHANISM and TRANSPARENCY

From these discussions we saw:

1: COMPLEXITY OF THE SAFEGUARDS ISSUES (e.g. seven UNFCCC safeguards, 152 indicators in Ph,) and there are LESSONS TO BE LEARNED from other initiatives

2: Existing governance arrangements – might be key to start address this complexity

- Risks
- Benefits
- Multi-stakeholder processes
- Legal framework/ PLRs
- Institutional arrangements
- Information + dissemination

3: Triple value - of governance for REDD+

- its a prerequisite for sustained and (env/soc) sustainable GHG ERs/ERs;
- it is a potential outcome of REDD+ (+ve and -ve);
- and its the means to operationalise safeguards

Discussion moderated by Keith – key take aways:

Main question leading into the discussion was: *What is UNFF's added value in this work?*

Discussion centred around a number of themes (which Steve have teased out during the lunch break):

- **Benefit sharing**
- **Governance-based safeguards processes**
- **Complexity and confusion**
- **Validity of REDD+**
- **Role of UNFF**

- Through the REDD+ discussion, we exposed some discussion on UNFF and its mandate – and also try and understand UNFF's added value
 - o No concrete solutions
 - o UNFF's value of having a strong convening power, broad constituency to further a diverse portfolio of governance related mechanisms, of which REDD+ is one, to further processes of TRANSFORMATIVE GOVERNANCE CHANGE