



CHATHAM HOUSE

UN-REDD
PROGRAMME
The United Nations Collaborative Programme
on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and
Forest Degradation in Developing Countries



MONITORING GOVERNANCE SAFEGUARDS IN REDD+ CHATHAM HOUSE & UN-REDD PROGRAMME WORKSHOP¹

Meeting Report
24 – 25 May 2010

The need for monitoring REDD+ governance

How does one ensure that REDD+ mitigation actions are credible, both in terms of the emissions reductions achieved and the broader social and environmental impacts that they will inevitably have? At the 15th Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in December 2009, consensus was reached that a number of safeguards should be supported and promoted when undertaking REDD+ actions. These include the existence of transparent and effective national forest governance structures, respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities, and full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders. Further, the need to monitor governance, to ensure the effective implementation of REDD+ actions, was recognised.

How best these safeguards can be assured and governance assessed and monitored remains unclear. In response to this situation, on 24-25 May 2010, a workshop, supported by the UK Department for International Development (DfID) and the UN-REDD Programme, was convened at Chatham House, London, to discuss the scope, needs and priorities for monitoring governance for REDD+. The workshop brought together 40 experts from government, international donor agencies, academia and non-governmental organisations from around the world.

Aims of the workshop

The aim of the workshop was to improve understanding of what monitoring of governance for REDD+ might entail, drawing on current and past experiences from the forest sector and beyond. On this basis, the workshop sought to develop a draft framework of core governance parameters and key considerations for monitoring and reporting in order to inform the processes and negotiations on REDD+ and also to provide assistance and guidance to countries as they begin to develop their monitoring systems for REDD+. A further objective was to improve cooperation among the existing governance monitoring initiatives and to consider how these could be built on.

Results

There is a wealth of experience from assessing governance and monitoring governance effectiveness. Background papers prepared for the workshop had reviewed past and current

¹ Further details of the meeting, including the background papers, are available online at:
<http://www.un-redd.org/Events/tabid/590/language/en-US/Default.aspx>

initiatives, best practice and case studies, as well as relevant provisions in readiness proposals and national programme documents prepared by REDD+ countries, and drawn lessons to inform the discussion. The workshop expanded this discussion with participants contributing additional information from their experience. It was concluded that REDD+ governance monitoring should draw from existing initiatives, best practice, knowledge and case studies. The participants further discussed which aspects of governance are relevant to REDD+ and how these could be monitored.

What to monitor: defining core governance parameters

A framework of three core governance parameters for REDD+ was presented at the meeting which provided the basis for discussion of the question of 'what to monitor'. There was broad support for this framework and further inputs were provided. However, not all aspects were discussed in detail and no final consensus was reached. It was agreed that specific indicators need to be developed for each core parameter, along with country and context specific indicators and measures. A revised draft framework of core parameters and key considerations for each of the three parameters is presented in Annex 1.

Among issues highlighted as crucial for successful REDD+ implementation were: the existence of clear institutional roles and responsibilities; the need for effective coordination between institutions and across sectors; institutional capacity to implement decisions; transparent systems for the management of budgets and financial flows.

Another key aspect of governance recognised by workshop participants was the effective participation of all stakeholders. Participation needs to be broad and genuine, in particular ensuring that space is provided for vulnerable and marginalized groups. Transparency of and access to information, and the provision of information in a timely manner, are important to ensure effective participation. The need for sufficient capacity to implement genuine multi-stakeholder processes was noted.

It was highlighted that monitoring and data needs will differ between monitoring within country (for national purposes) and for reporting to international REDD+ institutions to demonstrate performance. The intensity of monitoring needs will also depend on what REDD+ phase the country is at: whether that of preparation or implementation, and related to this, whether funds for REDD+ activities are made available ex ante or following demonstration of performance. Much of the discussion during the workshop focused on monitoring for the international level, i.e. what would be required for member states to report to international REDD+ institutions. However, national level needs were also considered. The core governance parameters and key considerations presented in Annex 1 address the needs for performance monitoring at international level, but may also provide a broad scope for approaching national REDD+ governance monitoring.

How to monitor: developing principles for effective monitoring

Fifteen practical principles for implementing monitoring derived from best practice and lessons learned from existing initiatives and case studies were developed as a basis for discussion at the workshop (see Annex 2). As with the framework of core governance parameters, no consensus was reached on this although there was broad support for many of the elements presented. The group was notably supportive of the approach of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) to revenue transparency and reconciliation and the potential application of a similar approach to REDD+ financial flows.

The scope of monitoring and verification was discussed, and related to this, the role that independent monitoring should play. The need for clarity as to the roles and responsibilities of

different types of organisations in the monitoring of governance was noted, in particular, the roles of government and national and international non-governmental organisations.

The need to design the monitoring system according to particular national circumstances and take into account fragile governance situations was noted. A key issue highlighted in relation to this was the level of institutional capacity within the country. In many cases additional resources and expertise will be needed, but these should build on existing institutions and monitoring systems where possible. Further, it was noted that the monitoring systems must be sustained over the long-term.

More broadly, it was emphasised that monitoring needs, and thus the design of the system, will depend on the political economy of the country. Thus, it was suggested that monitoring should be based on a national multi-stakeholder process. Further, the advantages of participatory country-led assessments were highlighted, particularly in helping to ensure the appropriateness of the monitoring system and facilitating greater political buy-in.

Two aspects of the timing of monitoring were highlighted. Firstly, it was noted that there is a need to allow sufficient time within the design and implementation of monitoring to allow for feedback and learning of lessons. Secondly, it was considered that monitoring governance parameters would require an initial, one-off, assessment effort, as well as continued monitoring. Also, monitoring requirements will change as progress is made through the REDD+ phases.

Monitoring is more likely to be successful in an enabling environment. It is likely that monitoring needs in other policy areas will have similar requirements, suggesting opportunities for synergies and higher cost-effectiveness.

Conclusion

This workshop marked a first step in a process towards an effective and feasible framework for monitoring governance for REDD+. Further clarification is needed, both in relation to the draft framework of governance parameters and suggested principles for designing and implementing monitoring systems. The participants agreed that following up on the workshop will be essential.

ANNEX 1: DRAFT FRAMEWORK FOR MONITORING REDD+ GOVERNANCE

This draft framework builds on section 5.3 of background paper 1 and table 3 of background paper 2, and takes into account discussions during the workshop.

Core governance parameters for REDD+	Key considerations in scope	Of particular relevance to “supporting and promoting” (current safeguards text)
Clear and coherent policy, legal, institutional and regulatory frameworks	• Forest and land use policies, laws and regulations • Legal framework to support and protect land tenure/carbon ownership and use rights • Consistency of REDD+ policies with broader development policies • Clarity of mandates across different levels of government	a) Consistency with national forest programmes, international conventions and agreements c) respect for rights of indigenous peoples and local communities e) consistency with conservation of natural forests, biodiversity etc f) address risk of reversals g) address risk of displacement
Effective implementation, enforcement and compliance	• Cooperative enforcement of laws and regulations relevant for REDD+ • Effectiveness and integrity of judicial system • Implementation of, and compliance with, relevant international commitments/obligations • Anti-corruption measures	b)...effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation... f) address risk of reversals g) address risk of displacement
Transparent and accountable decision-making and institutions	• Stakeholder participation in REDD+ design and implementation, with special emphasis on vulnerable groups • Transparency and accountability of agencies responsible for implementation and enforcement • Conflict resolution and grievance mechanism • Transparency and accountability (including reconciliation) of REDD+ payments and revenues • Participatory and transparent monitoring, reporting, verification and MRV, including accessibility of information	b) transparent...national forest governance structures d) full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders

ANNEX 2: PROPOSED GUIDANCE ON TOOLS AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

These 15 proposed principles are based on section 5.4 of background paper 1. The workshop recommended they be annexed to this paper, but noted that further discussion is needed.

To be effective and feasible, the design of monitoring systems should be based on the following principles:

Cross-cutting principles

- Effective multi-stakeholder participation and accountability of institutions
- Consistency and complementarity in national and international systems
- Broad-based capacity building at all levels, including of civil society and forest-dependent communities
- Building on existing data sets

Principles for the development of indicators

The development of indicators used to gather the appropriate information for monitoring should be based on:

- Using the smallest possible indicator set to deliver the necessary credible data
- Cross-referencing data, designing 'intelligent' indicators and verification
- Demonstrating performance against benchmarks / milestones

Principles for developing effective tools and institutional arrangements

- Reliable information requires independent field-based monitoring and reporting
- Financing arrangements should foster ownership, independence and accountability
- Effective participation and verification requires access to information
- Effective implementation requires clear institutional roles, mandates and responsibilities
- Accountability requires effective national and international conflict resolution mechanisms
- Identifying priorities requires an intelligence-led approach
- Peer review assists credibility and acts as a buffer
- Delivery of information should be timely and transparent