



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



READINESS TO ENGAGE: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT EXPERIENCES FOR REDD+

FOREST CARBON, MARKETS AND COMMUNITIES
(FCMC) PROGRAM



JULY 2013

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by the FCMC Program.

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development by the Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities (FCMC) Program, , through a Task Order under the Prosperity, Livelihoods, and Conserving Ecosystems (PLACE) Indefinite Quantity Contract Core Task Order (USAID Contract No. EPP-I-00-06-00008-00, Order Number AID-OAA-TO-11-00022).

Tetra Tech
159 Bank Street, Suite 300
Burlington, Vermont 05401 USA
Telephone: (802) 658-3890
www.tetrattechintdev.com

Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities Program (FCMC)
1611 North Kent Street, Suite 805
Arlington, VA 22209
Telephone: (703) 592-6388

Scott Hajost, Chief of Party, Email: scott.hajost@fcmcglobal.org
Ian Deshmukh, FCMC Senior Technical Advisor/Manager, Email: ian.deshmukh@tetrattech.com

Erik Streed, USAID Contracting Officer's Representative, Email: estreed@usaid.gov

Research for this report was completed in October 2012. The report was edited and revised by FCMC in May 2013.

Author:
Nancy K. Diamond, Ph.D.

Reviewers:
Paula J. Williams, Ph.D., FCMC Social and Environmental Soundness Task Lead
Ani Zamgochian, FCMC Program Officer
Scott A. Hajost, FCMC Chief of Party
Robert O'Sullivan, FCMC Forest Carbon and Finance Task Lead
Stephen Kelleher, FCMC Cross-Cutting Task Lead

The US Agency for International Development (USAID) has launched the Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities (FCMC) Program to provide its missions, partner governments, local and international stakeholders with assistance in developing and implementing REDD+ initiatives. FCMC services include analysis, evaluation, tools and guidance for program design support; training materials; and meeting and workshop development and facilitation that support US Government contributions to international REDD+ architecture.

Cover Photo: "Northern Sumatran women's focus group in Indonesia discusses watershed and community development issues," Nancy Diamond, August 2005

READINESS TO ENGAGE: STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCES FOR REDD+

FOREST CARBON, MARKETS AND
COMMUNITIES (FCMC) PROGRAM

JULY 2013

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed by the author of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development of the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
ACRONYMS	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
1.0 BACKGROUND	1
1.1. REDD+ AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	1
1.2. THIS REPORT	2
2.0 REDD+ STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT EXPERIENCES	3
2.1 TYPOLOGY OF REDD+ STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	4
2.2 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT EXPERIENCES ACROSS SCALES	4
2.3 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT EXPERIENCES ACROSS ENGAGEMENT OBJECTIVES	8
2.4 LESSONS LEARNED AND PROMISING PRACTICES FOR SPECIFIC GROUPS	16
3.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	21
3.1 CONCLUSIONS	21
3.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	22
REFERENCES	25
ANNEX 1: PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODS OF THIS REVIEW	32
ANNEX 2: KEY TERMS	34
ANNEX 3: LESSONS FROM STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT	35
ANNEX 4: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITMENTS	40
ANNEX 5: ENDNOTES	46

ACRONYMS

AIDSESP	<i>Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana</i> (Inter-Ethnic Association for Development of the Peruvian Rainforest)
BeRT	Benefit and Risk Assessment Tool
CAN	Climate Action Network
CCBS	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women
CEESP	Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (IUCN)
CI	Conservation International
CLUA	Climate and Land Use Alliance
COONAPIP	<i>Coordinadora Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas de Panamá</i>
COP	Conference of the Parties
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAD	Decide, Announce, Defend
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
ESMF	Environmental and Social Management Framework
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FCMC	Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities Program
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FIP	Forest Investment Program
FLEGT	Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade Program
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
FPP	Forest Peoples Programme
FUNAI	<i>Fundação Nacional do Índio</i> (National Indian Foundation) (Brazil)
ICMBio	<i>Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade</i> (Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation) (Brazil)
IFC	International Finance Corporation
ILO	International Labour Organization
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MRV	Monitoring, Reporting and Verification
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
PNG	Papua New Guinea
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
REDD+	REDD “plus” (The “+” adds the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks)
REDD+ SES	REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards
R-PIN	Readiness Plan Idea Note
R-PP	Readiness Preparation Proposal
SEA	Stakeholder Engagement Analysis Methodology
SESA	Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment
SEPC	Social Principles and Criteria
SFX	<i>São Félix do Xingu</i> (Brazil)
UKP4	Presidential Working Unit for Supervision and Management of Development (Indonesia)
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
UN-REDD	United Nations collaborative initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
WEDO	Women's Environment and Development Organization
WOCAN	Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture & Natural Resource Management
WRI	World Resources Institute

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities (FCMC), a program of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), commissioned this study of stakeholder engagement in REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forest and enhancements of forest carbon stocks). The study covers national, sub-national and nested stakeholder engagement experiences, good practices and lessons learned. It provides feedback on how stakeholder engagement can be enhanced throughout the REDD+ strategy and programming cycle. The study is designed for government, donor, non-governmental organization (NGO) and civil society organization (CSO) staff and other actors designing and implementing REDD+ activities.

Key Findings

REDD+ programs are shaped by the history of governance in the forest sector, which has often been challenged by lack of transparency and accountability. Given that legacy, stakeholder engagement in REDD+ needs to incorporate human rights and sustainability principles. Legal and policy frameworks for REDD+ should be informed by participation rights enshrined as basic human rights in many national constitutions and legal frameworks, as well as by international law and multilateral environmental agreements. Stakeholder engagement is a means to achieve more sustainable policies, programs and projects that reflect stakeholder priorities, knowledge and ownership of implementation. Civil society actors envision early, ongoing and authentic stakeholder engagement in program-level REDD+.

Stakeholder engagement can be categorized by convener objectives and by increasing levels of power sharing between government and other stakeholders:

- **Type A – Information Sharing and Capacity Building** including transparent information sharing, capacity building and dialogue opportunities for a wide range of both stakeholders and rights holders who have limited understanding of REDD+ concepts, donor objectives and government plans
- **Type B – Analysis of Issues** via general-invitation consultation meetings, appointing expert members to working groups, and public online opportunities to review technical reports
- **Type C – Negotiation, Consensus-Building and Consent** around problem definition, priority setting, REDD+ processes, social and environmental impact assessment and monitoring, initiation and implementation procedures for consent and grievance resolution, benefit distribution arrangements and direct participation in decision-making
- **Type D – Oversight and Monitoring Roles** with governments for the overall readiness planning (e.g., national working groups), priority setting, budget allocations, benefit distribution systems, implementation approaches, impact monitoring and grievance mechanisms

While legal frameworks have improved and governments are increasingly holding information sharing and capacity building meetings, challenges remain with institutionalizing these practices, trying different methodologies and changing development partner staff attitudes and skills. Many governments have been slower to adopt stakeholder engagement objectives when this means that they share power with other stakeholders over forestry decision-making, i.e., having to reach consensus, seek consent, or structure oversight and monitoring with non-governmental actors. At all scales, authentic stakeholder engagement can only take place when there is sufficient political will to share power, build trust, commit resources and invest in human capacity.

While governments planning REDD+ readiness and implementation activities bear final responsibility for the quantity, quality and timing of stakeholder engagement, REDD+ donor requirements and guidance have definitely encouraged countries to engage in a meaningful way with stakeholders.

To date, stakeholder engagement has primarily focused on awareness raising, information sharing, capacity building, limited technical input and consensus building around some, but not all, critical technical and social issues. Experience with stakeholder engagement in REDD+ varies however across national, sub-national and community scales. Lessons and promising practices have been identified for engagement of specific groups, such as women, Indigenous Peoples and other poor forest-dependent communities, and the private sector. Relatively little has been done to promote the engagement of other disadvantaged groups, such as the very poor or disabled. This review identified a number of potential stakeholder engagement methods, but found that relatively few have been employed in REDD+.

Many general lessons about stakeholder engagement can and should be applied to REDD+ processes, but some challenges are REDD+-specific due to its multisectoral nature and complexity, tenure insecurity of many forest-dependent peoples, evolving safeguard and benefit-sharing systems, and challenges of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) among other issues. Challenges are serious, but not insurmountable: transparency, accountability and fairness will be key to ensuring stakeholder engagement.

While in this initial learning and experimentation phase, REDD+ donors and financing mechanisms, particularly the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) and the United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD), can support more open and democratic processes for REDD+ Readiness. Many other donors, such as the Forest Investment Program (FIP), bilateral donors, foundations, NGOs and the private sector, also recognize and support the value of early and continuing stakeholder engagement. CSOs report, however, that it remains difficult for them to obtain funding for stakeholder engagement processes, particularly at sub-national levels..

UN-REDD and FCPF are also trying to balance international norms around stakeholder engagement and participatory governance with the reality of different levels of experience with and commitment to stakeholder engagement in partner countries. In each country, prior relationships and cultural histories shape how governments, in general, and forestry departments, in particular, view and relate to stakeholders.

Key Recommendations

Much more can be done by countries during REDD+ development and implementation, especially Readiness Preparation and national REDD+ strategies, to clarify how risks will be mitigated and benefits distributed, and how to share oversight and monitoring responsibilities. **Continued donor support for stakeholder engagement is critical**, but donor requirements and guidance may still be insufficient to sway governments that remain uncommitted to reforming environmental governance to routinely include stakeholder engagement. Governments must be willing to address the **procedural rights** of stakeholders to be informed, engage with stakeholders on general topics and progress to stakeholder engagement on issues of substantive rights to land, resources, livelihoods and other potential REDD+ benefits, as well as roles in social impact and other monitoring. There is **still very little systematic monitoring of stakeholder engagement experiences, lessons learned and promising practices for REDD+ processes** by donors or others. As the REDD+ countries move into the implementation of their stakeholder consultation and participation plans, donors should keep close oversight of how well the countries follow their plans and the results of stakeholder input. If collected, this information could be shared across countries. Countries that are leaders in stakeholder engagement could help to create peer pressure so that other countries aim to live up to international standards for the quality and extent of stakeholder engagement. Support by donors for strengthening civil society, particularly at sub-national levels, will be critical. The international REDD+ community has an important continuing role in promoting stakeholder engagement as an ongoing process throughout REDD+.

Further details are provided in the following summary of key findings and recommendations.

Key Findings	Recommendations for Countries Implementing REDD+	Recommendations for Donors and Multilateral REDD+ Funding Mechanisms
GENERAL LESSONS ON STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT		
<p><i>Different requirements and standards for REDD+ stakeholder engagement exist among different countries, donors, and multilateral REDD+ funding mechanisms</i></p> <p><i>Limited systematic comparative monitoring and research has been done on REDD+ engagement processes</i></p>	<p><i>No specific recommendations on this item for countries implementing REDD+</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmonize requirements and standards set by multilateral REDD+ funding mechanisms and donors • Improve systematic monitoring of REDD+ stakeholder engagement experiences • Standardize reporting expectations, indicators, and standards for stakeholder engagement
<p>Most countries have postponed significant REDD+ stakeholder engagement pending funding for further REDD+ Readiness preparations, i.e., Readiness grants.</p> <p>Some countries have used their own funding to support stakeholder engagement, while relying on outside funding for other REDD+ activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiate stakeholder engagement as early as possible and continue on an ongoing basis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send consistent signals about stakeholder engagement through strengthened country requirements and standards, internal proposal review procedures and approval criteria • Require mandatory stakeholder analyses, including gender analyses to be done prior to submissions of funding requests
<p>The choice of REDD+ stakeholder process convener, i.e., specific government agency, or civil society organization(s), impacts stakeholder trust and perceptions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build trust through transparency, accountability and allocation of adequate time for dialogue and decision-making • Support civil society-led REDD+ information sharing and capacity building at local levels by improving information flows and representation across scales via REDD+ roundtable models, reserving seats and providing sufficient notice 	<p><i>No specific recommendations on this item for donors and multilateral REDD+ funding mechanisms</i></p>
<p>Tying REDD+ to larger, multi-stakeholder processes, such as national development plans, and including under-represented groups is critical to the sustainability and legitimacy of consensus and consent.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use REDD+ related reforms to institutionalize stakeholder engagement [as a broader principle] via policies, laws and regulations 	<p><i>No specific recommendations on this item for donors and multilateral REDD+ funding mechanisms</i></p>

Key Findings	Recommendations for Countries Implementing REDD+	Recommendations for Donors and Multilateral REDD+ Funding Mechanisms
Flexibility and using a diversity of methods to invite, engage, and communicate with stakeholders has been key to obtaining their inputs. So far, however, very little creativity and a limited range of methods have been used in REDD+ stakeholder engagement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand the repertoire of methods used for all four types of stakeholder engagement objectives Develop models and methods that can scale-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritize donor support for local capacity building modalities that can be scaled up to reach many communities
All methods for REDD+ stakeholder engagement require pre-planning, skilled facilitated implementation, and follow-up with stakeholders. There is a tremendous need for skilled facilitators, since REDD+ experts are not often strong facilitators and skilled facilitators may not understand REDD+ sufficiently. Demand is high among REDD+ stakeholders for training on issues such as drivers of deforestation, land tenure and land use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support capacity building for facilitators and stakeholders (i.e. general, specialized skills) across countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand learning across and within countries about effective stakeholder engagement practices via a learning-based community of practice
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AT NATIONAL, SUB-NATIONAL AND NESTED LEVELS OF REDD+		
Stakeholder engagement at national, sub-national, nested, and community levels varies enormously within and across countries. Few stakeholders move across different levels, and time, energy, and funds are limited. Some civil society-led multi-stakeholder roundtables have helped to forge vertical and horizontal linkages.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experiment with ways to increase power-sharing between government and stakeholders at national and sub-national levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require both national and sub-national level meetings for pre-submission validation of REDD+ Readiness plans Donor support for civil society strengthening, particularly at sub-national levels, will be critical

Key Findings	Recommendations for Countries Implementing REDD+	Recommendations for Donors and Multilateral REDD+ Funding Mechanisms
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT BY TYPES		
<p>REDD+ stakeholder engagement can be categorized by convener objectives and by increasing levels of power sharing between government and other stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type A: Information Sharing and Capacity Building • Type B: Analysis of Issues • Type C: Negotiation, Consensus – Building and Consent • Type D: Oversight and Monitoring Roles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experiment with ways to increase power-sharing between government and stakeholders at national and sub-national levels 	<p><i>No specific recommendations on this item for donors and multilateral REDD+ funding mechanisms</i></p>
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT TYPES A (INFORMATION SHARING & CAPACITY BUILDING)		
<p>Most REDD+ stakeholder engagement falls under Type A. Information sharing has been primarily through large events dominated by speeches and technical lectures. Type A activities provide little opportunity for discussion or stakeholder influence.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide opportunities for smaller group and more interactive dialogues • Provide information in multiple ways and shorter documents 	<p><i>No specific recommendations on this item for donors and multilateral REDD+ funding mechanisms</i></p>
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT TYPE B (ANALYSIS OF ISSUES)		
<p>Document review, technical working groups and general-invitation consultation meetings provide important opportunities for stakeholder engagement and provision of data on specific issues, including Indigenous Peoples and other vulnerable groups. Stakeholders have been most engaged on discussions of safeguard policies and impact assessment procedures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand stakeholder roles as technical contributors, such as by engaging communities and civil society partners in analyses and participatory baseline setting 	<p><i>No specific recommendations on this item for donors and multilateral REDD+ funding mechanisms</i></p>

Key Findings	Recommendations for Countries Implementing REDD+	Recommendations for Donors and Multilateral REDD+ Funding Mechanisms
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT TYPE C (NEGOTIATION, CONSENSUS-BUILDING & CONSENT, INCLUDING FPIC)		
Stakeholder consensus has been greatest around safeguard issues (particularly FPIC), social impact assessment and reformulation of the driver of deforestation analyses. Debate continues over the nature and implementation of FPIC, and its inclusion in REDD-related policy, legal, administrative and governance reforms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase consensus-building efforts around procedural rights of, and protections for, stakeholders (including FPIC) and benefit distribution • Pilot FPIC models in all countries with indigenous and forest-dependent communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to support learning and disseminating effective FPIC protocols and implementation
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT TYPE D (OVERSIGHT & MONITORING ROLES)		
The cross-cutting nature of REDD+ lends itself to broader stakeholder involvement in oversight and monitoring. Generally civil society envisions a wider range of monitoring roles for stakeholders than government does. Some countries, however, have only reserved one to two seats for civil society and indigenous representatives on National REDD+ Committees. Political will and donor support can encourage broader stakeholder representation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand stakeholder roles as technical contributors by engaging communities and civil society partners in participatory baseline setting and monitoring of social and environmental impacts • Institutionalize stakeholder roles in oversight bodies and processes. Go beyond tokenism by allowing civil society to elect its own representatives for reserved seats. 	<i>No specific recommendations on this item for donors and multilateral REDD+ funding mechanisms</i>

Key Findings	Recommendations for Countries Implementing REDD+	Recommendations for Donors and Multilateral REDD+ Funding Mechanisms
ENGAGEMENT OF DIVERSE STAKEHOLDER GROUPS		
<p>In many REDD+ stakeholder engagement efforts, participation of key groups – such as women, indigenous peoples, or the private sector – has been limited. Little attention has been given to engaging other marginalized groups, including ethnic and caste social minorities, as well as the very poor, the elderly or youth and the disabled.</p> <p>Experience shows, however, that stakeholder balance creates a better environment for diverse participation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase inclusiveness through stakeholder analysis, modified invitation and communication process and logistical accommodations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve reporting procedures for identifying stakeholder organizational or community affiliations, sex, ethnicity and numbers during REDD+ Readiness preparations
ENGAGEMENT OF SPECIFIC STAKEHOLDER GROUPS: WOMEN		
<p>At all levels of REDD+ discussions and capacity building, women and gender advocates have been underrepresented, despite international and national commitments to gender equality. While more common in REDD+ pilot projects, gender analyses and gender monitoring are still uncommon in national readiness studies. Gender integration guidance is available for community-based REDD+ pilot projects, but lacking for national and regional government REDD+ planning activities. Some REDD+ capacity building activities are adapting their agendas and methodologies to address gender issues and encourage women's participation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the use of gender-sensitive stakeholder analyses at early stages of REDD+ planning, to identify gender issues and gender advocacy experts • Build on past experience with enhancement of women's participation, such as logistical issues and targeted capacity building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require mandatory stakeholder analyses, including gender analyses, to be done prior to REDD+ Readiness submissions • Require mandatory participation of gender advocates in “validation” meetings prior to REDD+ Readiness submission • Increase support and guidance (e.g. gender manual or additions to other guidance, technical support to advance gender mainstreaming)

Key Findings	Recommendations for Countries Implementing REDD+	Recommendations for Donors and Multilateral REDD+ Funding Mechanisms
ENGAGEMENT OF SPECIFIC STAKEHOLDERS: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES & OTHER FOREST-DEPENDENT COMMUNITIES		
<p>Although government engagement with indigenous and other forest-dependent communities predates REDD+, these groups are still underrepresented at national and sub-national levels. Most engagement of indigenous stakeholders is taking place within a project context at the local level. A challenge of REDD+ is to build local knowledge and negotiation skills for indigenous and forest-dependent communities. Too few practical, large-scale strategies are being proposed to create an informed constituency of direct stake and rights holders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide adequate time for informing, building capacity, consensus and support among these stakeholders, with support from especially from government agencies and civil society experienced with working with indigenous populations • Broaden representation in REDD+ processes and on REDD+ standing committees • Develop better local language materials and methods to reach these groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require mandatory participation of indigenous advocates in “validation” meetings prior to R-PP submission • Continue donor support for engagement of indigenous and other marginalized peoples
ENGAGEMENT OF SPECIFIC STAKEHOLDER GROUPS: PRIVATE SECTOR		
<p>Private sector actors with potential stakes in REDD+ are not a uniform group with homogenous interests. Even within the same sector, opinions and strategies differ.</p> <p>The extent of private sector involvement in multi-stakeholder REDD+ processes is unclear and difficult to monitor.</p> <p>Civil society is concerned about ongoing awards of concessions during REDD+ Readiness planning and inadequate analyses of private sector roles in deforestation and degradation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase outreach to, and inclusion, private sector in public, mixed stakeholder events • Develop more balanced analyses of private sector roles in deforestation • Concession moratoriums during REDD+ Readiness planning • Engage business via larger Low Emissions Development Strategies or Green Economy planning 	<p><i>No specific recommendations on this item for donors and multilateral REDD+ funding mechanisms</i></p>

I.0 BACKGROUND

I.1. REDD+ AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities (FCMC), a program of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), commissioned this study. FCMC supports USAID's work on forestry and climate change issues, and is working to better understand and address key social dimensions of these issues, such as stakeholder engagement.

Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), work is ongoing to mitigate climate change through improved forest management. The concept and types of activities known as Reducing Emissions for Deforestation and Degradation (REDD, and more recently REDD+) deal with "policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries" (UNFCCC, 2010). REDD+ has great potential to advance or diminish the well-being of poor and vulnerable forest-dependent communities and democratic environmental governance. The details of how a future REDD+ mechanism will operate are still being negotiated under the UNFCCC.

The term "REDD+" is commonly understood to convey the idea that REDD+ is not just a technical matter involving greenhouse gas emissions. Many expect REDD+ finance to also support transformative economic, social and ecological changes and produce multiple economic and conservation benefits.¹ REDD+ is part of an ongoing and broader discussion about good governance (i.e., transparent, accountable, participatory) for forests and other natural resources.

As REDD+ has been under development during the past five years, most countries are not yet fully prepared to participate in international forest carbon market mechanisms. In 2010, the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties (COP) 15 adopted ideas proposed in *REDD Options Assessment Report* (The Meridian Institute 2009) to consider REDD+ national development in three phases. Phase 1 refers to development of national strategies or action plans, policies and measures and capacity building (often referred to as the "readiness phase"). Phase 2 is about implementation of national policies and measures, national strategies or action plans that could involve further capacity building, technology development and transfer, and results-based demonstration activities. Phase 3 describes the initiation of results-based actions that should be fully measured, reported and verified.

To date, most REDD+ activities are at the REDD+ Readiness or REDD+ Readiness planning stages. Considerable donor support has been provided to support this work, particularly through multilateral REDD+ financing mechanisms, such as the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), for which the World Bank serves as the Trustee of the funds and Secretariat of the Facility, the Forest Investment Program (FIP), also managed by the World Bank, and the United Nations collaborative initiative on REDD+ (UN-REDD).

At sub-national (regional, state, provincial or district) levels, governments and civil society are undertaking their own processes, but not necessarily in synchronization with the federal government. In other cases, however, the sub-national may "nested" in, or linked to, national processes.

Meanwhile, REDD+ negotiations and field projects are taking place with communities, local organizations, municipal and provincial governments and managers of protected areas with funding from multilateral, bilateral, foundation, private sector and conservation non-governmental organization (NGO) sources. The hope is that early field experiences will inform higher-level REDD+ planning and motivate investor and stakeholder enthusiasm for REDD+.

Many REDD+ proponents are unsettled by the process and fast pace of the implementation of local carbon “deals” with vulnerable forest-dependent communities. The forestry sector has generally had a poor reputation for stakeholder engagement in resource governance and is often mistrusted by civil society and communities. Much remains to be done to complete national and sub-national REDD+ rules and practices, or link with existing national and international agreements regarding stakeholder protections, or safeguards (e.g., safeguards, impact monitoring, equitable benefit distribution and grievance and redress processes). The quality and extent of stakeholder engagement has been questioned by numerous observers. Many community members in remote rural areas have not yet been reached. Early implementation of pilots, prior to stakeholder protections, is viewed with suspicion and some describe it as “building a boat while it is still sailing” (A. Mahaningtyas, pers. comm.).

The price of failure is highest for those stakeholders with the most to lose—specifically the men and women who live in communities that are dependent upon forests for their well-being and who have been long-time residents of forested areas. Many of these communities are comprised of indigenous groups, but there are other very poor and socially marginalized groups who may bear the brunt of ill-planned REDD+ schemes. For these rights holders, there are significant concerns with REDD+ impacts, such as increased alienation of land rights or livelihood, relocation or other negative social and cultural impacts. Compared to other REDD+ stakeholders, these forest-dependent community members have less education, much less access to the Internet and often lack the time and means to travel to REDD+ consultations and other meetings held in national or sub-national capitals. Historically, they have held very little power to influence the nature and scope of development activities and service provision, either locally or nationally. Even early REDD+ dialogue with stakeholders is likely to touch on requirements for communities in terms of land tenure, possible multiple benefits and benefit distribution arrangements. However, those who live within and on the forest margins are not generally represented in REDD+ discussions in any significant numbers.

1.2. THIS REPORT

Few reports for REDD+ compare stakeholder engagement experiences across countries. To fill this gap, USAID commissioned a desktop review of promising practices and lessons learned from recent REDD+ experiences with stakeholder processes. The information sources include the REDD+ and general stakeholder engagement literature, key informant interviews and supplemental written inputs from those who could not be interviewed.

This document provides a review of actual experiences with stakeholder engagement in REDD+ (Section 2). Stakeholder lessons are organized by scale (i.e., national, sub-national and nested²), and by engagement objectives (i.e., information sharing and capacity building [Type A]; analysis of issues [Type B]; negotiation, consensus-building and consent [including Free and Prior Informed Consent] [Type C], and oversight and monitoring [Type D]). Greater attention is given to national and sub-national lessons since there is already considerable knowledge about what should be done at the local level. In addition, special attention is given to three stakeholder groups (i.e., indigenous and other poor forest-dependent communities, women and the private sector). Suggestions are provided on different methods that could be used with different levels of stakeholder engagement, or with different stakeholder groups. The report provides some conclusions and recommendations on improving stakeholder engagement (Section 3).

The annexes provide supporting information, regarding: the purpose, scope and methods for the study (Annex 1), a glossary of key terms (Annex 2), broader lessons learned about stakeholder engagement (Annex 3), an overview of international, donor, and country commitments to stakeholder engagement in REDD+ (Annex 4), The document also contains Endnotes (Annex 5), as well as a list of References.

2.0 REDD+ STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT EXPERIENCES

Engagement of key stakeholders in genuine opportunities to influence policies, processes, programs and projects is commonly viewed as a basic human right and critical to broader engagement in democratic processes (UNDP, 2006).

The right to public participation is noted in many international declarations and conventions, beginning with the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Participation by specific groups in decision-making is highlighted in other agreements, such as the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the 2007 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). (For further discussion of relevant applicable international agreements and declarations, see Annex 4).

The 1992 UNFCCC specifies in Article 4 (1i) that Parties must "promote and cooperate in education, training and public awareness related to climate change and encourage the widest participation in this process, including that of non-governmental organizations" (with public access to information under Article 13 (4c) of the 1998 Kyoto Protocol to UNFCCC). The UNFCCC 2010 voluntary REDD+ safeguards, also known as the Cancun safeguards (Box 1), specifically highlight the need for stakeholder engagement in REDD+.

Stakeholder engagement is essential for the sustainability of development and resource management, enhancing the design and implementation of these activities and building local understanding and ownership. Although costs and risks (e.g., hijacking of outcomes by powerful interest groups, stakeholder trust and "consultation fatigue") are associated with convening multi-stakeholder processes, potential long-term benefits of allowing people to meet and be heard generally outweigh these challenges (TCBC, 2006; UNDP, 2006; World Bank, 2008).

Stakeholder engagement improves REDD+ and empowers stakeholders by:

- Facilitating early identification of interested stakeholders, issues, conflicts and benefits Gathering data, exchanging and generating ideas
- Creating communication channels and learning opportunities
- Developing shared understandings, agreement and buy-in regarding priorities, policies and programs, protocols and solutions that are more sustainable and cost-effective
- Providing venues to air grievances when group decisions are not implemented as expected

Box 1: UNFCCC REDD+ Safeguards that Address Stakeholder Engagement

Of the seven UNFCCC Cancun safeguards for REDD+, four are most directly related to stakeholder engagement. In order of importance, they include:

Safeguard (d) focuses on "the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular Indigenous Peoples and local communities, in REDD+ actions."

Safeguard (c) specifies "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" (UNDRIP).

Safeguard (b) recognizes the importance of "transparent and effective national forest governance structures..."

Safeguard (e) discusses enhancing social and environmental benefits.

Source: UNFCCC. (2010).
FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1. Appendix I to Cancun

- Improving management of risks and enhancing public sector, corporate or civil society reputations
- Building social capital for more participatory, transparent and accountable forms of governance
- Negotiating trade-offs and outcomes among stakeholders who will have different benefits and costs

2.1 TYPOLOGY OF REDD+ STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

This review suggests a typology of REDD+ stakeholder engagement types, based on convener objectives, and increasing levels of power sharing. Throughout this report, experiences, lessons learned and promising practices are categorized according to the following:

- **Type A (Information Sharing and Capacity Building)** - Disseminating balanced and objective information, providing some dialogue opportunities and building capacity
- **Type B (Analysis of Issues)** - Collecting information from stakeholders that is processed and presented to decision-makers
- **Type C (Negotiation, Consensus-Building and Consent)** - Gathering people together to consider information, generate feedback and new ideas, interact with other stakeholders and directly participate in decision-making
- **Type D (Oversight and Monitoring)** - Working together to oversee and monitor a process, strategy, program or policy implementation

At all levels and across all types of stakeholder engagement, REDD+ poses some particular challenges for stakeholder engagement in national and sub-national planning, in contrast to planning for forestry, other natural resources and poverty reduction. Stakeholders need a basic level of understanding of key concepts and terms and sufficient information on plans, benefits and risks. Regardless of educational level, many people have found it difficult to understand the science of climate change, emission reductions measurements and the abstract nature of still-developing, performance-based market mechanisms. Stakeholders require accurate information on emissions values and benefits and risks of carbon deals. For the most part, this type of information is unavailable, which contributes to stakeholder misconceptions, fears and mistrust. Potentially high stakes are involved, with great incentives to skew public information. Moreover, in many countries public trust and good will is undermined by ongoing granting of concessions (forestry, agriculture and mining) by governments.

Early REDD+ work points to significant differences in the timing, nature, breadth and depth of stakeholder engagement to date. There are also differences in who convenes processes (be it government or civil society), whether government and civil society-convened activities for stakeholder engagement are parallel or linked, and the historical baggage carried by particular ministries and/or government units with regard to their treatment of stakeholders during past processes. While the main funding from donors goes to national governments, civil society is working at various levels to lead events, roundtables, working groups and other forms of capacity building at national and sub-national levels.

2.2 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT EXPERIENCES ACROSS SCALES

2.2.1 National Scales

No one-size-fits-all formula exists for national-level REDD+ Readiness. Early national and sub-national activities have included stakeholder information sharing and capacity building, followed by policy and legal changes, setting up institutional, technical systems and safeguards, and developing human capacity. The pace

of REDD+ Readiness preparations has varied significantly across countries due to differences in governance structures and processes, policies and laws, market relations, the strength and capacity of civil society, and cultural traditions and values. Some countries may need to add or expand regulations related to stakeholder engagement for REDD+ Readiness activities. Initial lessons provided in the harmonized REDD+ R-PP template guidance from FCPF and UN-REDD (FCPF, 2012) and elsewhere have relevance at all levels.

Draw from past engagement experiences. Governments need to learn from and build upon past multi-stakeholder processes in forestry and related activities (e.g., payment for environmental services, integrated conservation and development projects). Where trust is low, the choice of lead government agency, government transparency, accountability and other good faith measures are key. However, even when past experience is lacking for forestry and natural resources, governments can take advantage of the multi-sector nature of REDD+ and donor support to provide at least a minimal stakeholder involvement (e.g., Cambodia) (F. Pinto, pers. comm.).

Start early and maintain engagement and transparency over time. Stakeholder platforms, at national and other levels, can provide ongoing mechanisms for formal and informal information sharing and feedback among all stakeholders. Committees and working groups should include a balance of stakeholders from within government and across civil society and Indigenous Peoples organizations, rather than be dominated by government.

Provide stakeholders with opportunities to take on roles beyond the design of R-PP Consultation and Participation Plans and safeguards. Stakeholders can provide constructive input on national REDD+ strategies or Readiness Preparation Proposals (R-PP) analyses related to: land use and drivers of deforestation; forest law and policy and governance; dialogue about trade-offs for proposed REDD+ strategy; new institutional arrangements; land tenure changes; benefit distribution; and grievance resolution arrangements.

View Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) as a process rather than an isolated event. The R-PP template guidance notes "adequate time needs to be allowed for the careful management of awareness raising and engagement with local authorities (and) communities, as well as with national indigenous organizations and relevant intermediary groups. Provision of enhanced local capacity for effective awareness-raising and discussion of issues is important, as is carefully structuring an FPIC process and documenting its decisions."

2.2.2 Nested Scales (Linked National and Sub-National)

A nested approach to REDD+ provides flexible means to link national with subnational approaches (Angelsen, A. et al., 2008). There are obvious advantages to vertically nested and overlapping mechanisms for information sharing, benefit distribution, oversight and monitoring, and grievance and redress mechanisms. These linkages would help to transfer baseline and impact information upwards for better national and sub-national planning. They would also help to communicate information on government plans downward, support the distribution of benefits across scales and sharing responsibility for monitoring. However, these efforts are quite nascent. Few stakeholders move across different levels, and time, energy and funds are limited. Very few studies track linkages within countries and their benefits (Rubio et al, 2012). To date, few promising practices have been identified for forging ongoing nested linkages, but some common arrangements have been adopted.

National governments sometimes convene one-time information sharing/learning meetings in regional capitals with sub-national stakeholders. National government staff or committee members (or consultants) meet once (or more often) with a range of sub-national stakeholders (e.g., government staff and elected officials, local or international civil society representatives based in sub-national areas, indigenous representatives from organizations and communities, and local university representatives). Some countries systematically reached out to all forested regions; others only meet with a few regions. In 2011, Bangladesh held a large national multi-stakeholder workshop in Dhaka followed by one regional workshop in Chittagong

Hill Tracts for its first national and regional consultation workshops on its forestry sector and REDD+ Roadmap. In the same year, the Government of Papua New Guinea (PNG) held two provincial-level consultative workshops with awareness-raising training for provincial, district and local government.

Civil society and indigenous organizations, including both national and sub-national entities, jointly convene one-off information sharing or learning events in regional capitals or communities. Some are nested efforts that are planned and managed by alliances of national and sub-national organizations (e.g., Cambodia). In other situations, the conveners are combinations of sub-national organizations and community-based organizations. While there is great interest in these types of activities, civil society struggles to secure sufficient funding.

Sub-national representatives on standing national REDD+ committees or working groups. Although this idea is being discussed in many countries, national governments have not generally been inviting sub-national government officials to participate in national-level REDD+ committees or working groups. Some national climate committees have included sub-national representatives but not necessarily government (e.g., representatives from Peru's regional REDD+ Roundtables participate in the National Climate Change Committee, but regional governments do not have seats on this body) (F. Leon, pers. comm.). The civil society and indigenous representatives on national bodies tend to be appointed representatives from national networks and federations in capital cities rather than those in sub-national organizations.

Civil society monitoring across states and scales via policy and project databases. To track what is going on at federal and state levels, Brazilian civil society is monitoring policies and programs via their "REDD Observatory" database (L. Hasenclever, pers. comm.).

2.2.3 Sub-National Scales

Sub-national scales of government, i.e., provincial, state, regional or district, vary widely in the extent to which they are engaged in REDD+ Readiness planning and the degree of stakeholder engagement:

State progress is exceeding federal progress in some countries. For example, Brazil's states, civil society and even municipalities have stepped into the void to educate stakeholders and plan possible REDD+ futures, while the federal government works on an internal consensus for a National REDD+ Strategy developed with early stakeholder input. Acre, Mato Grosso and Amazonas states have passed laws and advanced project plans. In addition, civil society organizations (CSOs) are very active in some of the states and are strong forces in advancing state-level REDD+ planning.

Some states are progressing faster with REDD+ planning and stakeholder engagement practices than others. For example, in Indonesia the provincial governors have different attitudes about REDD+. Some are moving forward quickly (e.g., Central Sulawesi, which has passed a decree establishing a provincial REDD+ working group) but other provinces are taking a wait-and-see attitude (A. Mahaningtyas, pers. comm.). In Nigeria, the Cross River State was proactive in creating its own deforestation reduction policies and stakeholder dialogue prior to national REDD+ planning. To date, stakeholder dialogue has continued with its REDD+ pilot project funding (S. Efik, pers. comm.). In Peru, regional governments and mixed roundtables were better positioned to work with traditional governance and cultural elements, but are not always able to include indigenous communities, concessionaires and municipal government (Rubio et al, 2012). A variety of promising practices have been developed.

Civil society-led, multi-stakeholder roundtables can help to forge horizontal and vertical linkages. In Peru (see Box 2) and Mexico, CSOs are leading the formation and ongoing facilitation of multi-stakeholder roundtables in regional capitals, but links are still weak with national processes. Civil society participants have included sub-national organizations and international conservation and development organizations based in sub-national areas. Government representatives include national technical staff who work locally and also political representatives. Community leaders and members have been invited, but face transportation and

financial challenges, particularly when their communities are isolated and more remote from regional capitals (e.g., upriver indigenous communities have greater difficulty being involved with the Madre de Dios Regional REDD+ Roundtable than in the San Martin Region) (L. Barquin, pers. comm.; F. Leon, pers. comm.; Rubio et al., 2012).

Box 2: Multi-Stakeholder REDD+ Roundtables in Peru

Peru's civil society, prior to REDD+, had organized multi-stakeholder roundtables at the national and regional level, which were later adapted to REDD+. The regional roundtables in Madre de Dios and San Martin have regional governments that are predisposed toward stakeholder input. Each region's REDD+ roundtable has a different history and priorities. The Madre de Dios roundtable is more environmentally focused and has prioritized establishment of regional reference levels for emissions; San Martin's REDD+ roundtable includes more indigenous and community representatives and its work emphasizes stakeholder engagement and indigenous participation. Parallel indigenous REDD+ roundtables, at the national and regional levels (i.e., Madre de Dios, San Martin, Ucayali and Loreto), were established by the national, umbrella indigenous organization, *Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana* (AIDESEP, Inter-Ethnic Association for Development of the Peruvian Rainforest).

Sources: The REDD Desk. (2012). Peru Summary. Downloaded on Aug. 8, 2012 from <http://www.theredddesk.org>. Interview, Luis Barquin, August 17, 2012; Interview, Fernando Leon, August 16, 2012. Rubio et al. 2012.

For the sub-regional government level (e.g., districts, counties, and large rural municipalities with forested lands), there are planning processes for REDD+ and also pilot projects at community and sub-regional levels. There is not much information available about lessons learned for REDD+ planning at this level. In the Brazilian state of Pará, one municipality has initiated a successful multi-level process for a Municipal Pact and oversight Commission (see Box 3).

Box 3: Sub-National Stakeholder Engagement in Brazil

In 2007, the Federal Government of Brazil black listed a number of rural municipalities in the Amazon with very high deforestation rates. It required these municipalities to develop plans to achieve net zero deforestation. The Municipality of São Felix do Xingu (SFX) in Pará State covers nine million hectares of large private ranches, small farms, indigenous communities and protected areas. The SFX Municipal government, with international support from The Nature Conservancy, the European Commission and also Brazil's Ministry of the Environment implemented a four month multi-stakeholder process. It worked with the 10 main communities to first develop community-level deforestation reduction pacts with both government and local stakeholder commitments. From each community, participants elected two local representatives to serve on a municipal-level commission for pact implementation. This commission then created a Municipal Pact for the End of Illegal Deforestation and its work plan. Although overlooked initially due to a focus on illegal deforestation, the pact and the commission later expanded to include representatives of indigenous communities, FUNAI, and the national protected areas agency (ICMBio). Source: Cortez, Rane. (2012). *Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ in Brazil: From National Policy to Municipal Action: A case study of the Central Xingu REDD+ Pilot Program*. Unpublished paper. The Nature Conservancy, Belem.

2.2.4 Community Scale

For pilot projects at the community level, a number of REDD+ guidelines³ draw from past stakeholder engagement processes for design and impact assessment. Stakeholder engagement is encouraged but not required under the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS); it is a requirement for the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards (CCBS), with the latter system specifying gender and age-based inclusiveness, culturally appropriate methods and multiple criteria and documentation of stakeholder participation in design, review and monitoring inputs. Olander and Ebeling (2011) note that working with communities is an ongoing process, rather than a single design step, and

different types of projects require different levels of community engagement (private versus community-managed lands; stakeholder ownership versus usufruct rights).

Reviews and critiques of REDD+ stakeholder engagement exist for many individual projects but not many that compare multiple projects. A multi-country comparison of 12 REDD+ projects (Harvey et al, 2010) found that local stakeholder engagement challenges included addressing unrealistic expectations about the magnitude and timing of REDD+ benefits via communication and educational activities; accurately estimating costs of stakeholder engagement, particularly in areas with few organizations; addressing both land and carbon property rights in areas where residents are limited to usufruct rights; and mistrust of authorities and future fairness in distribution of carbon revenues. Blomley and Richards (2011) note that it is important to understand vulnerability and representation in local contexts to avoid elite capture and to tap the local expertise and relationships of local institutions. They also address the costs of participation to local people and the need to provide in-kind benefits and funds for meetings outside of villages.

A recent comparative study conducted by Conservation International (CI) in Peru (Rubio et al, 2012), which piloted an approach for Stakeholder Engagement Analysis (SEA). This approach looked at stakeholder engagement at national, regional and project levels (Box 4).

In terms of local projects, this study found that continuous dialogue with stakeholders was critical throughout implementation and communication needed to take place at the household level. The projects built both knowledge and skills related to REDD+ and climate change for villagers and the staff from protected areas. Topics included alternative livelihood, organic certification, and forest management activities for producers. Other training in carbon negotiations, fund management and carbon monitoring helped those who were working for organizations that managed local projects. It was also important for REDD+ projects to consider and work within existing community and municipal development plans.

Box 4: Conservation International's Stakeholder Engagement Analysis (SEA) Methodology

CI's SEA Methodology is "designed to analyze a country's current situation of REDD+ stakeholder engagement at different scales."

Grounded in participatory analysis and dialogue and validated by a multi-stakeholder steering committee, information gathered during the analysis identifies gaps and priorities within the existing stakeholder engagement process.

The result of the SEA methodology supports the development of a Stakeholder Engagement Action Plan.

CI has piloted this approach in Peru, analyzing how stakeholder participation is occurring at the national and regional levels (in San Martin and Madre de Dios regions) and in the context of six REDD+ project initiatives. For more information, see Conservation International (2012) and Rubio et al. (2012).

2.3 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT EXPERIENCES ACROSS ENGAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

2.3.1 General Lessons across the Four Engagement Objectives

Most countries appear to have postponed significant engagement of stakeholders until after they receive Readiness funding. Some countries do not have complete stakeholder analyses at the time of their R-PP submissions. Some R-PP Consultation and Participation Plans focus on one-way communication activities rather than two-way engagement with stakeholders.

The choice of government agency as process conveners makes a difference to stakeholders. Forest departments are often assigned lead responsibilities for REDD+ (Peskett & Brockhaus 2009), but many lack the necessary stakeholder trust and skills to effectively manage and facilitate stakeholder engagement. Perceptions of corruption, ineffective enforcement, ongoing concession awards and lack of accountability are common problems. Some countries are choosing other lead institutions with less negative history with stakeholders (e.g., Indonesia assigned primary responsibility for REDD+ to the Presidential Working Unit for Supervision and Management of Development [UKP4], which has less negative history with stakeholders).

Trust between conveners and stakeholders can be built over time, despite past history. It is helpful to include both opponents and supporters from civil society. Conveners enhance trust when they act in transparent and accountable ways (i.e., sharing what they do know and have planned; taking notes at meetings and sharing them afterwards; opening documents for review and providing feedback on how input was addressed). Forest concession moratoria have also enhanced stakeholder trust.

Conveners should seek balance across participating stakeholders. Stakeholder balance tends to create a better environment for diverse participation. Civil society has been more successful than government in this regard (H. Berliani, pers. comm.); events dominated by government staff tend to inhibit participation by others. Women and Indigenous Peoples have generally been underrepresented at national and sub-national levels due to being overlooked, intention and/or lack of resources to support travel and other costs. Other overlooked groups include the private sector, academia and media representatives, but some countries, such as Zambia, have involved these groups from the launch of their REDD+ program (UN-REDD, 2010).

Flexibility in use of methods has been key for obtaining stakeholder input. Nonetheless, a much wider range of methods is available than currently are being used to invite, engage and communicate with stakeholders (see Box 5).

Logistical hurdles must be addressed for all four engagement objectives. Adequate notice about meetings and document review periods, support for travel expenses and other accommodations (such as meeting locations, language interpretation and childcare), have helped to increase participation by community members and women representatives.

Balance must be reached between allowing for adequate dialogue time but not exhausting stakeholder good will and availability. While they have time and travel constraints, stakeholders have often felt that stakeholder processes have been rushed, including meetings, document sharing and review. They have found this situation to be particularly troubling for discussion of serious issues regarding safeguards, mitigation and impact monitoring strategies, land tenure security, benefit distribution and grievance resolution plans. To motivate stakeholder participation over time, conveners have varied meeting formats and offered capacity building incentives. With good planning and communications, different people should be able to choose to be involved in what is most relevant to them.

There is a tremendous need for skilled facilitators for REDD+ workshops and training. Training is likely to be needed since REDD+ experts are not often strong facilitators and skilled facilitators may not understand REDD+ sufficiently. Facilitators with different styles will be needed depending on engagement levels, social groups and status levels (e.g., high officials or community members). At local levels, civil society is investing in focal points who are trained to train others (e.g., CI has created a Trainer of Trainers manual in Peru and is retaining a core local team to facilitate REDD+ trainings in local languages) (L. Barquin, pers. comm.). In Cambodia, a group of national-level NGOs trained facilitators from local NGOs on REDD+ concepts and government plans, prior to three provincial workshops (F. Pinto, pers. comm.). Because of strong facilitation, the organizers were able to better understand critical gaps in local understanding and awareness of REDD+ and needs for continued information to the local NGOs and workshop participants.

Budget hurdles can be overcome with sufficient political will and creativity. For example, the government of Mexico used external funding for technical issues related to Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV), etc. and internal funds for stakeholder engagement (M. E. Mesta, pers. comm.).

Box 5: Menu of Methodologies by REDD+ Stakeholder Engagement Objective

REDD+ Stakeholder Engagement Objectives	Method of Selecting Stakeholders	Menu of Methodologies	
Type A: Information Sharing and Capacity Building <i>Provide and exchange data, opinions and options (one-way and two-way exchange)</i>	Self-Selection or Convener-Selected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Hearings Public comment Open House Listening Sessions Focus Groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surveys Online Dialogues/Blogs Storytelling "Cafe" Style Methods (World Cafe, Philosopher Cafe)
Type B: Analysis of Issues <i>Provide non-binding but influential advice or comments, set baselines</i>	Convener-Selected (or civil society holds parallel processes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advisory Committee Citizen Juries/ Panels/ Assemblies Deliberative Polling Community Forums Policy Dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task Force National Issues Forums Design Charrettes Scenario Planning Future Search Appreciative Inquiry Open Space Whole Scale Change
Type C: Negotiation, Consensus-Building and Consent <i>Reach a workable agreement</i>	Convener-Selected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustained Dialogue Peacemaking Circles Search for Common Ground 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consensus Agreement Delpbi Methodology Settlement Agreement Negotiations
Type D: Oversight and Monitoring <i>Stakeholders or citizens share responsibilities for implementation</i>	Self-Selection or Convener-Selected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent Committees/ Teams 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Town Meetings Partnerships Study Circles

Adapted from: Addor (2011), O'Haire et al. (2011), Dalton and Harter (1998), and Jeffery (2009).

2.3.2 Type A Objectives (Information Sharing and Capacity Building)

For R-PP and earlier proposals to donors, most governments have focused on Type A objectives for stakeholder engagement in national and sub-national REDD+ Readiness planning over the past five years. There is an important role for Type A activities throughout all of the REDD+ phases, but these events provide little opportunity for discussion or stakeholder influence. It is easier for governments to share information than decision-making power.

For information sharing on REDD+ planning, most governments have relied heavily on large events with speeches and overly technical lectures. These types of open-access events with 75-plus participants can generate some momentum and high-level, government support for REDD+ Readiness planning. They can also be useful for stakeholder mapping and analysis. But with most time spent on speeches and lectures, they are not particularly effective venues for increasing knowledge, sharing ideas or building relationships. Large meetings have also been used in communities and districts to share information on project plans.

Capital city venues for national and sub-national planning have excluded many stakeholders.

National and provincial capital city venues are largely inaccessible to those who cannot afford the time or travel-related expenses, in particular the majority of rights holders who live in and around forested areas.

Conveners and participants come to activities with a wide range of expectations. Stakeholders have hoped to gain access to policy fora and networking opportunities. They have sought opportunities to develop new skills and capacities or obtain certifications for training. They have often expected consultation and

dialogue rather than one-way communication. In events at all levels, conveners and facilitators have aimed to actively manage stakeholder expectations about both processes and expected outcomes.

At all levels, there has been, and will continue to be, a great demand for information about REDD+ by all stakeholders. Many stakeholders feel that they cannot engage in REDD+ dialogue and consent processes without knowing more about REDD+. Stakeholders have appreciated balanced information from neutral informants and felt that some information providers and material has been biased. Better materials are needed, including simplification of technical matters and translation into local languages. Both materials and training approaches need to be tailored by educational levels, REDD+ literacy, etc. and shared widely. Civil society umbrella organizations can often be effective capacity builders and trainers of trainers, (e.g., with donor support, Nigeria's Climate Change Network took on the challenge of educating its 150 member organizations, at all levels, about climate change and REDD+) (S. Efik, pers. comm.). Apart from project-specific community work, there is a great need to find better ways to transmit REDD+ information vertically and horizontally.

Improving knowledge is particularly challenging in multi-stakeholder settings. Needs assessments for participants have not been conducted for many information sharing events. Capacity building activities events, with highly technical materials and passive learning approaches, often hit too low or too high for a mixed audience with varying capacities and backgrounds. Time is lost bringing new participants up to speed when organizations rotate participants over time. Capacity building experts suggest that active learning with smaller groups of similar stakeholders is likely to be more effective.

Beyond local and country approaches, there is also a role for multi-country capacity building. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) established an intensive nine-day seminar ("REDD University") for 250 stakeholders from DRC and 15 other African countries, supplemented by follow-up training and communication (i.e., sketches, documentaries and information pieces for national radio and television) (UN-REDD, 2010).

Combining methods has been effective. Zambia's newly established REDD+ Coordination Unit worked over a one-year period with stakeholders to enhance their understanding of REDD+ and involve them in the National REDD+ Strategy. The government held a multi-stakeholder orientation and training workshop with 75 participants, convened regular meetings with CSOs and conducted field surveys in nine provinces for the development of the Stakeholder Assessments and Engagement Plan (UN-REDD, 2011). Civil society conveners, such as CI, have also combined capacity building workshops with information sharing in Peru, Indonesia, and Madagascar (L. Barquin, pers. comm.). Information sharing and education about REDD+ can take forms other than workshops or webinars (e.g., a group of Brazil's CSOs created the Brazilian REDD Observatory to collect country-wide policy and project information in 2010 to support capacity-building and advocacy).

Sharing information may not necessarily lead to later consensus or consent. While balanced and relevant information in local languages is key to developing stakeholder awareness, ownership and appropriate expectations, it may still not be sufficient to reach agreements. The available information raises many legitimate concerns about land dispossession, tenure disputes and benefit distribution arrangement from new and untested market-based mechanisms tied to carbon emissions performance. Governments still cannot answer many questions about their national REDD+ strategies, benefits and distribution plans and the direction of future carbon markets.

2.3.3 Type B Objectives (Analysis of Issues)

Document review is a routine stakeholder engagement approach for many countries. These can be REDD+ strategies or technical reports (e.g., ecological and socioeconomic analyses of drivers of deforestation and land use, as well as governance and policy, legal, regulatory and governance analyses for creating favorable REDD+ frameworks). The reviewed documents include those prepared "in-house" by

government staff and consultants, as well as others resulting from broader input and involvement. Governments post documents and accept comments via websites, emails or postal services or via public meetings.

Some governments have adopted innovations with stakeholder input options for document distribution and review. For example, the Indonesian government distributes its documents and sets a deadline for input by email and SMS and also in hard copy at consultation meetings for those without email. At the village level, materials for review are translated into local languages, key themes are presented on local radio before meetings are held and the documents and invitations are issued via SMS and comments are accepted via SMS (H. Berliani, pers. comm.). The Government of Ghana is creating materials suitable for illiterate stakeholders under FCPF funding. Liberia, Kenya and Cameroon have experimented with community radio for REDD+ education under FCPF funding. In general, stakeholders have an interest in reviewing shorter, local language summaries tailored to specific audiences rather than the full 150-200 page documents.

Sufficient review time is needed. While a two to three-week period may meet a country's legal requirements for information sharing, it has often been insufficient for the stakeholders who have been asked to review 150-200 page documents.⁴ In addition to these methods, face-to-face multi-stakeholder meetings allow both horizontal and vertical dialogue.

Feedback and transparency build trust with stakeholders. Civil society expects the government to act in transparent and accountable ways in terms of recording and sharing stakeholder input, using document highlighting to show changes and explaining why some input was rejected. Stakeholders are often alienated when input is ignored or last-minute changes are made without stakeholder consultation and consensus.

Technical working groups convened by government and civil society have been another important opportunity for stakeholder engagement. These groups can be temporary or permanent technical working groups that include unpaid stakeholder experts from civil society, academia and sometimes the private sector. Stakeholders are not included for all topics, e.g., of Indonesia's 10 national working groups for REDD+ Readiness, five have civil society representatives (A. Mahaningtyas, pers. comm.). Government groups often operate under the auspices of the REDD+ coordinating body. These groups usually share their results to a wider group of stakeholders.

Civil society and indigenous experts and organizations have been asked by government to prepare consultant analyses for REDD+ planning. A wide range of topics have been addressed, however stand-alone and integrated gender analyses are still uncommon.

General-invitation consultation meetings are another means to gather data on specific issues for problem analysis for the R-PPs. General and specialized stakeholders have analyzed drivers of deforestation, land use and tenure, and governance problems. For general stakeholders, these discussions may take place in the context of an information sharing meeting. However, often indigenous and other vulnerable forest rights holders have not been invited to participate in these analyses.

Participatory analytical tools can help to open opportunities for stakeholder information and dialogue. In Nigeria and Indonesia, the governments are piloting a REDD-specific Participatory Governance Assessment. The methodology looks at the legal and policy framework, the capacity of REDD+ actors and implementation issues for spatial and forest planning, rights regulation, forest organization, forest management and control and REDD+ infrastructure. Stakeholders are involved in decisions about the process, focus, indicators and methodology, and they serve as reviewers of the initial roadmap (UN-REDD, 2011). In Indonesia, the Participatory Government Assessment's expert panel includes one representative from a civil society indigenous organization, one from a civil society think tank and one from academia, in addition to two from government, a legal specialist on REDD+ and a United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) senior advisor (UN-REDD, 2012).

For technical analyses, stakeholders have been most engaged on discussions of safeguard policies and impact assessment procedures. Work on both topics, at national and local levels, is still nascent. For example, the Government of DRC is working with a CSO to develop and pilot a comprehensive set of national and social environmental standards using UN-REDD's Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria. It has also held capacity building workshops for national level practitioners on multiple benefits and safeguards, which led to improvements to the National Programme Document (UN-REDD, 2011). In other countries, efforts are ongoing at the national and sub-national levels to adapt international REDD+ standards, developed by the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES) initiative, to the local conditions and needs.

Civil society generally can envision a wider range of topics and stakeholder opportunities for analysis, baseline setting and strategy development than is imagined by governments. While the R-PP Consultation and Participation Plans, safeguards and FPIC are obvious issues for stakeholder involvement, civil society has also indicated interest in "technical" analyses for highly contested issues (e.g., drivers of deforestation, land tenure and land use, REDD+ strategy options). Both civil society and academia have convened dialogue events.

Demand is high for specialized training on various REDD+ topics and also practical skills that enhance stakeholder capacities to analyze, monitor and advocate. For example, in 2011, the Government of PNG trained more than 30 people, including civil society and provincial government representatives, on basic remote sensing techniques and a separate workshop on MRV for university educators (UN-REDD, 2011).

2.3.4 Type C Objectives (Negotiation, Consensus-Building and Consent, including FPIC)

Most countries are not able to draw upon long histories of successful national and sub-national consensus-building or consent practices.⁵ Most of their stakeholder experiences have been limited to information sharing, capacity building, and analysis (Types A and B). Past forest policy and governance reform discussions, including those linked to European Union-funded Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Program, have been more focused on broad-based, national-level consultations when there has been sufficient government commitment and strong civil society (e.g., Ghana). However, FLEGT is not requiring countries to engage stakeholders (Global Witness, 2008).

Tying REDD+ to **larger, multi-stakeholder processes related to national development has contributed to consensus.** For example, the Government of DRC organized a 2011 workshop to define four prospective storylines for national development (UN-REDD, 2011) and the role of REDD+. The Government of PNG has linked REDD+ discussions to the formulation of its low-carbon development strategy. Vietnam has tied REDD+ to efforts related to the National Target Programme to address climate change (UN-REDD, 2009).

Consensus-building and consent practices are more advanced at local levels for REDD+ planning and other projects than at regional and national levels of governance. Experience indicates that sufficient information, time, trust and relationships are essential for consensus and consent. A number of practices have already been noted above, including acknowledging historical relationships, inclusive invitation processes, maintaining convener transparency and accountability, skilled and neutral facilitation and realistic methods and time frames. If consensus and/or consent are the objectives of conveners, then stakeholders need better and timely information and sufficient time to digest it. Both consensus and consent require much more extensive processes than validation to reach agreement on REDD+ related issues, such as substantive rights, benefits and protections from risks to land and resource rights. At national and regional levels, formation of alliances, collaborations and partnerships has contributed to consensus-building. However, governments are generally not sharing their authority to define problems or budget priorities, set up institutional architecture or determine pilot locations.

Inclusiveness is critical to the legitimacy and sustainability of consensus and consent. As noted above, some, but not all, key stakeholders have been involved; gender advocates, women, indigenous groups, forest-dependent communities and the private sector have been under-represented. Some countries are building consensus from the ground up. For example, Panama used broad-scale consultation with 11 Indigenous Congresses in combination with asking six indigenous experts, selected by the national indigenous coordinating body (*Coordinadora Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas de Panamá*/COONAPIP) to coordinate a technical review by 65 other individuals of Panama's National REDD+ Programme submission to UN-REDD. The six coordinating representatives were compensated for their time and work and possessed various types of technical expertise, including gender and law (UN-REDD, 2009).

Legal and government reforms are opportunities to support more meaningful stakeholder engagement in REDD+. Some countries, such as Mexico, have an existing institutional framework for environmental stakeholder engagement that predates REDD+. In Mexico, this framework includes a Consultative Committee on Sustainable Development, established after the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED, also known as the Rio Earth Summit) meeting, which operates at national, regional and state levels; Forestry Consultative Committees at the regional level; and the Protected Areas Committees in and around protected areas (M.E. Mesta, pers. comm.).

Both government and civil society have conducted consensus-building around some specific REDD+ issues. Stakeholders have had the greatest impact on consensus around safeguard issues (including FPIC), social impact assessment and reformulation of the driver of deforestation analyses in some countries. The Government of DRC held more than 30 thematic meetings with 400 people and 17 ministries in 2011 to generate consensus about the drivers of deforestation and degradation (UN-REDD, 2011). Three Brazilian CSOs of workers, rubber tappers and indigenous groups (i.e., *Grupo de Trabalho Amazônico, Conselho Nacional das Populações Extrativistas and Coordenação Indígenas da Amazônia Brasileira*)⁶ (Hasenclever, 2010) worked together with traditional communities and households in settlement projects to develop risk minimization principles and criteria for REDD+ project design and implementation. These three organizations held three regional meetings in Manaus, Porto Velho and Belem to solicit stakeholder input on the first version of the National REDD Standard developed by the multi-sectoral Standard Committee.

Stakeholders have been highly motivated to discuss the implementation rules for FPIC. Indonesia's three national-level consultations, which included more than 200-plus experts and other stakeholders, resulted in a set of FPIC implementation guidelines with national and provincial levels recommendations. It also began a pilot FPIC process in Central Sulawesi Province under the National Forestry Council (UN-REDD, 2011). PNG has completed a second version of its FPIC guidelines with civil society and Indigenous Peoples' participation (UN-REDD, 2011). The government of Panama, with Indigenous Peoples' representatives and CSOs, developed country guidance on FPIC and recourse mechanisms (UN-REDD, 2010). In Paraguay, indigenous groups have elaborated community-based protocols (G. Sriskanthan, pers. comm.).

Many implementation challenges remain for FPIC based on past experience. There are ongoing debates about the nature of FPIC, how past implementation hurdles can be overcome, and if the principles and protocols for FPIC can be applied to non-indigenous, but vulnerable, forest-dependent communities. While past indigenous consultations for projects have often been one-off consultation meetings aimed at socializing projects, FPIC aims to create activities and conditions in which Indigenous Peoples can "exercise their fundamental human rights to negotiate the terms of externally imposed policies, programs and activities that directly affect their livelihoods or well-being, and to give or withhold their consent to them (Anderson, 2011)." Many countries already have a poor track record for applying FPIC principles to mining and infrastructure development activities,⁷ the legal status of FPIC is unclear and guidance has been inadequate. FPIC reforms have also not been a consistent part of discussions about REDD-related policy, legal, administrative and governance reforms.

FPIC pilots have had varying levels of success. FPIC has not been a part of many local level REDD+ processes: there are debates about whether it should be required by funders for all REDD+ projects. When it has been undertaken, conveners have often been unable to offer complete information (i.e., plans, timing, benefits, risks and processes) to community residents. In Vietnam, the first country to proceed with formal preparations for field-based REDD+ activities, piloted FPIC in 78 communities in two districts of Lam Dong Province. External reviewers of a six-month FPIC process (Nguyen Quang Tan et al, 2010) noted that teams spent only two hours in each community, used an overly rigid meeting structure that focused only on project benefits, allowed too little time for community discussion, did not allow communities to have internal discussions about consent after the visit, did not establish grievance resolution mechanisms and did not make public announcements about the outcome of the community meetings. A Brazilian two-year FPIC process in Rondonia State for the Suruí Forest Carbon Project (Blomley and Richards, 2011) represented collaboration among international and Brazilian project partners, an indigenous representative organization and its local grassroots social and political organization partners. The process included technical meetings, community assemblies and 10 village-level information sessions and internal meetings of the indigenous leadership. The result was a cooperative agreement, signed by the four clans representing the Suruí indigenous communities and representing their autonomous decision to support a REDD+ project that aligns with their Fifty-Year Plan and equitably shares benefits across all communities involved.

2.3.5 Type D Objectives (Oversight and Monitoring Roles)

Box 6: Community-based Monitoring

REDD+ will require monitoring of carbon stocks as well as non-carbon elements, such as land tenure, biodiversity, human rights, benefit sharing and modes for participation. Although the means by which Indigenous Peoples and local communities will be involved have yet to be determined, the role of these stakeholders in monitoring is referred to in the UNFCCC Cancun Agreements (UNFCCC, 2010).

Community-based monitoring for REDD+ can:

- **Be cost effective** – community-based monitoring costs one-third to half the costs of monitoring by external consultants (Skutsch et al, 2011)
- **Ground truth remote sensing data** – remote sensing based methods still need to be supplemented with ground-based methods to ensure accuracy of emissions reporting (Schelhas et al, 2010)
- **Increase frequency of monitoring** – information must be collected regularly and communities are well-positioned to monitor over longer periods and with greater frequency (Rist, 2010)
- **Increase understanding of social and cultural impacts** – in addition to carbon monitoring, communities are well-placed to collect information on socio-economic impacts, benefit sharing processes, modes for participation in decision-making and biodiversity

For countries that have already established National REDD+ Committees for oversight, some have reserved seats for only one or two civil society and indigenous representatives. These committees commonly set priorities and determine work plans, control budgets and benefit distribution, oversee impact monitoring and grievance resolution mechanisms. Governments commonly appoint the stakeholder representatives. Some choices appear to be driven by politics (e.g., excluding indigenous representatives due to recent political unrest) and also result from oversight (e.g., missing gender balance and advocates). The limited representation of stakeholders can appear to be tokenism, but is a step forward for some countries that have not allowed stakeholder oversight in the past (e.g., Cambodia).

Political will and donor support have encouraged some countries to go beyond tokenism for stakeholder representation on national committees. Despite past tensions from its civil war, the Government of DRC passed a decree in 2009 that specified that the REDD National Committee will include one environmental and rural development NGO representative, two representatives from Indigenous Peoples and other forest communities, one representative from a research NGO, along with government, private sector and academic representatives (UN-REDD, 2009).

Civil society generally envisions a wider range of monitoring roles for stakeholders than the government does. Civil society has proposed participatory monitoring at local and higher levels (e.g., benefit distribution, impact assessment, and application of

mitigation measures) by stakeholders or neutral parties. Many countries already have experience with local level participatory monitoring of impacts to improve transparency and ownership.

Civil society is already monitoring the quality and effectiveness of stakeholder engagement in many countries. Monitoring done by Indigenous Peoples and local communities (of both carbon emissions and removals and non-carbon elements) enables their participation in designing and implementing national REDD+ strategies, as explicitly mandated in the Cancun Agreements (UNFCCC, 2010) (see Box 6).

The cross-cutting nature of REDD+ has lent itself to broader stakeholder involvement in oversight and monitoring. Cambodia's National Committee for REDD+ has included multiple government agencies and civil society stakeholders (F. Pinto, pers. comm.), in contrast to the committee for its Cambodia's National Forest Program. Indonesia has chosen to locate primary responsibility for REDD+ at the national level to units or committees other than forestry departments.

Temporary and permanent bodies for oversight of benefit distribution, grievance resolution and impact monitoring for carbon projects are still at a very early stage. Most of the early organization has been undertaken by civil society. Early examples should be shared more widely (e.g., the Government of Vietnam and civil society representatives designed an equitable benefit distribution system in 2009 [UN-REDD, 2009]).

2.4 LESSONS LEARNED AND PROMISING PRACTICES FOR SPECIFIC GROUPS

2.4.1 Gender Advocates and Women

At all levels, and within most stakeholder groups for REDD+, there are gender differences in REDD+ stakes, interests and rights. The literature on gender issues and women's participation in REDD+ is still quite limited and most of it focuses on local level gender issues. These issues include access to, and ownership of land and other natural resources, project benefits and impact distribution by sex. Box 7 elaborates the gender issues relevant for four types of stakeholder engagement based on past gender work in related sectors. (Similar analyses could also be done for other specific stakeholder groups).

Women and gender advocates have been underrepresented at all levels of REDD+ discussions and capacity building, despite international and national commitments to gender equality. From local to international level, the absence of equal numbers of men and women, regardless of stakeholder group, have been noted. Women from indigenous and other forest-dependent communities are particularly underrepresented. Countries are not routinely including governmental and civil society gender advocates to REDD+ processes at national and sub-national levels. However, Nigeria has made a point to include gender ministry representatives (S. Efik, pers. comm.) and Mexico (M. E. Mesta, pers. comm.) has included governmental, civil society and indigenous representatives who are gender advocates to discuss the distribution of benefits under national REDD+ strategies and formulate strategies to increase women's participation. The International Union for Conservation of Nature's (IUCN) Gender Unit, Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resources (WOCAN) and Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO) have been profiling gender issues and differences in representation. IUCN has piloted a potential model for engaging gender advocates (see Box 8). UN-REDD recently made the business case for REDD-related gender mainstreaming (Rutherford, 2011) and was planning to conduct a gender review of its program and gender guidance development (S. Haugland, pers. comm.).

Box 7: Relevant Gender Issues by Stakeholder Engagement Types

Stakeholder Engagement Objectives	Relevant Gender Issues
General Considerations for Type A-D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equal representation of women in meetings, workshops, trainings • Skilled facilitation to ensure women's active participation • Materials appropriate for language and literacy levels of targeted audience • Logistics and locations of meetings to adapt to men and women's availability and mobility • Inclusion of gender experts and representatives of gender advocacy organizations
Type A: Information Sharing and Capacity Building	<p>Connection between gender issues and REDD+ made in basic information sharing and training events, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for pilot project participation • Possible impacts on land ownership and rights • Likely benefits, incentives and gender-equitable distribution plans • Ideas for measuring social impacts on women and men • Options for resolving grievances and accommodations for men and women's barriers • Cultivation of stronger capacities, via tailored factual information and gender-specific skill development in leadership, communications, facilitation and advocacy
Type B: Analysis of Issues	<p>Gender analysis and gender baseline information by REDD+ themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gendered land use and roles in deforestation and forest degradation • Gendered patterns of ownership and rights to land and other natural resources and opportunities for greater gender equity • Women's representation in governance and gender barriers to institutions, processes, services and inputs • Gender barriers and opportunities created by laws, policies and regulations and proposed reforms
Type C: Negotiation, Consensus-Building and Consent	<p>Dialogue, prioritization and consensus regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for pilot project participation and benefit distribution, including gender criteria • Land ownership and resource rights requirements and options to mitigate gender differences • Gender-sensitive conflict management mechanisms • Safeguard protections for vulnerable groups and women among those groups • Gender-equitable distribution plans for various types of benefits, including those of particular interest to women, i.e., credit, technology, community benefits • Plans for measuring and monitoring social impacts on women and men • Plans for resolving grievances and accommodations for men and women's barriers • Rules and procedures for obtaining FPIC from men and women in indigenous and other forest-dependent vulnerable communities
Type D: Oversight and Monitoring Roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Men and women's equitable representation and respective roles in oversight functions for various REDD+ bodies and programs • Men and women's roles in monitoring activities at various levels and monitoring of gender-related impacts, both positive and negative

Both gender analyses and gender monitoring are still uncommon. Gender analyses have been more common at the local level for REDD+ pilot projects (e.g., Nepal [WOCAN and the Himalayan Grassroots Women's Natural Resource Management Association, 2012], Cambodia [Boudewijn, 2012]) than other levels. They are still uncommon as part of national readiness studies or for multi-country comparisons (e.g., gender issues for REDD+ are discussed for Asia in the 2011 USAID-commissioned report (Gurung et al, 2011) and gender mainstreaming practices for the REDD+ national planning process in three Congo Basin countries (Peach Brown, 2011)). Results of the latter were not promising: only two of three countries discussed gender issues in their National Adaptation Programs of Action and R-PPs, and all three ignored gender issues and representation in their agendas and invitations for workshops and committees. In terms of monitoring, tracking participants by sex is more common for local events than for sub-national and national events. There is almost no information available on the quality and impact of men and women's participation or how gender issues are addressed in REDD+ plans.

Some REDD+ capacity building activities are adapting their agendas and methodologies to address gender issues and encourage women's participation. In some Indonesian communities, gender issues were integrated into local REDD+ workshops (UN-REDD, 2011). In 2012, trainers from local members of the Cambodian NGO Forum modified one of their four provincial workshops to focus on the knowledge, interests and preferences of indigenous women (F. Pinto, pers. comm.). Since the participants would be coming from multiple provinces, the emphasis shifted to relationship building and they used a less formal and more participatory teaching approach with increased time for discussion. Rather than starting with abstract discussion about climates and markets, they began with active group discussions about women's roles in managing and making decisions about natural resources and forests before shifting to more technical and detailed information on REDD+.

Box 8: Gender and REDD+ National-level Road Maps

At the national level, IUCN worked in three countries: IUCN's 2011 initiative in Cameroon, Ghana and Uganda under its Pro-Poor REDD+ Project. The initiative used multi-stakeholder processes to develop Gender and REDD+ national-level Road Maps for readiness, implementation and consolidation. In each country, a three-day national-level REDD+ introductory workshop with women's organizations and gender experts was followed by a two-day REDD+ policy maker workshop with some gender participants from the earlier workshop. During the second workshop, the participants generated gender mainstreaming ideas for a country-specific REDD+ Road Map. In a separate document, IUCN has elaborated some gender considerations for specific components of what is now the R-PP.

Source: Aguilar, L. and A. Sasvari. (nd). *Gender equality within the REDD and REDD-plus framework*. IUCN, Costa Rica.

Gender integration guidance is available for community-based REDD+ pilot projects but is lacking for national and regional government REDD+ planning activities. Besides gender guidance from past forestry and agriculture projects (e.g., the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [FAO] [FAO, 1995], World Bank [World Bank, 2009]), some of the early REDD+ documents for project design or impact monitoring have advice regarding gender integration strategies.

2.4.2 Indigenous Peoples and other Poor Forest-Dependent Communities

Government engagement and relations with stakeholders from indigenous and other forest-dependent⁸ communities predate REDD-related planning and projects. There are national and local historic, cultural, policy and economic dimensions and sensitivities surrounding these relations and social status. For indigenous groups, their rights, control of land and political power vary significantly, even among groups in the same country (e.g., Bolivia) and for voluntarily isolated groups who must depend on indigenous federations and other advocates. Indigenous groups generally have less social, economic and political power than other ethnic groups. Like others in remote locations, they lack secure access to land and other natural resources and their livelihood options are more limited. In some cases, REDD+ planning has led to increasing government openness to discussions of indigenous land rights and representation (e.g., Indonesia).

In terms of stakeholder engagement, indigenous and other forest-dependent people are still underrepresented at national and sub-national levels. Over time, an increasing number of organizational representatives have been attending REDD+ information sharing events. However, there is usually not a critical mass of men and women community representatives present due to financial and logistical hurdles. Many potentially affected communities remain unreached due to budget constraints for government and civil society. On an unofficial basis, indigenous organizations in some countries are forming their own national and regional level REDD+ groups (e.g., Peru and Ecuador), which operate in parallel, and sometimes overlap with other civil society REDD+ groups.

Indigenous experts and communities have provided technical input for analyses (Type B activities). Indigenous groups do not see their only expert roles as limited to consultation on social issues (e.g., R-PP Consultation and Participation Plans, safeguard parameter setting, FPIC, benefit and risk distribution, impact monitoring and grievance mechanisms). They have made important inputs into analyses of land use,

deforestation/degradation drivers and feasible strategies. Their inputs have advanced multiple benefit concepts of REDD+ by looking at non-monetized cultural values and highlighted power issues between the winners and losers of new REDD+ financing arrangements. Beyond official channels, indigenous groups and networks have also provided their input and opinions via the media and direct relations with donors (e.g., Ecuador and Honduras).

Most negotiation, consensus-building and consent activities (Type C) with indigenous and forest-dependent people are taking place within a project context at the local level. Some of these processes respect and accommodate local indigenous mechanisms for political deliberation and decision-making, while others impose external structures, methodologies and rushed timeframes.⁹

Indigenous representation for oversight and monitoring (Type D) has been limited at higher scales but there are some local examples. Governments seldom reserve more than one indigenous seat on national REDD+ committees, despite differences of interests among indigenous groups and the importance of critical mass for minorities on committees. The REDD+ decision-making bodies of UN-REDD countries are supposed to have at least one-third of their members from civil society and Indigenous Peoples organizations (G. Sriskanthan, pers. comm.), but approval of UN-REDD funding has been given, in some cases, without this condition being met.

One of the great challenges of REDD+ is to build local knowledge and negotiation skills for indigenous and other forest-dependent communities. As noted above, the locations and logistical hurdles for national outreach activities are not conducive to the participation of community members. There have been scattered efforts by civil society to do site-based trainings and information sharing regarding REDD+ and national plans and to use trained local focal points for two-way dissemination of information. Other countries are tapping government ministries in charge of indigenous affairs to disseminate REDD+ information to very remote communities (e.g., video production by FUNAI in Brazil) or using community radio in Africa and Indonesia. In general, still too few practical, large-scale strategies are being proposed to create an informed constituency of direct stake and rights holders.

Very little attention has been given to engaging other marginalized groups, including ethnic and caste social minorities, as well as the very poor, the elderly or youth and the disabled. Both indigenous groups and social minorities often are the poorest people in forested areas. Social analyses have helped pilot projects to include people of different ages and minority identities and integrate these representatives into dialogue events and training workshops. Local partners, such as Nepal's community forest user groups and federation, can be well-positioned to represent and/or understand the most appropriate, culturally specific ways to engage social minorities as potential REDD+ beneficiaries. There has been no attention given to the intersection of the rights of the disabled and their involvement in and impacts from REDD+ benefits and risks. These groups should be included in plans for benefit distribution, particularly when benefits will be distributed for community-level projects.

2.4.3 Private Sector

Private sector actors with potential stakes in REDD+ are not a uniform group with homogenous interests. They include individual companies, federations and trade associations engaged in extractive and productive activities (e.g., forestry, oil palm production, ranching, large-scale farming) and also the financial sector. Even within the same sector, opinions and strategies differ—some do not want to risk being seen with others to avoid accusations of collusion. Some private sector actors are underrepresented by formal groups (e.g., Brazilian smallholders) (F. Daviet, pers. comm.). Trade unions are REDD+ stakeholders in Brazil, but their involvement elsewhere is less apparent.

The actual extent of involvement of the private sector in multi-stakeholder REDD+ processes is not clear. Private sector involvement is both public and private, and the latter is difficult to monitor. Industries involved in deforestation (e.g., agriculture, mining or road development) have not consistently been part of

multi-stakeholder processes, but are thought to be involved in private meetings with government (A. Mahaningtyas, pers. comm.). Representatives from different sectors have sometimes joined REDD+ information sharing events, participated in reviews of technical documents, been appointed to working groups and been part of national REDD+ committees (e.g., Peru).

Engaging business via broader green economy and/or low carbon development dialogue. While forestry and agricultural operators see a clear interest in engaging with REDD+ discussions, those in other sectors may not see their connection to the green economy being strictly focused on REDD+. An approach focused on green economy and low carbon development has motivated participation by different sectors in business fora (e.g., West Papua Province, Indonesia) (P. Wood, pers. comm.).

3.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 CONCLUSIONS

Stakeholder engagement in REDD+ planning and implementation, at all levels, is a question of both human rights and sustainability. The Cancun REDD+ safeguards explicitly call for stakeholder engagement. Participation rights are enshrined in international agreements, both for human rights and the environment, and within many national constitutions and legal frameworks. Multilateral REDD+ financing mechanisms and donors have supported this stakeholder engagement and play an important role in encouraging inclusive approaches to REDD+. Civil society has pushed for more meaningful participation and institutionalization of engagement for environmental and other forms of governance. Stakeholder engagement is also seen as a means to achieve more sustainable policies, programs and projects, which reflect stakeholder priorities, knowledge and ownership of implementation.

General stakeholder engagement principles (and recommendations) for REDD+ consultations, summarized in the FCPF and UN-REDD joint guidance (FCPF and UN-REDD, 2011), are consistent with past lessons learned and cut across all levels. They call upon conveners of REDD+ processes to:

- Recognize stakeholder diversity and hear the voices of forest-dependent and vulnerable groups
- Include a broad range of relevant stakeholders at national and local levels
- Give special emphasis to issues of land tenure, resource use rights and property rights
- Start prior to the design phase and apply principles at every stage of the REDD+ process, including planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting and with adequate lead time
- Facilitate dialogue and timely and transparent exchange of information
- Lead to consensus building that reflects broad community support
- Include impartial, accessible and fair accessible mechanisms for grievance, conflict resolution and redress throughout the process and implementation of REDD+ policies and measures
- Include records of consultations and report back on the outcomes of the consultations to stakeholders via public disclosure arrangements that are in a culturally appropriate form (including in local languages) and document how and why views were taken into account or not.

REDD+ is shaped by the history of governance issues in the forest sector, which has often been challenged by lack of transparency and accountability. Nonetheless, meaningful stakeholder engagement has taken place in the forest sector, at least at local levels, as evidenced by several decades of community-based forestry, natural resources management and conservation. Such changes in both governance and management are not always easy—they take time and costs and risks exist for all involved. A less promising track record, however, exists for meaningful stakeholder engagement and power sharing at national and regional government levels. While legal frameworks have improved and governments are increasingly holding at least information sharing meetings, challenges still exist with institutionalizing these practices, trying different methodologies and changing staff attitudes and skills. Governments have been slower to adopt approaches in which they share power with non-governmental actors (i.e., consensus, consent, oversight and monitoring) over forestry decision-making. At all scales, authentic stakeholder engagement can take place only when sufficient political will exists to share power, build trust, commit resources and invest in the human capacity.

Many general lessons about stakeholder engagement should be applied to REDD+ processes, but some REDD-specific challenges exist. REDD+ is new and evolving, and involves multiple sectors. Most government and other stakeholders require primers on climate change and carbon markets. REDD+ casts the land rights and cultural values of some of the most vulnerable people in the world against emerging and potentially volatile international markets. Arrangements for benefits and likelihood of risks are unclear. Safeguard protocols are still being developed. Even when governments agree to follow FPIC, there is little experience to draw upon, the information to be shared is incomplete, and it is not clear that refusal of consent by indigenous communities or organizations will be acceptable to government or the private sector. Risks to rights may even be greater for poor, non-indigenous groups who also depend upon forests but lack tenure security and their own advocacy organizations. Challenges are serious, but not insurmountable: transparency, accountability and fairness are key to ensuring stakeholder engagement over time.

3.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

3.2.1 Key Recommendations

Much more can be done by countries during REDD+ development and implementation, especially with REDD+ Readiness planning and activities, and national REDD+ Strategies, to clarify how risks will be mitigated and benefits distributed, and to share oversight and monitoring power with stakeholders. Continued donor support for stakeholder engagement is critical. The requirements and guidance of multilateral REDD+ financing mechanisms and donors may still be insufficient to sway the governments that remain uncommitted to reforming their environmental governance by routinely including stakeholder engagement throughout REDD+ Readiness and Implementation processes. Governments must be willing to address the procedural rights of stakeholders to be informed. They need to not only engage with stakeholders on general REDD+ topics, but also engage stakeholders on issues related to substantive rights to land, resources, livelihoods and other potential REDD+ benefits, as well as stakeholder roles in social impact monitoring.

Very little systematic monitoring of REDD+ stakeholder engagement experiences, lessons learned and promising practices has been done. As REDD+ countries move into implementation of their Readiness Consultation and Participation Plans, donors should keep close oversight of how well they follow these plans and the results of stakeholder input. If collected, this information could be shared across countries. Country leaders in stakeholder engagement could put “peer pressure” on other countries live up to international standards for the quality and extent of stakeholder engagement. Donor support for civil society strengthening, particularly at sub-national levels, will be critical. The international REDD+ community has an important, continuing role in promoting stakeholder engagement as an ongoing process throughout REDD+.

3.2.2 Recommendations for Countries Implementing REDD+

Advance stakeholder engagement and inclusiveness:

- Increase inclusiveness through stakeholder analysis, and build on past experience with modified invitation and communication processes, and logistical accommodations
- Initiate stakeholder engagement as early as possible and continue on an ongoing basis
- Increase the use of gender-sensitive stakeholder analyses at early stages of REDD+ planning, to identify gender issues and gender advocates
- Improve participation of indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities, by providing adequate time for informing, building capacity, consensus and support among these stakeholders, broaden their participation in REDD+ processes and standing committees, and develop better local language materials and methods to reach these groups
- Increase outreach to, and inclusion of, private sector in public, mixed, stakeholder events
- Develop more balanced analyses of private sector roles in deforestation and place moratoriums on concessions during REDD+ Readiness planning

- Engage business via larger Low Emissions Development Strategies or Green Economy Planning
- Build trust through transparency, accountability and allocation of adequate time for dialogue and decision-making
- Increase consensus building efforts around procedural rights of, and protections for, stakeholders (including FPIC) and benefit distribution
- Use REDD+ related reforms to institutionalize stakeholder engagement [as a broader principle] via policies, laws, and regulations

Improve the level of engagement of stakeholders:

- Support civil society-led REDD+ information sharing and capacity building at local levels by improving information flows and representation across scales via REDD+ roundtable models, reserving seats and providing sufficient notice
- Provide opportunities for smaller groups and more interactive dialogues, and provide stakeholders with information in multiple ways and with shorter documents
- Expand stakeholder roles as technical contributors by engaging communities and civil society partners in participatory baseline setting and monitoring of social and environmental impacts
- Pilot FPIC models in all countries with indigenous and forest-dependent communities
- Experiment with ways to increase power-sharing between government and stakeholders at national and sub-national levels
- Institutionalize stakeholder roles in oversight processes: ensure critical mass and gender balance by allowing civil society to elect its own representatives for reserved seats on oversight bodies
- Use REDD+ related reforms to institutionalize stakeholder engagement via policies, laws and regulations

Methods and capacity building:

- Expand the repertoire of methods used for all four types of stakeholder engagement objectives
- Develop models and methods that can scale up
- Support capacity building for facilitators and stakeholders (i.e., general, specialized skills) across countries, including targeted capacity building for specific groups

3.2.3 Recommendations for Donors and Multilateral REDD+ Financing Mechanisms

Requirements and standards:

- Harmonize requirements and standards of donors and multilateral REDD+ financing mechanisms
- Send consistent signals about stakeholder engagement through strengthened country requirements and standards, internal proposal review procedures and approval criteria
- Require that prior to submissions of proposals for additional REDD+ support, such as R-PP submissions, require improved stakeholder engagement, through: (1) mandatory stakeholder analyses, including gender analyses, (2) mandatory participation of gender advocates and indigenous advocates in "validation" meetings, and (3) both national and sub-national level meetings for validation

Reporting:

- Standardize reporting expectations, indicators and standards for stakeholder engagement
- Improve reporting procedures for identifying stakeholder organizational or community affiliations, sex, ethnicity and numbers during REDD+ Readiness preparations

Guidance and capacity building:

- Prioritize donor support for local capacity building modalities that can be scaled up to reach many communities

- Increase support and guidance (e.g., gender manual or additions to other guidance, technical support to advance gender mainstreaming)
- Continue to support learning and disseminating effective FPIC protocols and implementation

Monitoring:

- Improve systematic monitoring of stakeholder engagement experiences under REDD+ Consultation and Participation Plans
- Expand learning across and within countries about effective stakeholder engagement practices via a learning-based, community of practice

REFERENCES

- AccountAbility. (2011). *A100 Stakeholder Engagement Standard 2011*: Final Exposure Draft.
- Accra Caucus on Forests and Climate Change. (2011). *Is REDD-readiness taking us in the right direction: Case studies from the Accra Caucus*. Accra: Accra Caucus on Forests and Climate Change.
- Addor, M.L. (2011). *Generation Z: What is the Future of Stakeholder Engagement?* 2011 Faculty Fellows Paper, Institute for Emerging Issues. Raleigh: North Carolina State University.
- Aguilar, L., & A. Sasvari. (n.d.). *Gender equality within the REDD and REDD-plus framework*. Costa Rica: IUCN.
- Anderson, P. (2011). *Free, Prior and Informed Consent in REDD+: Principles and approaches for policy and project development*. Bangkok: The Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC) and GTZ-Asia.
- Angelsen, A., Streck, C., Peskett, L., Brown, J. and Luttrell, C. (2008). *What is the right scale for REDD? The implications of national, sub-national and nested approaches*. CIFOR Infobrief #15. Retrieved from http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/Infobrief/015-infobrief.pdf
- Arenstein, S.R. (1969). *A ladder of citizen participation*. Journal of the American Planning Association. 35 (4): 216-224.
- Australian Government, Department of Immigration and Citizenship. (2008). *Stakeholder Engagement Practitioner Handbook*. Australian Department of Immigration and Citizenship - National Communications Branch, Canberra.
- Barquin, Luís. Interview, August 17, 2012.
- Berliani, Hasbi. Interview, August 13, 2012.
- Blomley, T., & Richards, M. (2011). *Building forest carbon projects. Community engagement guidance: Good practice for forest carbon projects*. Washington, DC: Forest Trends.
- Boudewijn, I. (2012). *REDD+ and Community Forestry in Oddar Meanchey: Inclusion and Benefit Sharing*. Unpublished research.
- Chiu, Marco. Interview, August 16, 2012.
- Climate Investment Funds (n.d.). *Forest Investment Program*. Retrieved from <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/node/5>
- Conservation International (CI). (March 2012). *REDD+ Stakeholder Engagement Assessment Methodological Framework* Retrieved from http://www.conservation.org/Documents/CI_REDDplus-Stakeholder-Engagement-Analysis-Methodology.pdf
- Dalton, D., & Harter, P. J. (1998). *Better decisions through consultation and collaboration*. EPA, Washington, DC.
- Dooley, K., Griffiths, T., Martone, F., & Ozinga, S. (2011). *Smoke and Mirrors: A critical assessment of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility*. FERN, Moreton in Marsh, United Kingdom and Forest Peoples Programme (FPP), Moreton in Marsh, United Kingdom.
- Efik, Surveyor. Interview, August 12, 2012

- Environmental Council. (n.d.). *The Environment Council's Principles of Authentic Engagement*. Retrieved from <http://www.the-environment-council.org.uk/what-we-do/authentic-engagement.html>.
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (1995). *Gender Analysis and Forestry Training Package*. Rome: FAO.
- Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF). (2009). *National consultation and participation for REDD*. Washington, DC: FCPF.
- FCPF. (2011). *FCPF Charter* (Revised May 11, 2011). Washington, DC: FCPF
- FCPF. (2012). *Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) Template*, Version 6 Working Draft. Washington, DC and UN-REDD, Geneva: FCPC.
- FCPF. (2012). *FCPF Capacity Building Programs for Forest-Dependent Peoples and Southern Civil Society Organizations* (FMT Note 2012-5). Washington, DC: FCPF.
- FCPF & United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD Programme). (2011). *A Draft Framework for Sharing Approaches for Better Multi-Stakeholder Participation Practices*. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.org/publications/tabid/587/Default.aspx>
- FCPF & UN-REDD Programme. (2011). *Draft guidelines on stakeholder engagement in REDD+ Readiness with a focus on the Participation of Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent communities*. Washington, DC and UN-REDD, NY: FCPF.
- Friends of the Earth International. (2010). *REDD: The realities in black and white*. Amsterdam: Friends of the Earth International Secretariat.
- Global Witness. (2008). *Honest engagement: Transparency and civil society participation in REDD*. London: Global Witness
- Gurung, J., Giri, K., Setyowati, A.B., & Lebow, E. (2011). *Getting REDD+ Right for Women: An analysis of the barriers and opportunities for women's participation in the REDD+ sector in Asia*. USAID. Retrieved from <http://www.forestcarbonasia.org>.
- Harvey, C.A., Zerback, O., Papageorgiou, S. & Parra, A. (2010). *What is needed to make REDD+ work on the ground? Lessons learned from pilot forest carbon initiatives*. Arlington, VA: Conservation International.
- Hasenclever, L. & Shankland, A. (n.d.). *Challenges for the real participation of Indigenous Peoples in REDD+*. Poverty in Focus.
- Hasenclever, L. (2010). *Civil society engages in a (sic) open debate about REDD* (Unpublished article). Brazil: IIEB.
- International Association for Public Participation (IAP2). (2007). Downloaded on August 15, 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.iap2.org>.
- International Finance Corporation (IFC). (2007). *Stakeholder Engagement: A Good Practice Handbook for Companies Doing Business in Emerging Markets*. Washington, DC: IFC.
- International Rivers (n.d.). *The World Commission on Dams*. Retrieved from <http://www.internationalrivers.org/campaigns/the-world-commission-on-dams>
- Jeffery, N. (2009). *Stakeholder engagement: a road map to meaningful engagement*. Bedford, UK: Doughty Centre, Cranfield School of Management, Cranfield University.

Lovera, S. (2008). *The hottest REDD Issues: Rights, equity, development, deforestation and governance by indigenous peoples and local communities*. Gland, Switzerland: Global Forest Coalition, Asunción (Paraguay) and IUCN-Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policies.

Mahaningtyas, Avi. Interview, August 10, 2012.

Meridian Institute. (2009). *REDD Options Assessment Report*. Report commissioned by the Government of Norway's International Climate and Forest Initiative. Washington, DC: The Meridian Institute.

Mesta, Maria Elena. Interview, August 17, 2012.

Moss, N., Nussbaum, R., Muchemi, J., & Halverson, E. (2011). *A review of the three REDD+ safeguard initiatives*. Geneva, Switzerland and Washington, DC: UN-REDD Programme and FCPF.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). (n.d.). *Introduction to stakeholder participation. Social Science Tools for Coastal Programs*. Charleston, SC: NOAA Coastal Services Center.

O'Haire, C., McPheeters, & M., Nakamoto, E. (2011). *Engaging stakeholders to identify and prioritize future research needs*. Appendix G: Strengths and limitations of Stakeholder Engagement Methods. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>.

Olander, J. & J. Ebeling. (2011). *Building forest carbon projects: Step-by-step overview and guide*. Washington, DC: Forest Trends.

Open Government Partnership. (2011). *Open Government Declaration*. Retrieved from <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/open-government-declaration>.

Overseas Development Institute (ODI). (January 2009). *Mapping Political Context: Stakeholder Analysis*. Retrieved from www.odi.org.uk/publications/5530-stakeholder-analysis

Peach Brown, H.C. (2011). *Gender, climate change and REDD+ in the Congo Basin forests of Central Africa*. International Forestry Review. 13 (2):163-176.

Peskett, L. & Brockhaus, M. 2009. *When REDD+ goes national: a review of realities, opportunities and challenges*, pp. 25-43 in Angelsen, Arild, Ed. *Realising REDD+ National strategy and policy options*. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.

Pinto, Femi. Interview, August 4, 2012.

Nguyen Quang Tan, Luong Thi Truong, Nguyen Thi Hai Van, & K*Tip. (2010). *Evaluation and verification of the Free, Prior and Informed Consent Process under the UN-REDD Programme in Lam Dong Province, Vietnam*. Bangkok: RECOFTC - The Center for People and Forests.

Quesada-Aguilar, A. & L. Aguilar. (n.d). Chapter 4.3. *Gender and REDD+ road maps in Cameroon, Ghana and Uganda*. Costa Rica: IUCN.

Rapp, Kenn. Interview, September 4, 2012.

REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES). (2012). *Draft REDD+ SES Version 2*. Retrieved from <http://www.redd-standards.org>.

REDD in Brazil (2011). *REDD Countries: A database of REDD activities on the ground*. Retrieved from the REDD Desk http://www.theredddesk.org/countries/brazil/readiness_overview.

Reed, Mark. S. (2008). *Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review*. Biological Conservation 141 (2008) 2417-2431.

- Ribot, J.C. (2011). *Seeing REDD for Local Democracy: A Call for Democracy Standards*. Common Voices. (Vol. 3). January 2011, pp. 14-16.
- Richards, M. & Panfil, S. (2011). *Social and biodiversity impact assessment (SSBLA) manual for REDD+ projects: Part 1 - Core guidance for project proponents*. (Version 2). Washington, DC: Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance, Forest Trends, Fauna and Flora International, and Rainforest Alliance.
- Rist, L., R. U. Shaanker, et al. (2010). *The use of traditional ecological knowledge in forest management: An example from India*. Ecology and Society 15(1).
- Rubio, H., Sandoval, M., Barquin, L., & Turriate, K. (2012). *Una aproximacion a la Participacion Plena y Efectiva en las iniciativas REDD+ en el Perú*. Lima: Conservation International.
- Rutherford, K. (2011). *The business case for mainstreaming gender in REDD+*. Geneva: UN-REDD.
- Schelhas, J. et al. (2010). *Opportunities and capacity for community-based forest carbon sequestration and monitoring in Ghana*. In: *Nature & Faune: Enhancing natural resource management for food security in Africa*. F. N.-A. Bojang, A.: 41-45.
- Sey, Haddy, Interview, September 4, 2012
- Shankland, A. & Hasenclever, L. (2011). *Indigenous Peoples and the regulation of REDD+ in Brazil: Beyond the war of the worlds?* IDS Bulletin 42 (3), May 2011.
- Skutsch, Margaret, et al. (2011). *The Costs and Reliability of Forest Carbon Monitoring by Communities*. Chapter 6 in *Community Forestry Monitoring for the Carbon Market: Opportunities under REDD+*. Edited by Margaret McCall Skutsch. London: Earthscan.
- Sriskanthan, Gayathri. Interview, August 14, 2012.
- Stakeholder Research Associates Canada Inc. (SRA), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) & AccountAbility. (2005). *The Stakeholder Engagement Manual. Volume 1: The Guide to Practitioners' Perspectives on Stakeholder Engagement*. Ontario, CA: Stakeholder Research Associates Canada Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.accountability.org/images/content/2/0/207.pdf>
- Stern, N. (2006). *Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Terra Global Capital. (2012). *Reduced emissions from degradation and deforestation in community forests - Oddar Meanchey, Cambodia*. Project design document for validation under Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard (Version 3-0). Washington, DC and San Francisco, CA: Terra Global Capital.
- Torfaen County Borough Council (TCBC). (2006). *Working towards more effective and sustainable brownfields revitalisation policies*. Stakeholder engagement - a toolkit. Torfaen, UK: UK:REVIT.
- United Nations Development Group (UNDG). (n.d.). *Mainstreaming Environmental Sustainability in Country Analysis and the UNDAF: A Guidance Note for United Nations Country Teams and Implementing Partners Teams*. Retrieved from <http://www.unemg.org/Portals/27/Documents/>.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2006). *Multistakeholder Engagement Processes*. Conference Paper #7, Working Draft, No. 6. New York, NY: Capacity Development Group, Bureau for Development Policy. Drafted by Ndey Isatou Njie and Lara Yocarini.
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). (2010). *Draft decision-/CP.16, Outcome of the work of the ad hoc working group on long-term cooperative action under the convention*. Retrieved from http://www.unfccc.int/files/meetings/cop_16/application/.../cop16_lca.pdf

- United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) (n.d.). *Participation of Major Groups*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/esa/forests/participation.html>
- UN-REDD Programme. (2009). *Establishing an independent civil society advisory group and transparent global learning on forest, livelihoods and climate change*. Geneva: UN-REDD. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.org>.
- UN-REDD Programme (2011). *UN-REDD Programme Guidelines on Free, Prior and Informed Consent*. Draft for Comment – December 2011. Retrieved from http://www.un-redd.org/Launch_of_FPIC_Guidelines/tabid/105976/Default.aspx
- UN-REDD Programme. (2011). *UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria*. Version 3 draft for consultation. Geneva: UN-REDD. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.org>.
- UN-REDD Programme. (2012). Newsletter 26. (February 2012), p. 2. Geneva: UN-REDD, Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.org>.
- UN-REDD Programme. (2012). *PGA for REDD+ pilots: overview for 2012*. Geneva: UN-REDD. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.org>.
- UN-REDD. (2009). *UN-REDD Annual Report*. Geneva: UN-REDD. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.org>.
- UN-REDD. (2010). *UN-REDD Annual Report*. Geneva: UN-REDD. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.org>.
- UN-REDD. (2011). *UN-REDD Annual Report*. Geneva: UN-REDD. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.org>.
- UN-REDD. (2011). *Draft Benefit and Risks Tool*. Retrieved from: <http://www.unredd.net/>.
- UN-REDD. (2011). *The UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015*. Geneva: UN-REDD. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.org>.
- Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN). (2012). Case study: An assessment of gender and women's exclusion in REDD+ in Nepal. Bangkok: WOCAN.
- World Bank. (2009). *Gender in agriculture sourcebook*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (n.d. a). *Forests Strategy and Operational Policy*. Retrieved from <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTARD/EXTFORESTS/0,,contentMDK:20458437~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:985785,00.html>
- World Bank. (n.d. b). *Stakeholder Analysis?* Retrieved from <http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/PoliticalEconomy/stakeholderanalysis.htm>
- World Wildlife Fund (WWF). (October 2005). *Cross-Cutting Tool: Stakeholder Analysis*. Retrieved from http://www.panda.org/standards/1_1_stakeholder_analysis/

(continued on next page)

UN-REDD National Programme Documents or equivalent FCPF R-PP Documents

Government of Bolivia. (2010). *National Programme Document – Bolivia*. UN-REDD Programme La Paz, Bolivia. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.net>.

Government of Ecuador. (2011). *National Programme Document – Ecuador*. UN-REDD Programme, Quito, Ecuador. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.net>.

Government of Cambodia. (2011). *National Programme Document – Cambodia*. UN-REDD Programme, Phnom Penh, Cambodia. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.net>.

Government of Indonesia. (2009). *National Programme Document – Indonesia*. UN-REDD Programme, Jakarta, Indonesia. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.net>.

Government of Mexico. (2010). *FCPF Readiness Preparation Proposal Form - Mexico*. Mexico City, Mexico. Retrieved from http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/forestcarbonpartnership.org/files/Documents/PDF/Mar2010/Mexico_120211_R-PP_Template_with_disclaimer.pdf.

Government of Nepal. (2010). *FCPF Readiness Preparation Proposal Form - Nepal*. Kathmandu, Nepal. Retrieved from http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/forestcarbonpartnership.org/files/Documents/PDF/Oct2010/R-PP_Nepal_revised_October.pdf.

Government of Nigeria. (2011). *National Programme Submission Form – Nigeria*. UN-REDD Programme, Lagos, Nigeria. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.net>.

Government of Peru. (2011). *FCPF Readiness Preparation Proposal Form - Peru*. Lima, Peru. Retrieved from <http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/forestcarbonpartnership.org/files/Documents/PDF/Mar2011/Peru%20R-PP-%20Final%20English%20Translation-March7%20version-March16,%202011.pdf>.

Government of Sri Lanka. (2012). *National Programme Document (Readiness Preparation Proposal) - Sri Lanka*. UN-REDD Programme, Colombo, Sri Lanka. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.net>.

Government of Tanzania. (2009). *National Programme Document – Tanzania*. UN-REDD Programme, Arusha, Tanzania. Retrieved from <http://www.un-redd.net>.

Key Resource People Contacted

	Name	Country	Organization
1	Daviet, Florence	USA	World Resources Institute (Brazil)
2	Haugland, Silje	USA	UN-REDD (formerly UNDP/Indonesia)
3	Sriskhanthan, Gayathri	USA	UN-REDD
4	Rapp, Kenn	USA	FCPF
5	Sey, Haddy	USA	FCPF
6	Pardo, Samuel	Bolivia	Fair Climate Program
7	Cortez, Rane (written comments)	Brazil	The Nature Conservancy
8	Hasenclever, Leonardo	Brazil	IEB
9	Pinto, Femy	Cambodia	NTFP Exchange
10	Chiu, Marco	Ecuador	Initiative for Conservation in the Andean Amazon
11	Berliani, Hasbi	Indonesia	Kemitraan
12	Mahaningtyas, Avi	Indonesia	Kemitraan
13	Wood, Pete	Indonesia (W.Papua)	Samdhana Institute
14	Steni, Bernadinus	Indonesia	HUMA NGO
15	Putri, Anggalia	Indonesia	HUMA NGO
16	Mesta, Maria Elena	Mexico	M-REDD Project (USAID)
17	Efik, Surveyor	Nigeria	Nigeria Climate Change Network
18	Barquin, Luis	Peru (US-based)	Conservation International
19	Leon, Fernando	Peru	Initiative for Conservation in the Andean Amazon
20	Massao, Glory (written comments)	Tanzania	Mpingo Conservation and Development Initiative (MCDI)

ANNEX I: PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODS OF THIS REVIEW

This desktop study reviews stakeholder engagement experiences, good practices and lessons learned with REDD+ Readiness planning. It aims to improve processes and provide feedback on how stakeholder engagement can be promoted as an ongoing process throughout the REDD+ strategy and programming cycle.

Target audiences for this study include those working in national and regional governments, NGOs, multilateral and bilateral agencies and other donors, CSOs and other actors (i.e., donor staff, field partners from government and civil society staff) designing, funding, tracking and implementing stakeholder engagement REDD+ activities at the national, sub-national or nested levels, throughout the REDD+ strategy and program cycle. The objectives of the report were to:

- Provide an overview of different approaches that have been used for stakeholder engagement in REDD+ Readiness activities, including national, provincial and/or linked or "nested" national-provincial situations
- Provide highlights of different national or country-wide stakeholder engagement architecture and processes, from forestry, natural resources and climate, and also Strategic Environmental and Social Assessments (SESA)
- Identify “best practices” for stakeholder engagement processes that involve four particular stakeholder groups (i.e., forest-dependent Indigenous Peoples, women, youth and the poor)
- Identify the extent to which such “best practices,” including FPIC, are being used for REDD+ Readiness planning and REDD+ implementation
- Propose recommendations for how stakeholder engagement can be promoted as an ongoing process throughout the REDD+ strategy and programming cycle, rather than just at the initiation stage

This study reviews national, sub-national and nested REDD+ stakeholder engagement experiences, good practices and key lessons. The focus is primarily on stakeholder engagement at the national level and to a much more limited extent on stakeholder engagement at sub-national levels of governance, i.e., provincial or municipal levels or via pilot projects. International stakeholder engagement processes were not examined, nor were those at the project, site-specific or local level. The emphasis is on REDD+ Readiness planning since that is the stage at which nearly all of the countries were working.¹⁰ The report assesses the extent to which indigenous groups, women, youth and the poor have been included in stakeholder engagement processes, as well as relevant lessons from two new structured processes for engaging stakeholders in REDD+ planning and other projects, SESA and FPIC.

There is general and REDD+ specific guidance on stakeholder engagement (see Annexes 3 and 4) and other general guidance advising how to manage community-level processes (see Annex 6). There are critiques of specific country or project experiences by CSOs. National governments also provide information on their stakeholder engagement efforts as described in their proposals to multilateral funding mechanisms and donors (i.e., the R-PP), but these range in specificity about stakeholder engagement practices and stakeholders involved.

This desktop study involved data collection via an extensive literature review and 18 key informant interviews. Informants included two staff UN-REDD, two FCPF staff, one US-based civil society researcher and also 14 individual experts from REDD+ country CSOs who had first-hand experience with participating in stakeholder consultations for the national program of UN-REDD or receiving FCPF funding. Civil society informants were prioritized since the official version of stakeholder engagement activities could generally be found in country proposals required by donors. The list of potential country informants was developed in several ways: UN-REDD and FCPF countries were prioritized; informants were found via personal and professional networking and Internet searches; and the use of a request for informants posted on the two listservs. Regional balance was sought among the informants, but not achieved due to either non-responsiveness or last-minute cancellations which could not be rescheduled within the study's limited time frame.

The literature for countries included REDD+ donor documents, newsletters and country submissions, as well as other available reports, presentations and critiques from civil society representatives;¹¹ other documents were sent in response to Climate-L and the IUCN-CEESP (International Union for Conservation of Nature's Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy) list-serv postings. Other sources of information included donor guidance and pilot cases for various dimensions of REDD+, including stakeholder engagement, FPIC principles and methodology, social and environmental principles and criteria and SESA methodologies, gender issues, participatory governance assessments and also recent program evaluations for FCPF and the Norway International Climate and Forestry Initiative. To place REDD+ planning within a longer historical perspective, the literature review also included works on participatory environmental governance and multi-stakeholder engagement processes, experiences and lessons. For the interviews, the REDD+ donor informants were those working on social issues related to REDD+, as was one informant from the World Resources Institute.

The analysis was conducted under the Social and Environmental Soundness Task of USAID's Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities (FCMC) Program. It was motivated by recommendations from the participants of a 2011 FCMC experts' workshop on the Social Dimensions of REDD+ and by those who felt that it was important to catalogue and compare experiences with REDD+ stakeholder engagement processes and make greater use of relevant past approaches to stakeholder engagement in natural resources management and other development work. FCMC plans to incorporate report findings into REDD+ capacity building activities with USAID staff and partners and widely disseminate the report to others engaged in related work.

ANNEX 2: KEY TERMS

REDD+ stakeholders are defined as "...those groups that have a stake/interest/right in the forest and those that will be affected either negatively or positively by REDD+ activities. They include relevant government agencies and elected officials at various levels, formal and informal forest users, private sector entities, Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent communities" (FCPF & UN-REDD, 2011). The REDD+ stakeholders may have direct or indirect stakes in REDD+ changes and outcomes, and the timing of impacts may be short, medium or long-term. REDD+ stakeholders include elected and technical staff at all levels of government, community leaders and members, opinion leaders, different types of resource users, local and international civil society, private sector organizations and advocates, academics and other researchers and experts (FCPF, 2009). Across and within stakeholder groupings there are important differences in the legitimacy of their stakes and representation claims, their motivations for participating, and their capacities and abilities to participate (e.g., knowledge; experience with multi-stakeholder processes; time, resources and transport available; social status and confidence due to sex, age, ethnicity, etc.).

Rights holders are a sub-set of REDD+ stakeholders who hold statutory and/or customary rights, such as rights to lands and other natural resources, that will (or may) be potentially affected by a REDD+ program (REDD+ SES, 2012). This term is most commonly used to refer to indigenous groups and their members, but is also used in some situations to describe those from other vulnerable forest-dependent communities or others with specific rights.

Stakeholder engagement is an umbrella term, encompassing a range of structured activities that inform and gather interested parties to address specific complex development issues and find sustainable, mutually acceptable solutions. The term conveys the idea that multiple stakeholders will have ongoing opportunities to weigh in on defining priority sub-issues, identify problem drivers and solutions and support implementation. Multi-stakeholder engagement processes are often premised on a set of principles referencing ideals of participation equity, fairness, respect, transparency and accountability and collaboration, between conveners and participants and among participants. Rather than one-off meetings, stakeholder engagement aims to improve dialogue and decision-making at all stages of planning and implementation, particularly when accompanied by capacity building around technical and process issues (UNDP, 2006).

Two other terms, stakeholder participation and stakeholder consultation, are sometimes conflated with stakeholder engagement.¹² **Stakeholder participation** is a broad term that can refer to anything from a person physically being present at an event to someone's active involvement (e.g., speaking up, offering time and labor, etc.) at stakeholder events or activities. Engagement requires participation, but participation does not necessarily mean that stakeholders feel ownership for processes, results and implementation of policies, plans and programs. **Stakeholder consultation** refers to a particular methodology used by the conveners of multi-stakeholder processes. It allows conveners to hear stakeholders without an obligation to act on this input.

Stakeholder analysis refers to the use of a variety of tools from document review to social and power mapping¹³ to obtain detailed information about individual stakeholders, stakeholder groups, differences within groups and relations among them. Stakeholder analysis helps conveners to avoid stereotyping stakeholders into single categories, associating them with views with which they are not comfortable or making assumptions about likely collaborators.

ANNEX 3: LESSONS FROM STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Generally, multi-stakeholder engagement involves (structured) processes meant to ensure participation on specific issues (UNDP, 2006), and premised on a set of principles that govern relations between conveners and participants, and also among participants. These principles reference ideals of participation equity, fairness, respect, transparency and accountability and collaboration. Rather than one-off meetings, stakeholder engagement is viewed as a broader, more inclusive and continuous means to improve dialogue and decision-making at all stages of planning and implementation (IFC, 2007). As needed, these processes also include activities which strengthen understanding of complex issues and capacities for effective participation and joint implementation of priority development actions (UNDP, 2006).

Box 1: Managing Expectations

The broader literature on stakeholder engagement suggests that it is critically important for conveners and stakeholders to have clear and shared expectations about (TCBC, 2006; SRA, 2005; UNDP, 2006):

- **Types of changes** that are realistically possible as a result of participation
- **Levels of participation** and time commitment being sought by conveners
- **Potential risks** to reputations, trust and confidence, and relationships
- **Unpredictable outcomes** and opportunity costs associated with stakeholder involvement
- **Conditions for discontinuing participatory processes** (e.g., too few resources available, lack of stakeholder interest in involvement, convener disregard for any stakeholder input)

Various typologies have been developed over the past 40-plus years to discuss stakeholder engagement:

- **Many models for public and private sector conveners categorize engagement by the type of activity** (e.g., the International Finance Corporation's (IFC) model progresses from communications and information disclosure, to consultation, participation, negotiation and partnerships [IFC, 2007]).
- **Other models address outcomes and recognize power differentials.** As shown in Box 2, the model by the International Association for Public Participation describes a spectrum with increasing levels of public impact (i.e., Inform, Consult, Involve, Collaborate and Empower) which is relevant to public or civil society conveners.


Box 2: Increasing Levels of Stakeholder Participation in Public Processes

Promise to the Public	We will keep you informed.	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decisions.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternative development and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.
-----------------------	----------------------------	---	--	---	------------------------------------

Adapted from the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) (2007). Spectrum for Stakeholder Participation in Public Processes. Retrieved from http://www.iap2.org/associations/4748/files/IAP2%20Spectrum_vertical.pdf

- **A third group of models, derived from the perspective of a civil society stakeholder, envisions stakeholder engagement with greater citizen control.** Arenstein's (1969) well-known eight-step ladder (Figure 1) of citizen participation has three higher and more authentic levels (i.e., partnership, delegated power and citizen control), and three intermediate rungs where conveners place a token number of stakeholders in passive roles and offer placation rather than real benefits (i.e., informing, consultation, placation). The lowest ladder rungs are not considered to be genuine stakeholder participation by civil society and they can generate considerable cynicism and mistrust (i.e., convener manipulation aimed at convincing people and “therapy,” which feigns a participatory approach but is done for the benefit of conveners). A related inauthentic form is when a government announces decisions to the public, becomes defensive if stakeholders disagree and only responds if stakeholders are highly articulate or politically effective (i.e., Decide, Announce, Defend [DAD] Model) (International Association for Public Participation, 2012). The problem with these insincere forms of stakeholder engagement is that they can increase stakeholder cynicism and decrease willingness to participate in future stakeholder processes.

Figure 1: Ladder of Participation



Source: Arenstein (1969).

Some models of stakeholder engagement have been adapted for analyzing options for promoting stakeholder participation in environmental issues, such as through the World Resources Institute's (WRI) Access Initiative (Foti et al., 2008), their Forest Governance Initiative and more specifically in REDD+ (Daviet, 2011; UN-REDD, 2011). To adapt these models to the REDD+ context, they need to incorporate the issue of stakeholder consent, particularly FPIC, for Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

For a stakeholder engagement event, conveners generally follow three steps:

- **Pre-engagement** (i.e., identification, mapping and analysis of stakeholders; agreeing and setting strategic objectives for stakeholder engagement processes; building relationships)
- **Engagement** (i.e., engagement planning and implementation, including strengthening engagement capacities)
- **Post-engagement** (i.e., collecting and responding to feedback, reporting back to stakeholders, ensuring learning, evaluating engagement work and resolving grievances)

Stakeholder engagement is improved with detailed information about individual stakeholders, stakeholder groups, differences within groups and relationships among them. **Stakeholder analysis** is much more than compiling a list of stakeholders. It is a set of analytical approaches, used by conveners, to identify interested groups and individuals and the relationships and power across and within groups. Stakeholder analyses help conveners to avoid assumptions and stereotyping of stakeholders and recognize key differences and similarities. Stakeholder analysis can help to identify trade-offs and who may benefit and who may incur costs with a proposed program or policy. Similarly, stakeholder analysis helps to ensure equitable participation opportunities by gender and other social variables, as well as regional and sectoral representation.

As stakeholders and their interests may change over time, stakeholder analysis should be an iterative process done throughout the planning and implementation cycle (IFC, 2007; Reed, 2008; WWF, 2005), but with particular emphasis on the early learning and design stages. When initiated early, stakeholder analysis can identify and address potential obstacles to implementation and help build coalitions and sustained impact (World Bank, n.d. b). The ongoing nature of stakeholder analysis and, more broadly, engagement, requires long-term planning and monitoring.

Several types of information should be collected as part of stakeholder analyses:

- *Relevant stakeholder groups* (e.g., affected stakeholders within a project's sphere of influence, which may include stakeholders directly impacted via land use change and those outside the immediate affected area. Given scarce resources, stakeholders must be prioritized according to influence and impact).
- *Relative social position and power* (e.g., formal or informal power to influence others, potential to affect or be affected by priorities, policies, institutions or programs, dependence upon others, control over resources and information, power and gender dynamics in stakeholder engagement processes) (TCBC, 2006; ODI, 2009).
- *Past and current relationships* among and within stakeholder groups and individual participants (e.g., antagonism or political alliances, sub-categories within a stakeholder group), including the relationship of these groups with the specific consulting authority [e.g., Forestry Department] and/or relevant decision-makers).
- *Cultural patterns and linguistic issues* influencing interactions (e.g., people's prejudices and willingness to meet together across gender, ethnic and religious differences, public speaking and debate norms, requirements for translation of verbal or written communication).
- *Differences within stakeholder groups and leadership legitimacy* (e.g., variations in positions, representativeness for stakeholder groups at large and legitimacy of organizations, networks and leaders' fairness of group decision-making about who should represent them). Additionally, those in national organizations in civil society may not represent the views of members, may lack legitimacy among grassroots constituents or may not have a base broader than the organization itself (e.g., research and some advocacy groups).

Conveners use a variety of tools for stakeholder analysis, depending on the intended scale of the stakeholder engagement (NOAA, n.d.; World Bank, n.d. b). The most accurate, in-depth information can be obtained via direct communication with both men and women stakeholders (e.g., interviews, surveys, attendance of stakeholder functions, or other methods). Key informants familiar with local political and social landscapes can offer information on stakeholders and relations among them. Secondary sources include websites, newspapers, public records, organizational publications, reports of other decision-making processes and other written materials can be quite useful. "Stakeholder mapping" is used to understand positions, relationships and relative power and interest and entails a combination of methods including surveys or even initial workshops. For communities, further analyses are also useful, including geographic analyses of land tenure and resource rights distribution relative to proposed projects (Rubio et al, 2012).

The scale and process for stakeholder engagement ideally should be agreed between conveners and key stakeholder representatives. Once stakeholder analysis has been done, decisions need to be made on processes for stakeholder engagement, i.e., which stakeholders will be involved, how many, how will they be involved, etc. An example of stakeholder engagement methodology in REDD+ is provided by an approach for Stakeholder Engagement Analysis, piloted by Conservation International (CI) in Peru.

A wide range of international stakeholder processes provide models of representational stakeholder engagement that may be adaptable to national program level REDD+. Examples might include the United

Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue (UNFF, n.d.), extensive consultative processes undertaken during the development of the World Bank's 2002 Forest Strategy (World Bank, n.d. a), or the work of multi-stakeholder bodies such as the World Commission on Dams (International Rivers, n.d.).

In specific countries, useful models for engagement of stakeholders at national or sub-national levels, or multi-stakeholder approaches, may be found in other sectors, or from earlier work in the forest sector.

Conveners should match engagement methodologies to their engagement objectives rather than vice versa. Sometimes, conveners may have several concurrent objectives, (e.g., information outreach combined with agreement-seeking processes). Methodological decisions are also influenced by: the size and complexity of proposed activities and stakeholder understanding; available budget, time and availability of trained facilitators; prior experiences with participatory processes; stakeholder preferences; and cultural norms and language differences.

A wide variety of engagement methods can be used, depending upon the specific objectives. Box 3 provides further information on participation methods and their advantages and limitations. Some engagement methods are age-old, while others are newer processes for group activities or are relevant when there is adequate budget and many stakeholders who have access to technology (e.g., presentation software, videos, online and mobile phone-based decision-making and surveys, and interactive websites [Addor, 2011]). One-way communication methods, such as websites, e-bulletin boards, newsletters, fact sheets and flyers, press releases, advertisements and reports, do not allow for reciprocal exchanges and are not sufficient or equivalent to stakeholder involvement in analyses and decision-making.

"Evaluation of stakeholder participation is perhaps even less clearly prescribed than participation itself (NOAA, n.d.)." Three groupings of measures have been discussed in the literature on global standards for participation (AccountAbility, 2011), as well as participatory governance principles¹⁴:

Descriptive measures summarize specific elements of engagement experiences. They could describe the level of budget assigned, the type and number of processes, the intensity of the engagement, the topics covered including FPIC, length of stakeholder engagements, and the composition of those involved (i.e., percentage by sex, ethnicity, age, stakeholder group, etc.).

Process criteria discuss the extent and quality of engagement activities. For conveners, criteria include their level of commitment to inclusivity, materiality and responsiveness (e.g., budget, staff and other resource commitments; experience and quality of staff assigned to stakeholder engagement processes; mobilization of additional resources after the stakeholder engagement processes), and the degree to which government units integrate stakeholder engagement approaches into their ways of doing business (e.g., changes in organizational strategy and operations management toward participatory governance, accountability and transparency about consultations, timelines and decisions). From the perspective of stakeholders, criteria includes the satisfaction levels of stakeholders with the purpose and relevance, methodologies, inclusiveness, logistics, accessibility and facilitation of the engagement, and also the transparency, accountability, responsiveness of government conveners and support for processes of FPIC and conflict and grievance resolution arrangements. Authenticity is an important qualitative dimension of stakeholder engagement processes, which is related to: 1) inclusiveness; 2) transparency, openness and clarity; 3) independence; 4) resourcing; 5) commitment; 6) accessibility; 7) accountability; 8) responsiveness; 9) willingness to learn; and 10) productivity.¹⁵

Outcome criteria describe the number and quality of outputs and results of particular stakeholder engagement processes in the short and long-term. Short-term outcomes could include improved issue definition, prioritization, type and level of consensus reached, tangible products such as strategies and action plans and degree of follow-up by conveners on the recommendations of stakeholders; longer-term objectives include policy reforms, improved resource conditions, legal enforcement, changes in behavior and relationships, plan implementation and the level of ownership felt by stakeholders with the outputs and

outcomes of engagement events and processes, including policies, plans, strategies, projects and structures. Outcomes could also involve policy, legal or regulatory changes that support routine and mandatory stakeholder engagement by government bodies, FPIC, grievance mechanisms and procedures.

Box 3: Common Stakeholder Participation Techniques

Method	Description
Advisory group/task force	Small group of people representing various interests that is set up to advise an agency on programs or actions. Advisory groups can be multi-year or indefinite arrangements, while task forces usually complete a single task and then disband.
Charrette	Intense, multi-day effort to design something or solve a problem. There are multiple versions of the charrette, most of which include a design team that attempts to translate public input into a form that could be implemented, for example, a new policy zoning regulation or building design.
Field Trip	Trip to specific location organized so that participants can match their mental images to real, on-the-ground conditions. Participants may be asked to express their reactions verbally or in writing.
Focus group	Small discussion group led by a facilitator who draws out in-depth stakeholder input on specific questions. Normally, several focus groups are held and participants can be chosen randomly or to approximate a subset of the community.
Hotline	Widely advertised telephone number that directs callers to someone in an agency who can answer caller questions and collect input.
Internet	Dialogue between agencies and stakeholders conducted by the agency or by a third-party representative.
Large group/small group meeting	After an opening presentation, the group is broken into smaller groups to discuss an issue or complete a specific task. Summaries of small group discussions and an open comment period may follow.
Open house	Event in which the public is invited to drop in at any time during an announced period. Event includes staffed booths or stations on specific topic and may precede a public meeting.
Poll or survey	Written or oral lists of questions to solicit community impressions about issues at a specific moment in time. Polls and surveys can be administered in person, or via the telephone or Internet.
Public hearing	Formal, single meeting where stakeholders present official statements and positions and those ideas are recorded into a formal record for delivery to the agency.
Public meeting	A large public comment meeting where the participants stay together throughout the meeting and make comments to the entire audience. Public meetings are less formal than a public hearing. Public meeting may also be used as a blanket term to describe many of the meetings described in this table.
Referendum	A direct vote by the whole electorate on its support of specific proposals or courses of action. Referendums should be preceded by public participation so that the options before voters are credible.
Retreat	A concentrated yet informal meeting away from the typical work setting that emphasizes social interaction as well as discussion of issues.
Town meeting	A less formal public hearing where all stakeholders have the opportunity to speak and may vote on an issue.
Workshop	Small stakeholder gathering, typically fewer than 25 people, designed to complete a specific assignment in a short time period.

Source: Jeffery (2009).

ANNEX 4: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITMENTS

INTERNATIONAL, DONOR AND COUNTRY COMMITMENTS TO STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

International Commitments

The rights of stakeholders to be consulted and involved in decision-making and for self-determination are now widely viewed as basic human rights and enshrined in various international agreements that have been signed or ratified by many REDD+ countries:

- International agreements that protect or support the participation rights of all citizens (e.g., the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights) and international covenants and conventions that protect the participation and property rights of specific citizens (i.e., the 1965 International Covenant on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the 1969 International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, the 1979 International Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, the 1989 International Labour Organization Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples [ILO No 169]. The 2007 UNDRIP supports the rights of Indigenous People to effective engagement, including FPIC).
- International environmental agreements protecting citizen participation, information, property and justice rights in environmental governance (i.e., the 1991 Convention on Biological Diversity, the 1992 Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, the 1998 [Aarhus] Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters).

Commitments to Stakeholder Engagement

REDD+ national-level work is underway in 53 countries with support from two multilateral funding mechanisms¹⁶: the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), and the United Nations REDD Programme (UN-REDD), which involves the UNDP, the FAO and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Their activities are supported by a variety of donors and UN member countries. Some other countries, such as Brazil, are developing REDD+ programs or activities without support from either FCPF or UN-REDD. The REDD+ Partnership is comprised of 75 partner countries that are either taking or supporting REDD+ actions. To date, most REDD+ multilateral funding has focused on government-led, national-level REDD+ Readiness work (Phase 1), and to a lesser extent, early implementation (Phase 2).

While the FCPF and UN-REDD were designed to fund REDD+ Readiness demonstration activities, and in the case of the FCPF Carbon Fund, to pilot results-based funding, their funding is insufficient to meet all Readiness or implementation needs. To address this funding gap another multilateral initiative, the Forest Investment Program (FIP) aims to complement funding provided by UN-REDD and FCPF in countries where there is overlap (Brazil, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Indonesia, Laos PDR, Mexico and Peru). Additionally, the FIP currently funds these eight pilot countries to demonstrate how its funding will help countries to generate emissions reductions for results-based payments. The Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities is also part of the FIP, and supports capacity building and participation of these stakeholders in REDD+ programs and projects (FIP, n.d.). Many countries are receiving REDD+ funding from more than one major donor. In addition to these multilateral

mechanisms, REDD+ funding is also being provided by bilateral donors (i.e., Norway, Germany, Australia, Japan and the United States), private foundations, non-governmental organizations and the private sector.

At sub-national levels, REDD+ field activities are at the implementation (Phase 2) and initiation stages (Phase 3). Some sub-national activities are being supported as pilot programs via FCPF or are learning activities under UN-REDD's Global Programme. Many other funders, including bilateral organizations, conservation organizations, sub-national governments and the private sector are supporting other REDD+ projects.

FCPF and UN-REDD, as well as other partners, have provided considerable financial and technical support for stakeholder engagement, as well as supporting capacity building activities for different stakeholder groups. They have developed common approaches, analyses, methodologies, tools, data and best practices.

National governments in developing countries engage with multiple stakeholders in a range of different REDD+ activities. As further examined in this review, countries vary considerably in the types and the extent of such stakeholder engagement. In many countries, broad stakeholder consultation and other forms of engagement are part of the normal political discourse and processes, as well as representation of stakeholder views by their elected leaders and representatives.

Civil society and foundations have been promoting stakeholder engagement in REDD+. International NGOs have been partnering with national, regional, and local NGOs to support stakeholder engagement, share best practices, pilot new approaches, and organize study tours or learning events to promote South-South sharing. International networks, such as the Climate Action Network (CAN), a network of over 700 NGOs from 90 countries, also support collaboration among both Southern and Northern partners. The Climate and Land Use Alliance (CLUA) of foundations also supports stakeholder engagement in REDD+.

FCPF AND UN-REDD Guidelines for Stakeholder Engagement

The FCPF and UN-REDD are providing considerable technical assistance and financial support to 53 developing countries to prepare and begin to implement their REDD+ strategies, programs and projects.

The FCPF works with 33 partner developing countries. The FCPF has two main funds: the Readiness Fund, which helps countries with readiness preparations; and the Carbon Fund, which supports sales of emission reduction credits from carbon projects. As part of Readiness activities, FCPF has also established two funds for civil society organizations and indigenous organizations that are involved in REDD+ planning at international and national levels.¹⁷ These special funds can be spent on analytical and research work, including mapping of lands and SESAs; sustainable livelihoods; good governance; community-level monitoring and reporting; training, outreach and awareness building; and multi-stakeholder dialogue with government.

UN-REDD works with countries in two different ways. Its National Programme provides direct financial and technical support to the design and implementation of UN-REDD National Programmes in 16 countries. An additional 30 countries are considered to be Partner Countries, which benefit from regional and global work under UN-REDD's Global Programme. It offers complementary support for national REDD+ actions via common approaches, analyses, methodologies, tools, data and best practices. In support of stakeholder engagement, UN-REDD also has a capacity development program for Forest-Dependent Indigenous Peoples and CSOs to help them participate in a full and effective manner in national and international REDD+ processes.

As indicated in Box 1, many countries received support from both FCPF and UN-REDD. In addition to funding, both UN-REDD and FCPF have institutionalized stakeholder engagement priorities, practices and requirements into their operating procedures with countries:

Box 1: Major REDD+ Readiness Multilateral Financing Mechanisms and their Partner Countries by Region

	Country	FCPF Partner Country	UN-REDD National Programme	UN-REDD Partner Country
Asia	Bangladesh			X
	Bhutan			X
	Cambodia	X	X	
	Indonesia	X	X	
	Lao PDR	X		X
	Malaysia			X
	Mongolia			X
	Myanmar			X
	Nepal	X		X
	Pakistan			X
	Papua New Guinea	X	X	
	Philippines		X	
	Solomon Islands		X	
	Sri Lanka		X	
	Thailand	X		
	Vanuatu	X		
	Vietnam	X	X	
Africa	Benin			X
	Cameroon	X		X
	Central African Republic	X		X
	Democratic Republic of the Congo	X	X	
	Ethiopia	X		X
	Gabon	X		X
	Ghana	X		X
	Ivory Coast			X
	Kenya	X		X
	Liberia	X		
	Madagascar	X		
	Morocco			X
	Mozambique	X		
	Nigeria		X	
	Republic of the Congo	X	X	
	South Sudan			X
	Sudan			X
	Tanzania	X	X	
	Uganda	X		X
	Zambia		X	
Latin America	Argentina	X		X
	Bolivia	X	X	
	Chile	X		X
	Colombia	X		X
	Costa Rica	X		X
	Ecuador		X	
	El Salvador	X		
	Guatemala	X		X
	Guyana	X		X
	Honduras	X		X
	Mexico	X		X
	Nicaragua	X		
	Panama	X	X	
	Paraguay	X	X	
	Peru	X		X
	Suriname	X		X

Both FCPF and UN-REDD follow their own institutional procedures and safeguard requirements.

FCPF's Charter outlines general Operational Principles related to stakeholder engagement.¹⁸ As a World Bank-managed trust fund, the country partners of the FCPF are expected to fulfill World Bank safeguards.¹⁹ Four of the safeguards involve stakeholder participation (i.e., environmental assessment, involuntary resettlement, cultural property and Indigenous Peoples). To meet these requirements for REDD+ planning activities, the FCPF is now requiring countries to conduct a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment²⁰ and produce an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). Broad national ownership is needed to ensure appropriate institutionalization and implementation and to earn stakeholder trust. Apart from environmental safeguards, UN-REDD does not have institutional safeguard requirements for country partners from the United Nations Development Group (United Nations Development Group, n.d.).

Stakeholder engagement is addressed by four United Nations country programming principles (i.e., human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability and capacity development) **and the various United Nations conventions and agreements.** It is also more specifically addressed under UN-REDD's Draft Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria and the accompanying Benefit and Risks Tool (UN-REDD Programme, 2011). For both UN-REDD and FCPF, they have institutionalized programmatic advisory roles for civil society and indigenous peoples (e.g., UN-REDD's Independent Civil Society Advisory Group [UN-REDD Programme, 2009]).

Financing and donor priorities are articulated in country proposal instructions and review criteria and guidance documents (see Annex 4). UN-REDD has used an inclusive and consultative global process for the development of guidance (e.g., stakeholder engagement, FPIC, grievance) and oversees the application of this guidance in National Programmes. The instructions for proposal preparation have sections on stakeholder consultation (i.e., the FCPF Readiness Plan Idea Note [R-PIN], the R-PP).²¹ In 2012, FCPC and UN-REDD harmonized some of their procedures, for example through development of a common instructions and requirements for a R-PP for countries applying to both funding sources. Specifically, country applicants must address how they have engaged stakeholders to prepare and/or validate the R-PP and how they will engage with stakeholders under a Consultation and Participation Plan for the future. The first and only joint guidance from UN-REDD and FCPF focuses on indigenous stakeholder engagement (2011 Draft Guidelines for Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness [FCPF & UN-REDD, 2011]). It offers principles and practical operational guidance on planning and implementing consultations.²² This guidance is reinforced by technical support and field missions by UN-REDD staff or consultants. In addition, both FCPF and UN-REDD include stakeholder engagement as part of proposal review criteria.

Stakeholder engagement is addressed by other analytical tools. Both UN-REDD and FCPF have also addressed stakeholder engagement dimensions of other methodologies (i.e., disclosure of information, FPIC, participatory governance). Challenges for support to stakeholder engagement have included:

- **Accommodating country differences.** UN-REDD and FCPF try to balance international norms for stakeholder engagement and participatory governance with varying country commitments to, and history of, stakeholder engagement and government-stakeholder relations.
- **Encouragement versus requirements.** Requirements for stakeholder engagement are fairly weak. For example, a UN-REDD candidate country is only required to hold a minimum of one meeting in-country to validate their R-PPs before submission to the UN-REDD Secretariat. This requirement can be met with the presence and signature of just one civil society/Indigenous Peoples representative in a meeting with the UN Resident Coordinator (or designate) and the National Government counterpart (or designate) or a meeting of a relevant body, such as a REDD+ National Steering Committee which often include no more than one or two civil society representatives.

- **Uneven documentation.** The FCPF and UN-REDD do not maintain consistent standards for the type and quality of information about stakeholder engagement that is submitted in the R-PPs, and several recent reviews of actual stakeholder consultation processes indicate that most countries receiving REDD+ Readiness funding have not met expected the standards.²³ Some countries provide many specifics (e.g., Nigeria's R-PP annexes with completed stakeholder event registration forms), others have vague narratives with meeting lists, and in others, one-way information sharing events are sometimes reported as stakeholder consultations.
- **Time pressure.** The multilateral financing mechanisms recognize that meaningful stakeholder engagement takes time,²⁴ but they are under a global spotlight from bilateral contributors, country governments, international conservation organizations and the private sector to disburse funds in a timely fashion, show country progress results and help ensure that countries can take advantage of market mechanisms and other carbon funding in the near future.
- **FPIC requirements and implementation.** FCPF commits itself to taking into account the need for effective participation of forest-dependent Indigenous Peoples and forest dwellers in decisions that may affect them, while respecting their rights under national law and applicable international obligations. For those countries that are not signatories to UNDRIP, FCPF has no additional requirements for FPIC; the World Bank Indigenous Peoples safeguard requires consultation but not consent or ongoing indigenous engagement. UN-REDD requires FPIC for all of its partners and supports indigenous and forest-dependent stakeholder engagement process throughout the REDD+ phases, including consent-focused educational and decision-making processes.
- **Linking REDD+ Readiness standards with stakeholder engagement.** FCPF, via the Carbon Fund's post-Readiness funding, has proposed that "consultation, participation and outreach" become one of nine market-ready standards (FCPF, 2011) for partner countries before they can access the FCPF's Carbon Fund for pilot emissions reduction projects. Country-level grievance resolution mechanisms²⁵ are also part of the Readiness assessment standards. These standards could help to motivate greater government attention to sufficient and meaningful stakeholder engagement.
- **Limited funding for civil society-led stakeholder engagement.** Civil society representatives have reported continuing difficulties in finding funding for stakeholder engagement processes and capacity building, particularly at sub-national levels. In rare cases, such as in Cameroon, the government allocated \$40,000 of their \$200, 000 readiness grant from FCPF to the country's Civil Society Platform, which includes Indigenous Peoples (K. Rapp and H. Sey, pers. comm.).

Box 2: Key FCPF and UN-REDD Guidance related to Stakeholder Engagement

FCPF

- World Bank safeguard policies on environmental assessment, forests, natural habitats, Indigenous Peoples, physical and cultural resources, involuntary settlement and disclosure of information
- World Bank Gender and Development Operational Policy (OP 4.20)
- Technical Guidance on Preparation for Consultation and Participation Plans "National Consultation and Participation for REDD" (2009)
- Comparative analysis of the draft FPIC guidelines
- FCPF Guidelines on the Disclosure of Information
- FCPF Guidelines for Establishing Grievance and Redress Mechanisms at the Country Level FCPF Guidelines and generic Terms of Reference for SESA and the associated ESMF

UN-REDD

- Draft UN-REDD Social Principles and Criteria (SEPC) (March 2012)
- Draft Benefit and Risk Assessment Tool (BeRT) (December 2011)
- Operational Guidance on the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest-Dependent Communities

Joint (FCPF + UN-REDD)

- Joint Guidance with UN-REDD on Stakeholder Engagement (2011 Draft)
- Common template for R-PP

ANNEX 5: ENDNOTES

¹ In a few countries (e.g., Bolivia), other government-run schemes are being designed and undertaken to advance sustainable forest and natural resources management as an alternative to REDD+.

² The term “nested approaches,” as used in this paper, refers to linked national and sub-national processes. In the broader REDD+ literature, it often refers to flexible approaches that allow sub-national and national programs to co-exist and progress.

³ Illustrative guides include: Olander and Ebeling, 2011; Blomley and Richards 2011; Richards and Panfil 2011.

⁴ For example, the government of Ecuador tried an approach of distributing their lengthy REDD+ plan to community leaders and asking them to organize their own meetings to collect and return feedback to the central government. However, communities let the government know that the lengthy document and the topics were still too abstract to generate comments from stakeholders (Marco Chiu, pers. comm.).

⁵ Many civil society informants for this study had not been involved or could not recall adequate stakeholder engagement processes related to forestry and natural resources management at the national or regional level. One Indonesia informant for this report [Avi Mahaningtyas, August 10, 2012] estimated that only one-third of the REDD+ consultation participants had prior experience with provincial multi-stakeholder environmental processes in Central Kalimantan.

⁶ Brazil summary, accessed August 13, 2012 at www.theredddesk.org/countries/brazil/readiness_overview.

⁷ For example, in Bolivia, FPIC is a sensitive issue for REDD+ because of recent disputes over proposed government highway construction through the middle of a national park that is also a recognized autonomous indigenous territory called TIPNIS (Isiboro Sécure National Park and Indigenous Territory).

⁸ This set of stakeholders includes groups which are socially, politically and/or economically due to their ethnicity, caste or religions or because of their lack of social organization as stakeholders (e.g., poor smallholder colonists).

⁹ For Brazil, see Hasenclever and Shankland n.d.

¹⁰ The word “sub-national,” in this report, refers to provincial, regional, and district-level efforts. One example of municipal planning for REDD+ in Brazil is included.

¹¹ In a short-term global study, it is not possible to fully research the internal politics and relative weight to be given to REDD-related public complaints which have been lodged by individual stakeholders, CSOs or groups of organizations.

¹² The term “stakeholder consultation” is sometimes used as a substitute for either stakeholder engagement or participation, but in reality consultation is only one methodology in the toolbox of conveners and its objective is for conveners to hear stakeholders without obligation to act on their priorities and wishes.

¹³ An organized approach for understanding a system by identifying the key actors or stakeholders in the system, and assessing their respective interests in, or influence on that system. Questions include asking about whose problem, who benefits and loses, power and influence differences and relationships between stakeholders.

¹⁴ Under the International Open Government Principles, quality measures of stakeholder consultations for country action plans include transparency about the details of their public consultation processes and timelines prior to consultations; wide consultation with civil society and the private sector to obtain a diverse range of views; creation of online summaries of all public consultations and individual comments; accessibility of opportunities for citizens to engage, including forewarning and a variety of engagement methodologies. (Source: www.opengovernmentpartnership.org, downloaded August 10, 2012).

¹⁵ The Environment Council's Principles of Authentic Engagement, accessible from <http://www.the-environment-council.org.uk/what-we-do/authentic-engagement.html>.

¹⁶ Data from donor websites, downloaded as of September 10, 2012.

¹⁷ According to Haddy Sey, FCPF staff member (pers. comm.), the FCPF Carbon Fund now has a \$3.5 million funding stream for REDD+ capacity enhancing activities for Indigenous Peoples and another \$ 2.0 million one for similar activities conducted by CSOs at any level in REDD+ countries. The two programs aim to “provide Forest-Dependent Indigenous Peoples and other forest Dwellers and Southern CSOs with information, knowledge and awareness on REDD+ in order to enhance their understanding of REDD+, and to engage more meaningfully in the implementation of REDD+ activities and to support activities that empower and enable these stakeholder groups, to enhance and influence REDD+ development outcomes, and also to strengthen mechanisms for inclusion, accountability, and participation. (FCPF, 2012).

¹⁸ For example, three of six general Operating Principles in its Charter are relevant to stakeholder engagement: 1) “Ensure consistency with the UNFCCC Guidance on REDD”; 2) “Comply with the World Bank’s Operational Policies and Procedures, taking into account the need for effective participation of Forest-Dependent Indigenous Peoples and Forest Dwellers in decisions that may affect them, respecting their rights under national law and applicable international obligations”; 3) “Build public and private partnerships for REDD among Participants and Relevant International Organizations, Relevant Non-governmental Organizations, Forest-Dependent Indigenous Peoples and Forest Dwellers, and Relevant Private Sector Entities” (FCPF, 2011).

¹⁹ Under its Charter and Operating Principles, FCPF is required to apply all World Bank safeguards to its funding. There are now delivery partners other than the World Bank and their safeguard standards must either be equivalent to or exceed World Bank safeguards.

²⁰ Stakeholder engagement and other forms of data collection contribute to the Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment and stakeholders should have a say in the resulting Environmental and Social Management Framework.

²¹ The joint FCPF-UN-REDD *Draft Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) Template and Guidelines* also includes a Terms of Reference for the SESA.

²² To date, the stakeholder engagement guidelines are the only joint guidance and signifies the level of respect accorded to the issue of stakeholder engagement.

²³Recent reviews include: Dooley, K., Griffiths, T., Martone, F. and S. Ozinga. 2011. Smoke and Mirrors, in its 2011 critical review of FCPF R-PP submissions for eight countries. FERN (UK) and Forest Peoples Programme (UK); Accra Caucus on Forests and Climate Change. 2011. Is REDD-readiness taking us in the right direction: Case studies from the Accra Caucus. Accra Caucus on Forests and Climate Change, Accra; Friends of the Earth International. 2010. REDD: The realities in black and white. Friends of the Earth International Secretariat, Amsterdam. More general but highly relevant criticisms of the adequacy of stakeholder engagement to date for REDD+ include Shankland, A. and L. Hasenclever. (2011) Indigenous Peoples and the regulation of REDD+ in Brazil: Beyond the war of the worlds? IDS Bulletin 42 (3), May 2011; Lovera, S. 2008. The hottest REDD Issues: Rights, equity, development, deforestation and governance by Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Global Forest Coalition, Asunción (Paraguay) and IUCN-Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policies, Gland; Ribot, J.C. 2011. *Seeing REDD for Local Democracy: A Call for Democracy Standards*, Common Voices, Vol. 3, January 2011, pp. 14-16; Global Witness. 2008. Honest engagement: Transparency and civil society participation in REDD. Global Witness, London.

²⁴ FCPF and UN-REDD have extended their time frames for R-PP completion (Kenn Rapp, pers. comm.).

²⁵ FCPF requirements for country-level grievance, accountability and redress mechanisms could also support stakeholder involvement in oversight processes during the REDD+ Readiness grant and beyond.