1. Forest Tenure Indicators

Forest tenure shapes the relationship between people with respect to forests by defining who can use what resources, for how long, and under what conditions. Clear and secure forest tenure is widely believed to be a key enabling condition for sustainable management of forests. The forest tenure indicators are divided into four subthemes:

- 1.1 Forest ownership and use rights (hereafter called "forest tenure rights") refers to the entire bundle of forest-related property rights that may be held individually or communally in a country, including rights of land ownership and secondary rights to access, use, and manage forest resources.
- 1.2 **Tenure dispute resolution** refers to the efforts made by judicial, administrative, and/or community-based entities to resolve conflicts arising between individuals or groups with respect to forest tenure rights.
- 1.3 **State forests** are forest lands owned by the government. They may be obtained by the government through purchase or expropriation (also known as compulsory acquisition or eminent domain), and in other cases they may be designated as state forest if presumed not to belong to anybody else. This designation may be reversed by selling or giving away the land or changing the status of the land to nonforest.
- **Concession allocation** refers to the process whereby the government confers 1.4 significant use rights in state forests to a private entity through a contractual agreement. The agreement may be referred to as a concession, license, permit, or other contract type and often relates to commercial forest exploitation, agricultural, or mining activities.

1.1 Forest ownership and use rights

1. Legal recognition of forest tenure rights

To what extent does the legal framework for forest tenure recognize a broad spectrum of existing forest tenure rights and rights-holders?

Indicator Guidance:

Forest tenure involves a bundle of rights that includes the rights to access, withdraw, and manage land and resources, and exclude others from these activities. Full ownership of forest land typically bestows this entire bundle of rights upon the owner. Rights can be individually or communally held, and may derive from customary systems of resource management. The objective of this indicator is to evaluate the spectrum of tenure rights granted by the law. To apply this indicator, researchers should review national laws on land rights and forest tenure. Legislation may include national constitutions, land tenure laws, forest laws, and implementing regulations related to land registration and titling. Different sets of rights will be stipulated in different types of legislation. For example, rights to land ownership may be set out in land laws, while forest laws may also establish tenure rights related to management or use of forests (e.g., community forest management, forest concession systems).

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Individual rights. The forest | Researchers should review laws to identify all types of individual |
| | tenure rights held by individuals | rights (e.g., ownership, access, withdrawal, management) that |
| | and households are recognized in | are officially recognized. They should describe the relative |
| | the legal framework. | strength of these provisions, including whether general |
| | | statements of recognizing rights are supported by specific rules |
| | | and procedures to ensure their implementation. |
| 2. | Communal rights. The forest | Researchers should review laws to determine the types of |
| | tenure rights collectively held by | communal rights that are officially recognized. Researchers |
| | local communities and other | should describe any relevant rules or limitations with respect to |
| | relevant groups are recognized in | the types of communal rights that are recognized; for example, |
| | the legal framework. | whether property can be communally owned or whether rights |
| | | are limited to access or management. Communal rights may be |
| | | allocated to a village, traditional authority, or community user |
| | | group. |
| 3. | Traditional rights. The forest | This element of quality primarily applies in countries with |
| | tenure rights traditionally held by | groups that self-identify as indigenous peoples and/or have |
| | indigenous peoples and other | formal customary systems. Researchers should identify whether |
| | groups with customary tenure | traditionally held rights to forest lands and resources are |
| | systems are recognized in the | officially recognized by the legal framework. These may be |
| | legal framework. | recognized via Constitution (e.g., Panama, Venezuela) or through |
| | | separate laws such as the national indigenous rights law in the |
| | | Philippines. Researchers should describe the relative strength of |
| | | these provisions, including whether general statements of |
| | | recognizing rights are supported by specific rules and procedures |
| | | to ensure their implementation. |
| 4. | Rights of women. The legal | Researchers should assess whether the legal framework for |
| | framework does not discriminate | tenure explicitly recognizes women's rights to own, manage, |
| | against the forest tenure rights of | and/or access land. They should also note any restrictions in |
| 1 | women. | relation to women's land rights, for example in owning land, |
| | | inheriting property, or retaining land assets during marriage or |

| in cases of divorce. Where relevant, researchers may also wish to |
|---|
| review customary rules regarding women's access to land, such |
| as whether they can own or inherit forest land. |

| Object of assessment: | . Legal recognition of forest tenure rights Object of assessment: | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|------|--|--|-------------|--|
| EOQ | Y/N | Explana | tion | | | | |
| Individual rights | , | • | | | | | |
| Communal rights | | | | | | | |
| Traditional rights | | | | | | | |
| Rights of women | | | | | | | |
| Additional notes | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Values | | | | | | Select | |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | | | Low | |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | | Medium | |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | | Medium-High | |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | | High | |
| Documentation: | | | | | | | |
| Researcher name and organi | zation | : | | | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | | | |
| Record the following: document of | | | | | | | |
| author or organization, date publ | ished, c | hapter or | | | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, record: | | | | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s) and title | | | | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organization | | | | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | | | | |

2. Legal support and protection of forest tenure rights

To what extent does the legal framework promote and protect the exercise of forest tenure rights?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator seeks to evaluate the clarity and comprehensiveness of the legal framework for forest tenure, particularly in terms of protecting and supporting rights. It can be applied to multiple types of rights (e.g., individual, communal, customary) to assess whether a given type of right or rights-holder is adequately supported and protected under the law. Researchers should identify the type(s) of right(s) that should be assessed to meet the goals of the assessment. For example, researchers may want to compare support for individual vs. communal rights in forested areas. Researchers should review national legislation regarding land rights and forest tenure. Legislation may include national constitutions, land tenure laws, forest laws, and implementing regulations for land registration and titling.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | Clarity. The legal framework defines rights clearly and consistently. | Researchers should review all relevant laws defining rights to land, forests, or trees. They should analyze whether rules governing rights to these resources clearly define the bundle of property rights (e.g., rights of access, withdrawal, management, exclusion, and alienability) that are conferred to a rights-holder. Since land laws and forest laws may define rights to forest land and trees differently, researchers should compare how these laws define rights and identify any potential contradictions or inconsistencies. |
| 2. | Duration. The legal framework defines rights that are of adequate duration. | Researchers should determine whether the rights being assessed are defined as time-limited or endure in perpetuity. While adequate duration will change depending on the type of rights or natural resources, researchers should attempt to evaluate whether the duration of rights is sufficient for the rights-holder to benefit from the right that is defined in law. |
| 3. | Scope. The legal framework defines rights that are of adequate scope. | Researchers should review whether the rights defined in the legal framework are of sufficient scope to allow rights-holders to make long-term decisions about resource management and benefit from the property rights granted to them. |
| 4. | Restrictions. The legal framework does not place unreasonable restrictions on how rights can be exercised. | Researchers should review the legal framework for forest tenure rights for unreasonable restrictions on land ownership or management. Examples may include burdensome restrictions on sales, transfers, or inheritance of land; limitations on which groups can own lands, or overly burdensome administrative procedures for having rights recognized. Researchers should note that some restrictions may be reasonable in the context of certain countries or situations, such as rules designed to protect the lands of indigenous peoples from being sold. Therefore, researchers may wish to consult legal scholars or groups affected by restrictions on tenure rights to assess whether they are considered reasonable. |
| 5• | Protections. The legal framework assures that rights cannot be taken away or changed unilaterally and unfairly, and it | The legal framework should provide certainty that rights cannot be extinguished by the government without some form of due process and compensation. Protection against forced evictions is particularly important for communities without formal rights |

| protects all citizens against forced evictions and denial of access to essential natural resources. | who are living in public forests. For example, laws may prohibit evictions that render individuals homeless and require all feasible alternatives to be explored prior to carrying out a forced eviction. Dedicated laws on expropriation may also include detailed requirements for notification, consultation, and compensation. |
|--|---|
| 6. Enforcement mechanisms. The legal framework establishes mechanisms to enforce rights and seek redress when rights are not respected. | Mechanisms to enforce rights may include ensuring that rights are formally documented and registered, ensuring that boundaries are clearly demarcated, or setting up dedicated forums for rights-holders to seek redress (e.g., courts, tenure dispute resolution) in instances where rights are not respected. Researchers should review the legal framework for measures that can be used as a basis for enforcing tenure rights. |

| 2. Legal support and protection of forest tenure rights | | | | |
|---|------------|--------------|-------------|--|
| Object of assessment: | | | | |
| EOQ | Z/N | Explanation | | |
| Clarity | 1/11 | Lipitination | | |
| Duration | | | | |
| Scope | | | | |
| Restrictions | | | | |
| Protections | | | | |
| Enforcement mechanisms | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | ı | | |
| 110000 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Values | | | Select | |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | Low | |
| Two elements of quality | Low-Medium | | | |
| Three elements of quality | | | Medium | |
| Four elements of quality | | | Medium-High | |
| Five or more elements of quality | | | High | |
| Documentation: | | | | |
| Researcher name and organizat | ion | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | |
| Record the following: document or so | ource | e title, | | |
| author or organization, date published | ed, ch | apter or | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, record: | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s) and title | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organization | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | |

3. Legal basis for adjudication of forest tenure rights

To what extent does the legal framework define a fair and effective process for the adjudication of forest tenure rights?

Indicator Guidance:

Adjudication is the process of final and authoritative determination of existing rights and claims of people to land and/or resources. Adjudication may occur in the context of first time registration of rights, or it may occur to resolve a doubt or dispute after registration. This indicator should be applied to any part of the legal framework that sets out a process for adjudicating tenure claims. Relevant legislation may include land tenure laws, forest laws, implementing regulations related to land administration, or procedural manuals for registering land rights.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Clarity of process. The legal | Adjudication typically entails a series of processes including |
| | framework defines a clear and | demarcation, resolution of overlapping claims, application |
| | streamlined process for | review, and final adjudication of rights over land parcels. The |
| | adjudication. | legal framework should sequentially define these processes, |
| | | including the process for first time registration of rights and, if it |
| | | exists, the process for resolving disputes after registration. |
| 2. | Requirements to identify | Researchers should review the laws to identify any process |
| | claimants. The legally | related to identifying claimants. Quality procedures should spell |
| | prescribed process requires that | out proactive efforts to identify claimants rather than relying on |
| | all existing tenure claims and | them to come forward themselves. Procedures should also clarify |
| | claimants be identified and | who is responsible for identifying claimants and any rules for |
| | documented at the outset. | how their claims should be documented. |
| 3. | Requirements to consult | Researchers should identify any legal requirements that potential |
| | claimants. The legally | claimants be notified and consulted during first time registration |
| | prescribed process requires that | or adjudication of claims. Laws or procedures may also stipulate |
| | all identified claimants be fully | how consultants should be notified, such as through public notice |
| | informed and consulted. | periods, and the manner of consultation. |
| 4. | Criteria to resolve | Researchers should assess whether the laws identify procedures |
| | overlapping claims. The | or criteria for adjudication of overlapping claims. For example, in |
| | legally prescribed process | Kenya the Land Adjudication Law allows for a locally appointed |
| | includes fair procedures and | land committee to resolve overlapping claims through recognized |
| | criteria for resolving overlapping | customary laws. Criteria for resolving overlapping claims may |
| | claims. | involve who was residing there first or duration of residence of |
| | | the claimants. |

| 3. Legal basis for adjudication | n of for | est tenui | re rights | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|-----------|--|---------------|--|
| Object of assessment: | | | | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explana | ntion | | | |
| Clarity of process | =/=: | P | | | | |
| Requirements to identify | | | | | | |
| claimants | | | | | | |
| Requirements to consult | | | | | | |
| claimants | | | | | | |
| Criteria to resolve overlapping | | | | | | |
| claims | | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | • | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Values | | | | | Select | |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | | Low | |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | Medium | |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | Medium-High _ | |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | High | |
| Documentation: | | | _ | | | |
| Researcher name and organ | ization: | | | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | | |
| Record the following: document | | • | | | | |
| author or organization, date published, chapter or | | | | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, | record: | | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s | | e | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organizat | | | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | | | |

4. Forest tenure adjudication in practice

To what extent are forest tenure rights fairly and effectively adjudicated in practice?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator evaluates the process of adjudication on the ground to ensure that it involves transparent consultation of all claimants including vulnerable and marginalized peoples. Adjudication may occur in the context of first time registration of rights, or it may occur to resolve a doubt or dispute after registration. Researchers can apply this indicator to case studies of either type of process (e.g., registering rights or resolving claims), but should clearly identify which type of process is being assessed. Researchers should collect primary data through interviews, focus groups, surveys, or other methods to assess the transparency, inclusiveness, and fairness of the process, including whether relevant legislation on adjudication was respected in practice. Key respondents include those responsible for administering the adjudication process, claimants, or experts with knowledge of adjudication practices.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Identification of claimants. | Researchers should determine whether claimants are identified |
| | Existing tenure claims and | by the relevant authority at the outset of the adjudication |
| | claimants are identified and | process. Researchers should also note the basis for identifying |
| | documented at the outset. | claimants, for example through existing records of land claims, |
| | | field surveys, or submitted applications. |
| 2. | Provision of information. | Researchers should interview land administration staff and |
| | Claimants are provided with | claimants to determine whether claimants were provided with |
| | understandable information | clear, comprehensible information regarding the process. They |
| | about the adjudication process. | should identify how information was shared, and whether it |
| | | reached relevant groups in a timely manner. If possible, |
| | | researchers should assess whether it is provided in relevant |
| | | languages and in comprehensible terms by reviewing relevant |
| | | documentation. |
| 3. | Consultation of claimants. | Researchers should identify relevant claimants in the study area |
| | Claimants are fully and | and assess whether all groups were informed and consulted, |
| | effectively consulted. | regardless of race, ethnicity, or socio-economic standing. They |
| | | should assess via interviews or other relevant methods whether |
| | | potentially impacted groups were made aware of the adjudication |
| | | process, understood their current rights under the law, and were |
| | | informed of the potential outcomes of the final determination |
| | | and how to contest that decision if necessary. |
| 4. | Support for vulnerable | Vulnerable or marginalized claimants may lack the knowledge or |
| | claimants. Vulnerable | expertise to navigate the adjudication process. Through |
| | claimants have access to legal | interviews with claimants, researchers should identify whether |
| | and other relevant support as | technical or legal support has been provided. Support services |
| | needed. | may be provided by the land agency, agencies in charge of social |
| | | affairs, or civil society organizations. Support may include help in |
| | | understanding their rights, understanding the adjudication |
| | | process, or documenting claims. |
| 5. | Fairness of outcomes. The | Researchers should assess the final results of the adjudication |
| | adjudication process does not | process; these may be available in the form of registered rights, |
| | result in any forced evictions or | reports on the adjudication process, or by interviewing those |
| | uncompensated loss of legitimate | involved. Interviews should also determine whether final |
| | rights. | decisions resulted in any displacements or reductions of rights |

| | | (such as limiting access to non-timber forest products or cultural |
|----|----------------------------------|--|
| | | forests) without compensation. |
| 6. | Access to redress. Claimants | Researchers should identify whether redress mechanisms |
| | have access to effective redress | provide claimants with specific avenues for disputing final |
| | mechanisms if their rights are | adjudication decisions. Easily accessible channels (e.g., help |
| | not respected. | desk, phone hotline, local office, or email) should be made |
| | | available for claimants to file complaints and appeals. These |
| | | should be recorded and addressed in a timely manner by |
| | | acknowledging receipt, providing written response, and detailing |
| | | resolutions or next steps. |

| 4. Forest tenure adjudication in practice | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|-----|--|-------------|--|
| Object of assessment: | | | | | | |
| · | | | | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanat | ion | | | |
| Identification of claimants | | | | | | |
| Provision of information | | | | | | |
| Consultation of claimants | | | | | | |
| Support for vulnerable claimants | | | | | | |
| Fairness of outcomes | | | | | | |
| Access to redress | | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Values | | | | | Select | |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | | Low | |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | Low-Medium | |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | Medium | |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | Medium-High | |
| Five or more elements of quality | | | | | High | |
| Documentation: | | | | | | |
| Researcher name and organiz | ation: | | | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | | |
| Record the following: document or | | • | | | | |
| | author or organization, date published, chapter or | | | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, re | | | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s) | e | | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organization | | | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | | | |

5. Legal basis for administration³ of forest tenure rights

To what extent does the legal framework provide for fair and effective administration of forest tenure rights?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator focuses on the legal elements that ensure effective administration of forest tenure rights. With respect to rights of ownership, administration may include activities such as titling, registering, surveying, demarcating, and transferring rights. In the case of usufruct rights, administration may include allocating permits, licenses, or other types of forest use contracts. This indicator can be applied in two different ways. Researchers may assess one specific service such as registration of land titles, or can assess all relevant services and try to assess the broader picture. In either case, legislation regarding the administration of forest tenure rights should be collected, reviewed, and evaluated. Relevant legislation may include land tenure laws, forest laws, implementing regulations related to land administration, or procedural manuals for registering land rights.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | Comprehensiveness. The legal framework comprehensively regulates all types of administrative services necessary to recognize and support existing forest tenure rights. | Administration is implemented through sets of procedures, including those that define how rights can be transferred, how lands are surveyed and boundaries demarcated, how forested lands can be used, and how lands are taxed. Rules should include clear guidance for how each of these procedures is carried out. |
| 2. | Simplicity. Legally prescribed administrative procedures avoid unnecessary complexity and minimize opportunities for administrative discretion. | Complex procedures could include requiring multiple official approvals or time-consuming steps. Administrative discretion refers to professional judgment, rather than strict adherence to regulations. Such discretion may lead to abuse of authority or inconsistency in administrative actions. The legal framework should stipulate clear regulations to minimize complexity and discretion in administrative procedures. |
| 3. | Fairness. Fees and other legally prescribed requirements are reasonable and affordable for the majority of customers. | Requirements set out in the legal framework may relate to financial, legal, and technical aspects of the application process. Researchers should note the costs of the administrative procedures being assessed. Interviews or comparisons with cost of living or average wages may provide a basis for assessing whether costs are reasonable. In addition, researchers should assess whether requirements create a burden for any applicants, for example by requiring extensive surveys or frequent travel to administrative offices. |
| 4. | Accountability. Customers have the legal right to challenge administrative decisions. | Researchers should assess whether the legal framework outlines formal, specific procedures for petitioning land and forest agencies to reconsider administrative decisions. For example, the law should specify if the challenges are required in writing and how long after a decision customers have to make requests. Additionally, it should describe the type of information that must accompany the petition. |

³ With respect to rights of ownership, administration may include activities such as titling, registering, surveying, demarcating, and transferring rights. In the case of usufruct rights, administration may include allocating permits, licenses, or other types of forest use contracts.

| 5. Legal basis for administration | n of | forest ter | ure rig | ghts | | |
|---|--------|------------|---------|------|--------|----------|
| Object of assessment: | | | | | | |
| EOQ Y | //N | Explanati | on | | | |
| Comprehensiveness | L/IN | Explanau | .011 | | | |
| Simplicity | | | | | | |
| Fairness | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Accountability Additional notes: | | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Values | | | | | Select | |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | 301000 | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | | Low | |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | Medium | |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | Medium | |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | High_ | <u> </u> |
| Documentation: | | | | | 1 0 == | |
| Researcher name and organiza | tion | : | | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | | |
| Record the following: document or s | sourc | e title, | | | | |
| author or organization, date publish | ied, c | hapter or | | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, red | cord: | | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s) and title | | | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organization | | | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | | | |

6. Forest tenure administration in practice

To what extent are forest tenure rights fairly and effectively administered in practice?

Indicator Guidance:

Tenure administration services include processes such as titling, registering, surveying, demarcating, and transferring rights, as well as allocating permits, licenses, or other types of forest use contracts. This indicator assesses the implementation of tenure administration in practice. Researchers should apply this indicator to the same administrative service or group of services assessed in the previous indicator on the legal framework for tenure administration. Researchers should identify the relevant agency for tenure administration and identify one or two administrative offices to assess as a case study. Tenure administration services may be provided by executive agencies responsible for land or forests, or may be decentralized to local government institutions. Researchers should gather documentation related to tenure administration (e.g., service records, performance reports, summary of services, procedural manuals) and conduct interviews with staff of the administrative agency as well as customers who have accessed administrative services. CSOs focused on tenure issues may also provide useful information.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Legal compliance. Service | Researchers should review service records and assess compliance |
| | providers adhere to relevant | with the laws and regulations assessed in the previous indicator. |
| | laws and regulations. | Assessing compliance may include verifying that required |
| | | documentation and signatures are present, reviewing fees assessed |
| | | and paid, and determining whether services are provided within the |
| | | timeframe set out in the legal framework. |
| 2. | Service standards. Service | Service standards may refer to the types and levels of fees for |
| | providers advertise and adhere | different services, hours of operation, types of services provided, |
| | to clear service standards. | required documentation or procedures for each service, and the |
| | | expected timeframe for completing tenure administration services. |
| | | Standards may be advertised through brochures, publications, |
| | | guidance documents, or even through proactive efforts such as |
| | | information sessions about services provided. |
| 3. | Nondiscrimination. Service | Based on the type of tenure administration services being assessed, |
| | providers serve all customers | researchers should identify all relevant customer groups that may |
| | without discrimination. | wish to access the services in question. For example, if researchers |
| | | are specifically assessing services with a narrow focus such as |
| | | registration of indigenous lands, "all customers" would refer to all |
| | | indigenous groups. Researchers should review service records and |
| | | conduct interviews to assess whether services are available without |
| | | discrimination. Evidence may include ensuring that service |
| | | providers do not prioritize or fast-track certain types of applications |
| | | or provide exemptions from administrative procedures without |
| | A 1111. Q 1 | justification. |
| 4. | Accessibility. Service | Researchers should document where tenure administration |
| | providers offer services at | services are provided and the hours at which they are accessible. |
| | times and locations that are | Convenience of these locations and hours to customers should be |
| | convenient to customers. | evaluated based on the types of customers and services being |
| | | provided. For example, whether the target customers generally |
| | | have the time, resources, and equipment to travel to office locations, and whether accessing services involves significant |
| | | opportunity costs in terms of foregone wages. |
| | | opportunity costs in terms of foregone wages. |

| 5. | Timeliness. Service providers | Through review of service records or interviews, researchers should |
|----|--------------------------------|---|
| | provide services in a | document multiple examples of how long it took to provide the |
| | reasonable amount of time. | services of interest. A reasonable amount of time may be identified |
| | | by the legal framework or procedural manuals; researchers should |
| | | compare data collected with any legal or procedural requirements. |
| 6. | Accountability. Customers | Researchers should assess whether procedures for complaints or |
| | can easily file complaints and | appeals of administrative decisions are accessible, specifically |
| | challenge administrative | whether they are provided at a reasonable cost, location, and |
| | decisions. | without overly burdensome procedures. They should interview or |
| | | survey customers to assess their level of awareness of these |
| | | procedures, in addition to reviewing any documentation or records |
| | | on complaints. If possible, researchers may identify specific |
| | | complaints and track how the case was processed and resolved. |

| 6. Forest tenure administration in practice | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-----------|-----|-------------|--|--|
| Object of assessment: | • | | | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanati | | | | |
| | I/N | Explanati | OII | | | |
| Legal compliance Service standards | | | | | | |
| Nondiscrimination | | | | | | |
| Accessibility | | | | | | |
| Timeliness | | | | | | |
| Accountability | | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Values | | | | Select | | |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of qua | ality | | | Low | | |
| Two elements of quality | · | | | Low-Medium | | |
| Three elements of quality | | | | Medium | | |
| Four elements of quality | | | | Medium-High | | |
| Five or more elements of q | uality | | | High | | |
| Documentation: | | | | | | |
| Researcher name and or | ganization | : | | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | | |
| Record the following: docum | ent or sourc | e title, | | | | |
| author or organization, date | published, c | hapter or | | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | | |
| For each of the above conduc | eted, record: | | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant nat | | tle | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organ | nization | | | | | |
| -Location and date of intervi | iew | | | | | |

7. Information about forest tenure rights⁴

To what extent is information about forest tenure rights effectively and transparently managed?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator assesses whether a dedicated system exists to store information about the nature and spatial extent of tenure rights in forests. An information system may refer to a database or website. Records may also be stored digitally or in hard copy in government offices. Researchers should identity the agency(s) in charge of maintaining records of forest tenure rights. It may be the agency responsible for land or forests, or the government may maintain such information through partnerships with other institutions such as CSOs, regional organizations, or implementing agencies. Records may include legal documents such as titles, deeds, certificates, licenses, permits, or other contractual agreements defining the ownership or use rights possessed by an individual, community, or the state. Systems for managing tenure rights are most likely not publicly accessible; therefore, researchers should interview staff responsible for managing these systems or those who access them frequently.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|--|---|
| 1. | Centralized system. Information about forest tenure rights is maintained in a centralized system. | Researchers should assess whether there is a system in place that unifies all relevant information on forest tenure rights such as a mapping system or database that lists records for all relevant tenure types. Even if this information is managed by separate agencies or departments (for example, ownership rights may be managed by a land agency and management rights by the forest agency), researchers should note whether this information is integrated. |
| 2. | Comprehensiveness. The information system contains comprehensive records of legally recognized rights (private and public). | Researchers should identify all relevant public and private forest tenure rights and assess whether they are documented in the information system. The types of relevant rights to be recorded may already have been identified in Indicator 1. Records included in the information system may include titled lands, boundaries of forest use contracts (e.g. logging concessions, hunting areas), indigenous territories, or boundaries of protected areas and reserves. |
| 3. | Inclusion of informal rights. The information system contains or links to available information about informal rights. Accuracy. The information system is up-to-date and accurate. | Researchers should assess whether the information system includes any documentation of informal rights. Informal records may include community maps or other documents produced by individuals or communities to document their tenure claims. Information system characteristics that promote accessibility include digital records and dedicated staff to manage and update the system regularly. Researchers should assess what procedures |
| 5. | Government accessibility. Information within the system | exist to ensure that information is current, including updating of old records and creation of new ones. Researchers should also assess whether any quality control or verification mechanisms are in place to ensure that information is accurate. Researchers should verify whether records are available to all relevant agencies (including subnational offices) through |

⁴ Legal records of forest tenure rights may include documents such as titles, deeds, certificates, licenses, permits, or other contractual agreements defining the ownership or use rights possessed an individual, community, or the state. Informal records may include community maps or other documents produced by individuals or communities to document their tenure claims.

| can be easily accessed by relevant | accessible channels via the internet, governmental intra-net, or a |
|------------------------------------|--|
| government users. | database. If older files are unavailable electronically, the main |
| | institution in charge of record keeping should ensure that other |
| | agencies can obtain hard copies in a timely manner. |

| 7. Information about forest | tenure | rights | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|-----|--|-------------|
| Object of assessment: | | | | | |
| FOO | 37/37 | E alamati | • | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanat | ion | | |
| Centralized system | | | | | |
| Comprehensiveness | | | | | |
| Inclusion of informal rights | | | | | |
| Accuracy | | | | | |
| Government accessibility | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Values | | | | | Select |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of qualit | У | | | | Low |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | Low-Medium |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | Medium |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | Medium-High |
| Five elements of quality | | | | | High |
| Documentation: | | | | | |
| Researcher name and orga | nization | : | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | |
| Record the following: document | t or sourc | e title, | | | |
| author or organization, date pul | | | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | , - | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | |
| For each of the above conducted | l record. | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name | • | ·lo | | | |
| - Institution/company/organiza | | ue | | | |
| - Institution/company/organiza -Location and date of interview | | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | | |

8. Support for rights-holders

To what extent are forest tenure rights-holders empowered and supported to exercise their forest tenure rights?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator should be applied to assess what mechanisms exist to provide support to forest tenure rights-holders. To apply this indicator, researchers should identify a specific geographic area of focus (linked to the scale of the overall assessment). Depending on the goals of the assessment, researchers may also wish to focus on a particular group of rights-holders (e.g., indigenous peoples) in a given area. They should also collect relevant documentation (e.g., brochures, posters, minutes of information workshops) provided by government agencies or CSOs to support rights awareness. In addition, researchers should conduct interviews with rights-holders regarding their knowledge of their rights.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Awareness of rights. Efforts | Mechanisms to facilitate awareness of forest tenure rights may be |
| | are made to raise the awareness | provided by the government, CSOs, community-based |
| | of rights-holders about their | organizations, or donor programs. Such mechanisms may |
| | forest tenure rights and duties | include outreach and capacity building workshops that inform |
| | under the law. | stakeholders of their rights under the law or efforts to |
| | | disseminate informative materials such as brochures or posters. |
| 2. | Access to information. | Researchers should review any information provided to rights- |
| | Rights-holders have access to | holders and evaluate whether it is presented in a way that is |
| | understandable information | understandable to audiences, including those without formal |
| | about the administrative | education. Understandable information may refer to the |
| | channels available to formalize | language itself (e.g., local languages or dialects) as well as the |
| | and defend their rights. | clarity of the information presented (e.g., avoiding overly |
| | | complex legal terminology). Interviews with information |
| | | recipients may also provide useful feedback on the |
| | | comprehensibility of information. |
| 3. | Access to support. Rights- | Researchers should assess the capacity building services and |
| | holders have access to capacity | technical support provided by the government, CSOs, |
| | building services and technical | community-based organizations, or donor programs. Examples |
| | support if needed to fully exercise | of support services may include legal representation, assistance |
| | their rights. | in understanding legal frameworks, documentation of |
| | | community lands, submission of applications to register tenure |
| | | rights, development of resource management plans, or |
| | | delineation of boundaries. |
| 4. | Assistance for vulnerable | Social vulnerability may be defined as "the social, economic, |
| | rights-holders. Vulnerable | demographic, and housing characteristics that influence a |
| | rights-holders have access to | community's ability to respond to, cope with, recover from, and |
| | additional legal, technical, and | adapt to environmental hazards." 5 In the context of forests, |
| | financial assistance as needed. | groups such as indigenous peoples, women, or other minority |
| | | ethnic populations may be considered vulnerable. Researchers |
| | | should identify any vulnerable groups in the area of assessment |
| | | and evaluate their access to assistance in exercising their tenure |
| | | rights. This element of quality is most relevant if the groups in |
| | | question have legally recognized tenure rights, but may also be |

⁵ See the Social Vulnerability Index at http://webra.cas.sc.edu/hvri/products/sovifaq.aspx

| applicable for groups attempting to document informal or |
|--|
| customary claims. |

| 8. Support for rights-holders | | | | | |
|--|---------|-------------|-----|------|-------------|
| Object of assessment: | | | | | |
| | Т | ı | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanati | ion | | |
| Awareness of rights | | | | | |
| Access to information | | | | | |
| Access to support | | | | | |
| Assistance for vulnerable rights- | | | | | |
| holders | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Values | | | | | Select |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | | Low |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | Medium |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | Medium-High |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | High |
| Documentation: | | | | | |
| Researcher name and organi | zation | : | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | |
| Record the following: document of | r sourc | e title, | | | |
| author or organization, date publi | shed, c | hapter or | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, | record: | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s) | | tle | | | |
| - Institution/company/organizati | | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | ~ | | | | |

9. Recognition and protection of forest tenure rights in practice

To what extent are forest tenure rights widely recognized and protected in practice?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator assesses how well forest tenure rights are recognized and protected in practice. To apply this indicator, researchers should identify a specific geographic area of focus (linked to the scale of the overall assessment). Depending on the goals of the assessment, researchers may also narrow their focus on a particular group of rights-holders (e.g., indigenous peoples) in a given area. Researchers should review available documentation of forest tenure rights (e.g., land titles or other records of registered rights) as well as interview government staff responsible for tenure administration and individual rightsholders.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | Recognition. Most rightsholders have had their rights formally recognized and recorded. | Formal recognition refers to registration of rights in a land register or cadaster. Researchers should access relevant records to determine what percentage of land in the area of assessment has been registered. Researchers may also look for evidence of land conflicts or large numbers of claims that have not been processed, which may indicate that not all rights in the area have been |
| 2. | Demarcation. Most individual and communal forest lands have boundaries demarcated and surveyed. | formally recorded. Demarcation is a process of setting boundaries to an area, often to clarify land ownership and other tenure arrangements. Researchers should review whether formally registered lands, both individual and communal if relevant, have clearly defined boundaries and have been surveyed. In some cases, demarcation and surveying may be required as part of the process to register rights. |
| 3. | Enforcement. Infringements of rights are quickly and fairly addressed. | Infringement of rights could include trespassing, illegal extraction and/or sale of resources (e.g., logging, mining), or allocation of new rights with boundaries that overlap already registered rights. Researchers should assess whether enforcement agencies such as the land or forest authorities or the police monitor and take enforcement action against illegal encroachment and activities. |
| 4. | Gender equity. Rights registered to individuals or households are often registered in the names of women, either jointly or individually. | Researchers should review land records to assess whether there are examples of rights being registered to women either individually jointly. Interviews with landowners or tenure administration staff may also provide insight into whether women are typically able to exercise their rights with respect to land registration in practice. |
| 5. | Customary tenure. Minimal conflict exists between customary forest tenure systems and statutory systems on the ground. | Conflict between customary and statutory tenure systems may be caused by overlapping boundaries, encroachment, or disagreements over resource use in particular areas. Researchers should conduct interviews with statutory and customary rightsholders as well as with staff of the agency responsible for land administration in the area of assessment to gauge their perceptions of tenure conflict. In addition, documented complaints, reports of criminal activity or violence, or pending court cases may also provide evidence of conflict. |

| 9. Recognition and protection of forest tenure rights in practice | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|-------|---|--|-------------|
| Object of assessment: | | | | - | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explana | ation | | | |
| Recognition | 1/11 | Explain | ation | | | |
| Demarcation | | | | | | |
| Enforcement | | | | | | |
| Gender equity | | | | | | |
| Customary tenure | | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | | | |
| raditional notes. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Values | | | | | | Select |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | | | Low |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | | Low-Medium |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | | Medium |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | | Medium-High |
| Five elements of quality | | | | | | High |
| Documentation: | | | | | | |
| Researcher name and organiz | zation: | | | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | | |
| Record the following: document o | r source | title, | | | | |
| author or organization, date publis | shed, ch | apter or | | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | _ | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, 1 | ecord: | | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s) | | e | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organization | | ~ | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | | | |

1.2 Tenure dispute resolution

10. Legal basis for dispute resolution bodies⁶

To what extent does the legal framework define a clear institutional framework for resolving disputes over forest tenure?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator evaluates whether the legal framework establishes clear institutions and rules for resolution of tenure disputes. Relevant legislation may include the Constitution, land tenure laws, administrative manuals or implementing regulations for tenure administration, forest laws, decentralization laws, or laws setting up the judiciary. Mechanisms for resolving disputes could refer to a range of different entities such as courts or tribunals set up through the judicial system, administrative bodies or procedures, or customary systems. Researchers should identify all relevant forms of tenure dispute resolution defined in the legal framework. Researchers may wish to assess several different types of dispute resolution mechanisms, or focus on a particular mechanism of interest.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Jurisdiction. The legal | Researcher should determine whether rules identify institutions |
| | framework assigns clear | with the mandate to resolve tenure disputes. Rules may identify |
| | institutional mandates for | multiple institutions across administrative levels of government, as |
| | tenure dispute resolution | well as assign different types of tenure disputes (e.g., disputes over |
| | bodies at different | ownership, access, management, or classification) to different |
| | administrative levels and for | institutions. Resolution of disputes may be the responsibility of |
| | different types of disputes. | administrative entities or may occur through the judiciary. For |
| | | example, Cameroon's 1974 Land Ordinance tasks local Land |
| | | Consultative Boards with resolution of most land disputes, while |
| | | significant disputes may be brought before the formal courts. |
| 2. | Authority. The legal | The legal framework should assign the institution(s) tasked with |
| | framework grants dispute | dispute resolution clear legal authority to hear cases, deliver rulings, |
| | resolution bodies adequate | and enforce final tenure decisions. |
| | powers to deliver and enforce | |
| | rulings. | |
| 3. | Impartiality. The legal | Measures to promote impartial dispute resolution may include |
| | framework defines | multistakeholder membership on dispute resolution bodies, |
| | requirements and procedures | legislative approval for judicial appointments, independent budgets, |
| | to ensure the independence | or independent oversight bodies. Procedures for selecting decision- |
| | and impartiality of dispute | makers for dispute resolution may also support impartiality by |
| | resolution bodies. | establishing clear rules and procedures to guide the selection or |
| | | appointment of decision-makers based on clear criteria. |
| 4. | Recognition of | Customary practices may refer to a broad range of traditional |
| | community-based | systems, and researchers should use discretion in identifying any |
| | systems. The legal | locally relevant customs or norms. The legal framework should also |
| | framework recognizes the | define the relationship between customary and other statutory forms |
| | legitimacy of community- | of dispute resolution. |
| | based and customary dispute | |
| | resolution systems. | |

⁶ Dispute resolution bodies may include judicial, administrative, or community-based entities.

| 10. Legal basis for dispute resolution bodies | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|------|--|--|-------------|--|
| Object of assessment: | | | | | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanat | ion | | | | |
| Jurisdiction | 1/10 | Explanat | 1011 | | | | |
| Authority | | | | | | | |
| Impartiality | | | | | | | |
| Recognition of community- | | | | | | | |
| based systems | | | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | | | | |
| raditional notes. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Values | | | | | | Select | |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | | | Low | |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | | Medium | |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | | Medium-High | |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | | High | |
| Documentation: | | | | | | | |
| Researcher name and organ | ization | 1: | | | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | | | |
| Record the following: document | or sourc | e title, | | | | | |
| author or organization, date publ | lished, c | hapter or | | | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, record: | | | | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s) and title | | | | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organizat | ion | | | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | | | | |

11. Capacity of dispute resolution bodies

To what extent do dispute resolution bodies have adequate capacity to resolve tenure disputes in a timely and fair manner?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator assesses the capacity of dispute resolution bodies in order to determine whether they have adequate resources and expertise to carry out their mandate effectively. Researchers should identify the dispute resolution mechanism(s) of interest based on the entities identified in Indicator 10. For each mechanism being assessed, researchers should collect documentation such as past studies or case records that may help draw conclusions about case volume and access to evidence. In addition, they should conduct interviews with staff of the dispute resolution body to assess questions related to expertise and resources.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | Tenure expertise. Dispute resolution bodies have expertise | Researchers should assess the level of expertise of decision- makers and other dispute resolution staff with respect to tenure |
| | in relevant tenure laws, systems, | laws (e.g. types of legally recognized land rights) and procedures |
| | and practices, including | (e.g., registering rights, demarcating boundaries). For entities |
| | customary systems. | that deal with customary or community claims often, staff should |
| | | also have knowledge of traditional or customary systems. |
| | | Expertise may be demonstrated through education, experience, |
| | | completion of trainings, or responses to questions designed to |
| | | assess knowledge of the content of tenure laws and procedures. |
| 2. | Expertise in alternative | Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) typically refers to processes |
| | dispute resolution. Dispute | and techniques for resolving disputes that do not include |
| | resolution bodies have expertise | litigation. They are often overseen by a neutral third-party, and |
| | in alternative means of resolving | may include negotiation, mediation, and arbitration. |
| | disputes, such as mediation. | Researchers should identify whether ADR techniques are used in |
| | | the dispute resolution mechanism being assessed and evaluate |
| _ | A | whether staff have training in such techniques. |
| 3. | Access to evidence. Dispute resolution bodies have access to a | Types of evidence include deeds, land titles, and other relevant |
| | range of evidence to inform | legal documentation. In addition to official data sources, dispute resolution bodies should also have access to unofficial |
| | rulings. | information such as community maps and oral testimony. |
| 4. | Financial resources. Dispute | For financial resources to be sufficient, dispute resolution |
| 4. | resolution bodies have sufficient | entities should have enough funding to pay personnel, |
| | financial resources to handle | operational and facility costs, and maintain regular hours for |
| | their case volume. | hearing disputes. Researchers should collect budget information |
| | | where possible, and conduct interviews with staff to assess the |
| | | level of resources. If budget information is unavailable, |
| | | examining the number or percentage of cases resolved in a given |
| | | time period or average length of each case may indicate resource |
| | | constraints. |
| 5. | Human resources. Dispute | Sufficient human resources refers to the number of staff required |
| | resolution bodies have sufficient | to operate the dispute resolution body. Information on human |
| | human resources to handle their | resources may be available via annual performance reports of the |
| | case volume. | dispute resolution entity, or may be obtained via staff interviews. |

⁷ For additional discussion, see: http://www.accessinitiative.org/blog/2010/01/greening-justice-creating-and-decomposition improving-environmental-courts-and-tribunals

| Examining the number or percentage of cases resolved in a given time period or average length of each case may indicate resource constraints. |
|---|
| |

| 11. Capacity of dispute resolution bodies | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|----|--|--|-------------|--|
| Object of assessment: | | | | | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanati | on | | | | |
| Clear goals | | | | | | | |
| Clear timeline | | | | | | | |
| Impacted groups | | | | | | | |
| Response to feedback | | | | | | | |
| Disclosure of decision | | | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Values | | | | | | Select | |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | 7 | | | | | Low | |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | | Low-Medium | |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | | Medium | |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | | Medium-High | |
| Five elements of quality | | | | | | High | |
| Documentation: | | | | | | | |
| Researcher name and organ | ization | : | | | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | | | |
| Record the following: document | | | | | | | |
| author or organization, date pub | lished, c | hapter or | | | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | | | |
| | For each of the above conducted, record: | | | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(| s) and ti | tle | | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organizat | tion | | | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | | | | |

12. Accessibility of dispute resolution services

To what extent are dispute resolution services widely accessible to all citizens?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator assesses whether tenure dispute resolution services are broadly accessible to citizens. It can be applied to either formal or alternative dispute resolution procedures, or to both types. Researchers should begin by verifying citizens' rights to bring tenure disputes before resolution bodies. Researchers should apply this indicator to the same dispute resolution mechanism(s) assessed in Indicator 11. Researchers should collect documentation such as laws governing the functioning of the judicial system, legislation establishing the dispute resolution bodies in question, and records of the dispute resolution entity. Researchers should also conduct interviews with staff of the dispute resolution body, claimants who have used or tried to access dispute resolution services, or other persons with knowledge of dispute resolution services.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance for Interpreting Elements of Quality |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | Legal standing. All citizens and communities have legal standing to bring tenure-related complaints before a dispute resolution body. | Standing generally refers to the legal right to bring a lawsuit, and often requires the plaintiff to demonstrate a specific or other interest. Researchers should assess the breadth of standing provisions in the law to identify the types of individuals and groups that can bring cases and any specific requirements for demonstrating standing with respect to tenure-related cases. For example, researchers may note whether standing requires formal recognition of tenure rights, or whether groups with informal or customary claims to land also have standing to bring tenure disputes. Legal analysis can be supplemented with interviews of legal experts or examination of legal precedent to identify any relevant rulings related to standing in tenure cases. Note that in some instances communities may be prevented from filing standing provisions where they lack the ability to be considered a legal entity. |
| 2. | Accessibility. Dispute resolution services are provided in locations that are accessible for the majority of citizens. | To determine accessibility, researchers should assess the scale at which services are provided (e.g., village, municipal, district level). Collecting primary data on how far claimants have traveled to access services should also be collected if possible. |
| 3. | Language. Dispute resolution services are provided in relevant local languages. | Researchers should assess whether communities in the area of assessment speak local languages. If yes, they should review case records and conduct interviews with staff and claimants to determine whether services are provided in relevant local languages. This may include both hearing causes and providing all documentation in the relevant local language. Where services in local languages are not available, researchers should note whether accommodations can be made to have translators in order for claimants to present evidence in their local language. |
| 4. | Affordability. Dispute resolution services are affordable for the majority of citizens. Legal aid. Free legal | Here, affordable implies that services are within the financial means of most people. This can be achieved through cost mitigation measures such as sharing staff across multiple dispute resolution bodies, waiving fees for certain groups, governmental funding for plaintiffs, or ADR. Vulnerable or marginalized peoples may include indigenous |

| services are available for citizens who cannot afford them. | populations, ethnic minorities, women, and those of lower socioeconomic class. Such groups may lack the expertise or resources needed to navigate dispute resolution processes. Legal support could |
|---|---|
| | include providing pro bono legal counsel, government assistance programs, or funding from civil society to bring tenure disputes before formal dispute resolution entities. |

| 12. Accessibility of dispute res | oluti | on service | S | |
|--|--------|------------|----|-------------|
| Object of assessment: | | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanati | on | |
| Legal standing | | • | | |
| Accessibility | | | | |
| Language | | | | |
| Affordability | | | | |
| Legal aid | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Values | | | | Select |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | Low |
| Two elements of quality | | | | Low-Medium |
| Three elements of quality | | | | Medium |
| Four elements of quality | | | | Medium-High |
| Five elements of quality | | | | High |
| Documentation: | | | | |
| Researcher name and organiz | ation | l : | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | |
| Record the following: document or | sourc | e title, | | |
| author or organization, date publis | hed, c | hapter or | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, re | ecord: | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s) | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organization | n | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | |

13. Effectiveness of dispute resolution

To what extent do dispute resolution bodies provide timely, effective, and transparent rulings?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator should be applied to the same dispute resolution body assessed in Indicators 11-12. Researchers should identify a recent ruling, or multiple rulings to evaluate if enough information exists and review any available records documenting the dispute resolution process. In addition, they should conduct interviews with relevant parties and dispute resolution staff. Researchers may also wish to do some corroborating field work if the case involved an issue (e.g., boundary disputes) that can be verified by visiting the disputed area.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Evidence base. Rulings are | In order to assess the evidence base, researchers should access |
| | made after all parties have | records of the dispute resolution body. These may include |
| | presented their arguments and | transcripts of cases (often used in more formal court settings), or |
| | evidence. | final decisions may include opinions that set out how the |
| | | evidence was considered and what conclusions were drawn. |
| | | Researchers can also collect primary data from those involved in |
| | | the process to ensure that evidence was presented. |
| 2. | Timeliness. Rulings are made | Researchers should identify via interviews or document review |
| | in a timely manner. | how much time passed between the initiation of the case(s) of |
| | | interest and the final decision. If possible, this information |
| | | should be compared to similar types of cases or to relevant legal |
| | | requirements on dispute resolution processes to assess whether |
| | | it is timely in the context of the assessment country. |
| 3. | Fairness. Rulings provide a fair | Researchers should review dispute resolution decisions and |
| | and effective remedy to the | assess the fairness and effectiveness of the results. Assessing |
| | dispute. | fairness may include reviewing whether the decision was based |
| | | on the evidence presented and justified in the final ruling. |
| | | Researchers should also interview parties to the dispute to gauge |
| | | their perceptions of the decision. Effective remedies may include |
| | | restitution, indemnity, compensation, or reparation. Rulings |
| | | could also be compared to other similar cases to see if it was |
| | | generally consistent with what is considered effective. |
| 4. | Enforcement. Rulings are | Researchers should assess whether final decisions are upheld or |
| | enforced in a timely manner. | implemented in cases where a ruling requires a specific action to |
| | | be taken. Information on enforcement of decisions may require |
| | | field interviews or verification, or could be assessed through |
| | | interviews with staff of the dispute resolution body. In instances |
| | | where rulings are not followed, researchers should review |
| | | enforcement records and determine if any additional penalties or |
| | | enforcement actions were implemented. |
| 5. | Disclosure. Rulings are | Researchers should determine how records and final rulings of |
| | documented and publicly | tenure disputes are maintained and whether they are made |
| | disclosed. | publicly available. If rulings are accessible, researchers should |
| | | note how they are disclosed and evaluate whether disclosure |
| | | mechanisms are accessible to stakeholders. |

| 13. Effectiveness of dispute resolution | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|-----|--|--|-------------|--|--|
| Object of assessment: | | | | | | | | |
| TO O | 77/27 | | • | | | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanat | ion | | | | | |
| Evidence base | | | | | | | | |
| Timeliness | | | | | | | | |
| Fairness | | | | | | | | |
| Enforcement | | | | | | | | |
| Disclosure | | | | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | T . • | | |
| Values | | | | | | Select | | |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quali | ty | | | | | Low | | |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | | Low-Medium | | |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | | Medium | | |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | | Medium-High | | |
| Five elements of quality | | | | | | High | | |
| Documentation: | | | | | | | | |
| Researcher name and orga | nization | : | | | | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | | | | |
| Record the following: documen | t or sourc | e title, | | | | | | |
| author or organization, date pu | blished, c | hapter or | | | | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | | | | |
| For each of the above conducte | | | | | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name | | | | | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organiz | ation | | | | | | | |
| -Location and date of interviev | V | | | | | | | |

1.3 State forest ownership

14. Legal basis for designating state forests

To what extent does the legal framework provide adequate checks and balances on government powers to designate lands as state forests?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator should be applied to assess the laws governing how state-owned forests are designated for different purposes. Researchers should review all relevant legislation pertaining to designation of state forests, and may also wish to interview legal scholars familiar with forest law. Relevant documents may include the Constitution, land tenure laws and policies, forest laws, land use laws, and corresponding implementing regulations.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | Public interest requirement. The legal framework states that state forests are to be held in trust for the people | Researchers should identify whether the legal framework includes a clear statement that state forests are held in trust or managed on behalf of the public. These statements are often included in a country's constitution, forest law, or land laws. Statements may refer to forests, land, or the environment more generally. For example, Chapter IX of the Kenyan constitution states that Trust Land shall be held for the benefit of local communities in the area. |
| 2. | Institutional mandate. The legal framework clearly specifies which agency has the authority to make designation decisions. | Researchers should identify which agency(s) has the authority to designate state forests. Often this will be the agency responsible for forests or lands. If multiple agencies make designation decisions, researchers should review the mandates of each agency and identify any overlap. |
| 3. | Decision-making criteria. The legal framework defines clear and appropriate criteria to regulate designation decisions. | Researchers should review whether the legal framework sets out decision-making criteria to guide designation decisions. Examples may include definitions that must be met in order for a land area to be considered forested, criteria requiring identification of potential claims to the land, or conditions under which designations can be changed. |
| 4. | Consultation requirements. The legal framework requires public consultation prior to designation decisions that may have significant social or environmental impacts. | Researchers should identify any legal requirements for public consultation, particularly of potentially affected populations, when designating state forests. Requirements may include the circumstances under which consultation is required, how consultation should occur, and the timeframe for holding a consultation and making the final decision. For example, the Guatemalan National Forest Agenda requires that consultations be carried out in the form of roundtables. |
| 5. | Transparency requirements. The legal framework requires that proposed and final designations are publicly disclosed. | Researchers should assess whether the legal framework outlines specific procedure(s) for disseminating information on designation of state forests. Procedures may set a specific number of days for soliciting public comments, require posting of notices in certain areas, or outline details on what information should be provided (e.g., information on proposed boundaries or uses of land). |

6. Requirements to respect rights. The legal framework requires that designation decisions recognize and respect existing customary and community rights to land and resources.

Researchers should review whether the legal framework requires existing customary and community rights to be respected. Even where community or customary rights are not formally recognized in law, there may be general statements about respecting customary uses or access to land. However, requirements are generally stronger when spelled out in specifics laws and decrees setting out procedures. For example, rules may require identification of any resource use in the area to be designated, specific outreach to affected populations, or obligations to maintain buffer zones or use areas.

| 14. Legal basis for designating state forest | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------|--|-------------|--|--|
| Object of assessment: | | | | | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanati | on | | | | |
| Public interest requirement | 1/10 | Explanati | .011 | | | | |
| Institutional mandate | | | | | | | |
| Decision-making criteria | | | | | | | |
| Consultation requirements | | | | | | | |
| Transparency requirements | | | | | | | |
| Requirements to respect rights | | | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | 1 | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Values | | | | | Select | | |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | | Low | | |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | Low-Medium | | |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | Medium | | |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | Medium-High | | |
| Five or more elements of quali | ty | | | | High | | |
| Documentation: | | | | | | | |
| Researcher name and organ | ization | : | | | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | | | |
| Record the following: document | or sourc | e title, | | | | | |
| author or organization, date pub | lished, c | hapter or | | | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, | record: | | | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s | | | | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organizat | ion | | | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | | | | |

15. Designation of state forests in practice

To what extent are decisions to designate and re-designate state forests transparent and accountable in practice?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator assesses how decisions to designate state forests are implemented in practice. It can be applied to a recent designation decision or to multiple designation processes if enough information exists. Researchers should evaluate on-the-ground practices against the relevant legal requirements identified in Indicator 14. This can be done through procedural observation and interviews with agency staff and rights-holders within the immediate area. Additionally, rights-holders within the area should be interviewed regarding their experiences with designation processes. Researchers should also search for documents such as minutes of consultation meetings, reports on designation processes, or summary of final decisions and designations.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | Oversight. Designation decisions are subject to effective anticorruption and oversight mechanisms. | Oversight mechanisms for designation of state forests may include transparency requirements, review of designation decisions by high level officials or independent monitors, rigorous criteria governing designation decisions, required authorization from oversight bodies for certain types of designations, or any other mechanisms that place checks and balances on power to designate forests. Researchers should identify what, if any, mechanisms to prevent corruption exist and assess how well they are implemented. |
| 2. | Legal compliance . Designation decisions are carried out consistent with relevant laws and regulations. | Researchers should assess whether designation decisions are consistent with all criteria and procedural requirements set out in the legal framework. These may include requirements related to documentation, defining and justifying public purpose requirements, or inventories or studies of the proposed area to be designated. |
| 3. | Public consultation. Designation decisions involve transparent and inclusive public consultations. | Researchers should determine whether any public consultations were held in advance of the designation decision. If the law requires consultation, determine whether the efforts that were carried out comply with what is set out in the law. Even in the absence of legal requirements, it is useful to document the number of consultations held, who participated, whether information was received in advance of consultation meetings, and whether public input was taken into account in the final decision. |
| 4. | Public disclosure . Proposed and final designations are publicly disclosed. | Maps, press releases, final contracts, or other relevant information on designation decisions should be made publicly available. Researchers should identify any information disclosed and assess whether the method of disclosure (e.g., website, local offices, by request) is publicly accessible. |
| 5. | Appropriateness. Existing designations are appropriate and consistent with broader national social, environmental, and economic objectives. | Broader national social, environmental, and economic objectives may include biodiversity conservation, sustainable management of forests, and poverty reduction. For example, Cameroon has a goal that the permanent forest domain (which is designated as the private property of the state) must be at least 30%. |

| | | Researchers should identify any such provisions and their impact on these social and environmental objectives. |
|----|---|--|
| 6. | Respect of existing rights. Existing designations are not violating the rights of existing communities and indigenous groups. | Researchers should identify the different types of rights-holders in the designated area. Relevant rights may include rights of access, withdrawal, or management that are formally recognized in laws or the constitution, or may include non-statutory rights such as customary claims and human rights. Examine whether the designation decision creates any restrictions or violations of rights. Evidence may be collected from reviewing documentation that sets out the terms of the designation, and through interviews with rights-holders to see if the designation has impacted them. |

| 15. Designation of state fo | rests in p | ractice | |
|--|-------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| Object of assessment: | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanation | |
| Oversight | , | 1 | |
| Legal compliance | | | |
| Public consultation | | | |
| Public disclosure | | | |
| Appropriateness | | | |
| Respect of existing rights | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Values | | | Select |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | Low |
| Two elements of quality | | | Low-Medium |
| Three elements of quality | | | Medium |
| Four elements of quality | | | Medium-High |
| Five or more elements of qu | ality | | High |
| Documentation: | | <u> </u> | |
| Researcher name and org | anization | 1: | |
| Secondary sources: | | | |
| Record the following: docume | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| author or organization, date p | ublished, c | hapter or | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | |
| For each of the above conduct | ed, record: | | |
| - Interviewee/participant nam | e(s) and ti | tle | |
| - Institution/company/organi | zation | | |
| -Location and date of intervie | | | |

16. Legal basis for expropriation⁸

To what extent does the legal framework provide adequate checks and balances on government powers to expropriate private property for public purposes?

Indicator Guidance:

Expropriation occurs when the state compulsorily acquires private property for a purpose deemed to be in the public interest. This indicator assesses whether the legal framework describes clear rules and procedures for any expropriation of land. Researchers should identify the legislation that sets out terms and procedures for expropriation. Relevant documents may include the Constitution, land laws, and implementing regulations or manuals of procedure related to land administration. In some cases, countries may also have specific laws on expropriation of lands.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | Public purpose requirement. The legal framework states that expropriation should only occur when rights to land or forests are required for a public purpose. | Researchers should Identify whether the Constitution or other relevant land laws include clear statements about expropriation occurring for public purposes only. |
| 2. | Public purpose definition. The legal framework clearly defines the concept of public purpose. | Researchers should review the legal framework for expropriation to determine whether it includes a specific definition of what types of activities or land uses can be defined as for the public purpose. They should also identify any specific criteria or conditions that must be met in order for the public purpose requirement to be met. |
| 3. | Clarity of procedures. The legal framework defines clear procedures for expropriation, including requirements to consider alternatives. | Researchers should identify whether rules governing expropriation define specific procedures for the expropriation process. These may include requirements for giving notice of planned expropriations, assigning clear authority for who can approve expropriations, advertising public comment periods, transferring legal title or ownership, and determining how compensation of landowners is calculated and distributed. It is typically good practice for rules to require that alternatives be considered, such as moving the proposed land use to a different site that reduces impact on rights-holders. |
| 4. | Transparency requirements. The legal framework requires public disclosure of information about the expropriation process and final decision. | Researchers should identify whether legal procedures for expropriation or general freedom of information legislation require that information on the expropriation process be publicly disclosed. This may include giving public notice of the planned expropriation, sharing information about compensation for landowners, as well as disclosing the final decision. |
| 5. | Consultation requirements. The legal framework requires that potentially affected people be fully informed and consulted prior to making a decision. | Researchers should identify laws that require public comments, consultations, or other mechanisms by which affected groups can provide input about the proposed expropriation. |

⁸ Expropriation occurs when the state compulsorily acquires private property for a purpose deemed to be in the public interest.

| 6. | Compensation requirements. | Researchers should examine whether the law sets out the |
|----|-----------------------------------|---|
| | The legal framework requires fair | justification for compensation and how it will be calculated and |
| | and prompt compensation for | distributed. Some laws may include compensation for occupants |
| | expropriated rights. | of the expropriated land that do not hold legal ownership rights, |
| | | such as renters or those claiming customary rights. The legal |
| | | framework should also define the timeframe for receiving |
| | | compensation, the type of compensation to be provided. This |
| | | may include, among other forms of compensation, money, rights |
| | | to alternative areas, or a combination of both. |

| 16. Legal basis for expropri Object of assessment: | | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|----|-----------------|
| object of assessment. | | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanati | on | |
| Public purpose requirement | | | | |
| Public purpose definition | | | | |
| Clarity of procedures | | | | |
| Transparency requirements | | | | |
| Consultation requirements | | | | |
| Compensation requirements | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Values | | | | Select |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | Low |
| Two elements of quality | | | | Low-Medium |
| Three elements of quality | | | | Medium |
| Four elements of quality | | | | Medium-High |
| Five or more elements of qua | lity | | | High |
| Documentation: | | | | |
| Researcher name and orga | nization | : | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | |
| Record the following: documen | | • | | |
| author or organization, date pu | blished, c | hapter or | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | |
| For each of the above conducte | d, record: | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name | (s) and ti | tle | | |
| - Institution/company/organization | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | |

17. Expropriation in practice

To what extent does the government exercise its power to expropriate private property in a justifiable and transparent manner?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator should be applied to a recent example of land being expropriated by the government. Depending on the scope of the assessment, researchers may want to focus specifically on expropriation of forest land. Researchers should review documentation such as public notices, minutes from consultations, documentation of title transfers, or notifications of the final decision. In addition, researchers should conduct interviews with relevant government officials and property owners affected by the expropriation process.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Justification. Expropriation | Researchers should assess whether the expropriation process |
| | only occurs for a justifiable | defined a public purpose that meets any requirements or definitions |
| | public purpose. | set out in the law. Justifiable public purposes may include |
| | | infrastructure development, development of a national park, or |
| | | conservation of endangered habitat. Justifications can be |
| | | controversial, so researchers may wish to interview affected |
| | | stakeholders and legal scholars to gauge their perceptions of |
| | | whether public purpose requirements were met. |
| 2. | Consultation. Potentially | Researchers should assess whether affected stakeholder groups were |
| | affected people are identified, | made aware of potential impacts of designation decisions and |
| | fully informed, and | provided with multiple opportunities to voice their opinions and |
| | transparently consulted. | concerns throughout the expropriation process. |
| 3. | Alternatives. Alternative | Researchers should identify whether any alternative approaches |
| | approaches and strategies to | were considered by decision-makers as part of the expropriation |
| | minimize social impacts are | process. These may include moving the site of the proposed project |
| | considered and adopted if | or minimizing the land area taken. Co-management may be relevant |
| | feasible. | in the context of expropriation for a park or conservation area. |
| | | Strategies to minimize social impacts may also be adopted, such as |
| | | land swaps or maintaining areas for certain types of access or use. |
| 4. | • | Compensation may be based on current property use, the value of |
| | prompt compensation is | the resources on the land, the value of improvements made on the |
| | provided for expropriated | land, or market value of the land itself. Compensation may be |
| | rights. | monetary or be designed to make up for expropriated rights by |
| | | providing rights in alternative areas. Researchers should assess the |
| | | expropriation case study to determine whether compensation was |
| | | provided, whether it was sufficient to cover the loss of property and |
| | | other rights, how much compensation was provided, and how long it |
| | | took for rights-holders to receive the compensation. Interviews with |
| | | those compensated may be important for assessing the overall |
| | | fairness of compensation. Fairness can also be evaluated through |
| | | comparisons with similar types of expropriations, if examples exist. |
| 5. | Redress . Mechanisms of | Researchers should identify whether redress mechanisms for |
| | redress are available and | expropriation processes provide specific avenues for disputing |
| | accessible. | decisions about expropriation and/or compensation. Easily |
| | | accessible channels (e.g., help desk, phone hotline, local office, or |
| | | email) should be made available for claimants to file complaints and |

| appeals. These should be recorded and addressed in a timely |
|---|
| manner by acknowledging receipt, providing written response, and |
| detailing resolutions or next steps. In the absence of dedicated |
| redress mechanisms, researchers should note whether courts have |
| been used to bring complaints in relation to expropriation processes. |
| |

| 17. Expropriation in practice | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|-----|--|-----------|----|
| Object of assessment: | | | | | | |
| Too. | 37/3T | B 1 | | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanat | ion | | | |
| Justification | | | | | | |
| Consultation | | | | | | |
| Alternatives | | | | | | |
| Compensation | | | | | | |
| Redress | | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Values | | | | Select | |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | | Low | |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | Low-Mediu | n |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | Medium | _ |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | Medium-Hi | gh |
| Five elements of quality | | | | | High | |
| Documentation: | | | | | | |
| Researcher name and organi | zation | : | | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | | |
| Record the following: document of | r sourc | e title, | | | | |
| author or organization, date publi | shed, c | hapter or | | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | | - |
| For each of the above conducted, | record: | | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s |) and ti | tle | | | | |
| - Institution/company/organizati | on | | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | | | |

1.4 Concession allocation9

18. Legal basis for allocating concessions in state forests

To what extent does the legal framework define a transparent and accountable process for allocating concessions in state forests?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator assesses the laws governing how concessions are allocated in state forests, including concessions allocated for timber extraction or other activities such as conservation projects, mining, forest conservation, or carbon sequestration (e.g., CDM or REDD+ projects). Researchers should collect information on laws relating to allocation of concessions. Relevant rules may be found within land laws, or individual sectors (e.g., forestry, mining) may each have separate legislation regarding the allocation of concessions. Researchers should identify which sector(s) and types of concession they are interested in assessing and apply this indicator once to each category. For example, this indicator could be used to compare the quality of concession allocation rules in the forest and mining sectors.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance | |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 1. | Quality of process. The legal framework defines an open and competitive process for allocating concessions. | Researchers should review the procedures for allocating concessions and assess whether they promote open and competitive processes. Common processes for awarding concessions include auctions, competitive negotiation, auction-negotiation hybrid allocation, and direct negotiation. Processes that promote auctions encourage participation of multiple bidders, or evaluate proposals based on detailed scoring criteria are typically considered to be more competitive and transparent. | |
| 2. | Anticorruption measures. The legal framework prohibits applications from people or companies who have been convicted of corruption or who have failed to pay taxes. | Researchers should assess whether measures are in place to restrict applications from those convicted of corruption or who owe outstanding taxes or fees. For example, Panama's Law 13, 2012 prohibits any "persons in arrears with the National Tax Office" from applying for mining concessions. | |
| 3. | Application requirements. The legal framework clearly defines the minimum qualifications and technical requirements for applying. | Researchers should review technical requirements for concession applications. Requirements may include providing information on the entity applying and its financial situation, past audits, shareholder reports, and summary of operations. Requirements may also be related to the proposed concession operations, such as feasibility studies, impact assessments, or management plans. | |
| 4. | Requirements to identify rights-holders. The legal framework requires that existing tenure claims and claimants be identified and documented prior to allocating a concession. | Researchers should review the legal framework to determine if it specifically denotes that existing tenure claims and claimants should be identified <i>before</i> concession allocation. In cases where the government holds auctions or other competitive bidding processes, this may be done by the forest agency. In other cases, this may be required of the concession-holder. | |

⁹ Concession refers to any contractual agreement (e.g. concessions or other large-scale forest contracts) that results in a significant acquisition of rights on state forest lands for forest exploitation or conversion.

| 5. | Transparency | Researchers should identify legal requirements for transparency |
|----|----------------------------------|--|
| | requirements . The legal | and information disclosure during the application process. Rules |
| | framework requires public | may require advertising the concession opportunity, disclosing |
| | disclosure of information | information on the area of land being allocated (e.g., land cover, |
| | relating to the allocation | species composition), or disclosing applications, appeals, and final |
| | process, applicants, and final | decisions. If concession processes include detailed assessments of |
| | decision. | technical qualifications or scoring, disclosure may also be required |
| | | for these documents. Rules may also include a timeline for when |
| | | information is disclosed and the method of disclosure. |
| 6. | Consultation | Researchers should assess whether the legal framework requires |
| | requirements. The legal | public notice or consultation during the concession allocation |
| | framework requires public | process. For example, the Cambodian 2001 Land Law sub-decree |
| | consultation prior to allocating | No. 146 on Economic Land Concessions includes requirements for |
| | a concession that may have | conducting public consultations. Researchers should also note at |
| | significant social or | what point in the allocation process public input is collected; |
| | environmental impacts. | feedback solicited in early stages of concession decision is more |
| | | likely to be considered when making decisions about areas of land |
| | | to be awarded and whether existing community uses are respected. |

| Object of assessment: | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanation | |
| Quality of process | | | |
| Anticorruption measures | | | |
| Application requirements | | | |
| Requirements to identify rights- | | | |
| holders | | | |
| Transparency requirements | | | |
| Consultation requirements | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | |
| Values | | | Select |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | Low |
| Two elements of quality | | | Low-Medium |
| Three elements of quality | | | Medium |
| Four elements of quality | | | Medium-High |
| Five or more elements of quality | • | | High |
| Documentation: | | | |
| Researcher name and organiz | zation: | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | |
| Record the following: document or | | * | |
| author or organization, date public | shed, cha | pter or | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, r | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s) | | | |
| - Institution/company/organization | n | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | |

19. Concession allocation in practice

To what extent are concessions allocated in an accountable and transparent manner in practice?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator evaluates the transparency and accountability of concession allocations in practice. It should be applied to one or several recent concession allocation processes related to the same sector or type of concession assessed in Indicator 18. Researchers should review the allocation process by conducting interviews with concession applicants/holders and comparing this information with the allocation procedures stipulated within the legal framework. The information gathered in these interviews should be verified through additional interviews with local rights holders and government staff who administer concession allocation processes regarding the respect of existing rights, public disclosure of the process, and consultation.

| de |
|------------|
| |
| iated |
| |
| ting |
| public |
| |
| |
| s in the |
| nes |
| holders |
| ghts are |
| etition |
| |
| 1 |
| nd |
| 3 |
|) |
| ts of |
| ıring |
| iring r |
| were |
| rchers |
| e, how |
| 5, 110 W |
| nade |
| om the |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| e, l |

| 19. Concession allocation in | practic | e | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----|--|-------------|
| Object of assessment: | | | | | |
| FOO | 37/37 | P11 | • | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanati | ion | | |
| Legal compliance | | | | | |
| Respect of existing rights | | | | | |
| Anticorruption measures | | | | | |
| Public disclosure | | | | | |
| Public consultation | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Values | | | | | Select |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | Sciecc |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | | Low |
| Two elements of quality | | | | | Low-Medium |
| Three elements of quality | | | | | Medium |
| Four elements of quality | | | | | Medium-High |
| Five elements of quality | | | | | High |
| Documentation: | | | | | <u> </u> |
| Researcher name and organi | zation | : | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | |
| Record the following: document of | or sourc | e title, | | | |
| author or organization, date publ | ished, c | hapter or | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, | record: | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s |) and tit | tle | | | |
| - Institution/company/organizati | on | | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | | | |

20. Quality of concession contracts

To what extent do concession contracts comprehensively describe all rights and obligations of the concession holder?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator should be applied to one or more recent concession contracts in the sector(s) of interest. Researchers should obtain copies of concession contracts and review their contents to assess how they deal with the elements of quality below. In many cases, concession contracts are not publicly disclosed and may be difficult to access. In this case, interviews with government agencies, concession-holders, or other persons with knowledge of concession terms or contracts may provide some information. If multiple contracts are available, researchers should attempt to review multiple contracts to assess whether provisions are generally consistent across contracts.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | Legal. Contracts include clear | Researchers should review the contract(s) and identify any legal |
| | legal provisions setting out the | terms, right, and conditions. These may include the duration of |
| | terms, rights, and conditions of | the contract, the specific property rights granted, any restrictions |
| | the agreement. | on rights within the concession boundary, and conditions related |
| | | to termination, transfer, or surrender of the contract. Contracts |
| | | may also include provisions on whether the concession |
| | | agreement must comply with any changes in the legal framework |
| | | that happen after the legal agreement. |
| 2. | Technical . Contracts include all | Technical requirements in contracts should describe methods |
| | technical requirements related to | and procedures that will be used to carry out the activities of the |
| | forest management, exploitation, | contract. These may include exploration activities, surveys, |
| | or conversion. | feasibility studies, environmental and social impact assessments, |
| | | management plans, and monitoring plans. Technical |
| | | requirements may also include specific parameters for extractive |
| | | activities in forests such as annual allowable cuts and diameter at |
| | | which trees can be harvested. |
| 3. | Administrative . Contracts | Administrative procedures may include the submission of |
| | include all administrative | documentation such as maps, forms, assessments, reports, or |
| | procedures and obligations with | plans at specific time points. Researchers should review whether |
| | which the contract-holder must | contract terms clearly spell out types of reporting that are |
| | comply. | required and how often they should be carried out; for example, |
| | | requirements to submit annual management plans. |
| 4. | Financial. Contracts include all | Financial terms and obligation may include pricing |
| | financial obligations of the | arrangements, production-sharing, fees, warranties, liabilities, |
| | agreement. | required deposits, and all taxes or other charges that must be |
| | | complied with in order to operate the concession. These terms |
| | | should be clearly outlined within contracts with clear timeframes |
| | | for any relevant payments. |
| 5. | Environmental. Contracts | Environmental protections may include areas that must remain |
| | include all environmental | vegetated such as riparian areas or high conservation value |
| | protection, impact assessment, or | forest. Mitigation obligations may include minimizing proposed |
| | mitigation obligations of the | project activity, rectifying or restoring impacts, abatement |
| | agreement. | measures, and compensation by providing replacement |
| | | environmental resources of equivalent or greater value, on or off- |
| | | site. Specific examples within the forest sector include selective |

| | | cutting and clearing methods, restoration and reforestation, and |
|----|-------------------------------|---|
| | | preservation of existing vegetation. |
| 6. | Social. Contracts include all | Social obligations may include the provision of benefits to groups |
| | social obligations of the | living within or near concession boundaries such as monetary |
| | agreement. | compensation, employment, or public goods such as the |
| | | construction of schools or clinics. Contracts may also have |
| | | requirements in relation to the number and skill level of jobs that |
| | | will be created, preferences for local workers, or other |
| | | commitments to community investment and partnerships. |

| BOQ Y/N Explanation Legal Technical Administrative Financial Environmental Social Additional notes: Values Select Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Low_ Two elements of quality Low-Medium_ Three elements of quality Medium_ Four elements of quality Medium_ Four elements of quality High_ Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | 20. Quality of concession contracts | | | |
|--|---|------------------|------|-------------|
| Legal Technical Administrative Financial Environmental Social Additional notes: Values Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Low-Medium_ Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium-Five or more elements of quality Five or more elements of quality Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | Object of assessment: | | | |
| Legal Technical Administrative Financial Environmental Social Additional notes: Values Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Low-Medium_ Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium-Five or more elements of quality Five or more elements of quality Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | | | | |
| Technical Administrative Financial Environmental Social Additional notes: Values Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Low-Medium Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium— Four elements of quality Medium— Five or more elements of quality Medium— Five or more elements of quality Medium-High Five or more elements of quality Medium-High Five or more elements of quality Medium-High Secondary sources: | | Y/N Explana | tion | |
| Administrative Financial Environmental Social Additional notes: Values Values Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Low Three elements of quality Medium Four elements of quality Medium Four elements of quality Medium Five or more elements of quality Medium Five or more elements of quality Medium-High Five or more elements of quality Medium-High Secondary sources: | | | | |
| Financial Environmental Social Additional notes: Values Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Low Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium Four elements of quality Medium Four elements of quality High Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | | | | |
| Environmental Social Additional notes: Values Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium Four elements of quality Medium-High Five or more elements of quality High Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | | | | |
| Social Additional notes: Values Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium Four elements of quality Medium-High Five or more elements of quality Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | | | | |
| Additional notes: Values Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium Four elements of quality Medium-High Five or more elements of quality High Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | | | | |
| Values Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium Four elements of quality Medium-High Five or more elements of quality High Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | Social | | | |
| Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Low Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium Five or more elements of quality Medium-High Five or more elements of quality High Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | Additional notes: | | | |
| Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Low Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium Five or more elements of quality Medium-High Five or more elements of quality High Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | | | | |
| Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Low Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium Five or more elements of quality Medium-High Five or more elements of quality High Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | | | | |
| Not applicable/assessed Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Low Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium Five or more elements of quality Medium-High Five or more elements of quality High Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality Two elements of quality Low-Medium Three elements of quality Medium-High Five or more elements of quality High Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | Values Select | | | Select |
| Two elements of quality Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium Five or more elements of quality High Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | Not applicable/assessed | | | |
| Three elements of quality Four elements of quality Medium Five or more elements of quality High Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | Zero to one elements of quality | | | Low |
| Four elements of quality Five or more elements of quality Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | Two elements of quality | | | Low-Medium |
| Five or more elements of quality Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | Three elements of quality | | | Medium |
| Documentation: Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | Four elements of quality | | | Medium-High |
| Researcher name and organization: Secondary sources: | Five or more elements of quality | J | | High |
| Secondary sources: | Documentation: | | | |
| · · | Researcher name and organiz | zation: | | |
| | Secondary sources: | | | |
| Record the following: document or source title, | Record the following: document o | r source title, | | |
| author or organization, date published, chapter or | author or organization, date publi | shed, chapter or | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | |
| Primary sources: | Primary sources: | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, record: | - | record: | | |
| , and the second | • | | | |
| - Institution/company/organization | - Interviewee/participant name(s) and title | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | , 1 , 0 | <i>)</i> 11 | | |

21. Social and environmental requirements of concessions

To what extent do concession contracts include requirements to ensure social and environmental sustainability?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator should be applied to one or more recent concession contracts in the sector(s) of interest. Researchers should obtain copies of concession contracts and review their contents to assess any requirements related to social and environmental sustainability. In many cases, concession contracts are not publicly disclosed and may be difficult to access. In this case, interviews with government agencies, concession-holders, or other persons with knowledge of concession terms or contracts may provide some information. If multiple contracts are available, researchers should attempt to review multiple contracts to assess whether provisions are generally consistent across contracts.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|--|---|
| 1. | Impact assessment requirements. Contracts require social and environmental impact assessment prior to beginning exploitation or conversion activities. | Researchers should note whether contracts require any form of social or environmental impact assessment at any point in the application process or in order to begin operations. Assessment requirements may depend on the type and size of concession. |
| 2. | Community engagement. Contracts require engagement and benefit sharing with local communities. | Researchers should identify any requirements related to community engagement. These may include partnerships, investments, or benefit sharing activities that provide a share of profits or other benefits such as housing, schools, or clinics, or employment. |
| 3. | Mitigation . Contracts require the development and implementation of measures to avoid or mitigate identified social and environmental risks. | Researchers should determine whether contracts require efforts to avoid or mitigate impacts of the proposed activities to be carried out. Mitigation measures may include ecosystem restoration (e.g., reforestation, rehabilitating wetlands), shifting boundaries of areas to be exploited, or other abatement measures that reduce impacts on land or people. Measures may also include compensation for lost livelihoods of groups living in the concession area. |
| 4. | Monitoring . Contracts require monitoring of social and environmental impacts. | Researchers should assess any monitoring requirements in contracts and note how often monitoring takes place (e.g., biannually, annually), who conducts the monitoring (e.g., the contract-holder or a third party), and what impacts should be monitored. |
| 5. | Response . Contracts require corrective measures if negative social or environmental impacts are detected. | Researchers should review whether contracts clearly state any obligations of the contract-holder to address problems or negative impacts identified by monitoring of operations. The contract may also include any consequences for noncompliance, such as government-issued penalties if corrective measures are not implemented. |

| 21. Social and environmen | ntal requi | rements o | f concession | ıs | |
|--|--------------|--|--------------|----|-------------|
| Object of assessment: | | | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanation | on | | |
| Impact assessment | -/ | The state of the s | <u> </u> | | |
| requirements | | | | | |
| Community engagement | | | | | |
| Mitigation | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | |
| Response | | | | | |
| Additional notes: | • | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Values | | | | S | elect |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | | L | OW |
| Two elements of quality | | | | L | ow-Medium |
| Three elements of quality | | | | N | Iedium |
| Four elements of quality | | | | N | Iedium-High |
| Five elements of quality | | | | H | Iigh |
| Documentation: | | | | | |
| Researcher name and org | anization | ı : | | | |
| Secondary sources: | | | | | |
| Record the following: docume | | | | | |
| author or organization, date p | ublished, c | hapter or | | | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | | | |
| For each of the above conduct | ed, record: | | | | |
| - Interviewee/participant nan | ne(s) and ti | tle | | | |
| - Institution/company/organi | zation | | | | |
| -Location and date of intervie | ew | | | | |

22. Compliance with social and environmental requirements in concession contracts

To what extent do concession-holders comply with social and environmental sustainability requirements in their contracts?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator assesses how contract-holders comply with environmental and social sustainability regulations in practice. It should be applied to the same concession(s) assessed in Indicator 21, although researchers should verify that these concessions are operating and have information available on implementation. Researchers should assess on-the ground compliance with provisions set out in the contract. If requirements do not exist, researchers should still attempt to answer the elements of quality below based on available information on implementation. Information should be collected via interviews with groups such as concession employees, local stakeholders impacted by operations, government agency staff responsible for oversight of concession operations, and if possible, by direct observation of concession operations. Reports on concession performance or monitoring may also provide useful information if available.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | Impact assessment. Social and environmental impact assessments are completed and publicly disclosed. | Researchers should determine whether ESIAs were conducted for the concession(s) of interest. They should also note whether and how these documents were publicly disclosed. |
| 2. | Community engagement. Equitable social agreements are established with local communities. | Researchers should identify any social agreements included in contracts and seek to verify whether these agreements have been implemented. For social agreements that relate to providing services such as schools, healthcare, sanitation, or employment, researchers may also wish to assess the quality and sustainability of the services provided; for example, whether new facilities are able to be maintained after the life of the concession project, or whether services are accessible to most community members. This information may be gathered through interviews with beneficiaries of social agreements as well as field observation. |
| 3. | Mitigation. Appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures are implemented. | Researchers should identify any mitigation actions included in contracts and seek to verify whether these actions have been implemented. |
| 4. | Monitoring. Social and environmental impacts are regularly monitored and reported on. | Researchers should identify any impact monitoring requirements included in contracts and seek to verify whether these actions have been implemented. In particular, researchers may wish to examine who conducted the monitoring, review the methods and process for monitoring, and interview independent experts as well as community groups to assess the accuracy of the monitoring reports. |
| 5. | Response. Corrective measures are taken when negative social or environmental impacts are detected. | Corrective measures may include stopping or modifying project activities that are causing negative social or environmental impacts. Interviews with concessionaires, impacted populations, or government staff with oversight over concessions may indicate whether corrective measures have been taken and whether they are effective. Monitoring and performance reports may also provide this information; if reports for multiple years are available, comparing findings from year to year may also provide |

| insight into whether negative impacts are addressed in a timely |
|---|
| manner. |

| Object of assessment: | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | т. | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanation | |
| Impact assessment | | | |
| Community engagement | | | |
| Mitigation | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Response | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Values | | | Select |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | |
| Zero to one elements of qual | lity | | Low |
| Two elements of quality | | | Low-Medium |
| Three elements of quality | | | Medium |
| Four elements of quality | | | Medium-High |
| Five elements of quality | | | High |
| Documentation: | | | · |
| Researcher name and org | anization | : | |
| Secondary sources: | | | |
| Record the following: docume | nt or sourc | e title, | |
| author or organization, date p | ublished, c | hapter or | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | |
| For each of the above conduct | ed, record: | | |
| - Interviewee/participant nam | | | |
| - Institution/company/organi | | | |
| -Location and date of intervie | | | |

23. Management of information about concessions

To what extent is information about concessions managed in an effective and transparent manner?

Indicator Guidance:

This indicator should be applied to a relevant system used to maintain information about concessions and their operations. Information systems may be individual platforms managed by sector agencies (e.g., forests, mining, agriculture), or an integrated platform for multiple sectors managed by a centralized land agency. Researchers should identify key sectors of interest and attempt to access the system for concession information. While it may not be practical or possible to assess all records within the system, researchers should identify a reasonable number of records to access—for example, sample records for different land use types or all records within a given geographic area of interest. Systems for managing concession information are often not publicly accessible; therefore, researchers should interview staff responsible for managing these systems or those who access them frequently. Government reports may also be of use.

| Ele | ement of Quality | Guidance |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Legal basis. The legal | Researchers should review the legal framework for land use or for |
| | framework requires a public | the specific sector of interest (e.g., forests) to assess whether there |
| | registry of concessions. | are any mandatory requirements to establish an information |
| | | system to manage concessions. For example, Mexico's mining laws |
| | | require that any concession, allotment, agreement, or arrangement |
| | | that may affect mining rights be recorded within the public registry. |
| 2. | Centralized system. | Centralization of a public registry may refer to a single sector |
| | Records of concessions are | bringing together all information across geographic scales; it may |
| | maintained in a central public | also refer to multiple sectors bringing information together into a |
| | registry. | single registry in order to view all concessions. Researchers should |
| | | assess whether any central systems exist and describe their |
| | | contents. In particular, they may assess how information from |
| | | subnational levels is put into a central system and whether there |
| | | are staff responsible for maintaining the system. |
| 3. | Digitized system. Records | Researchers should verify whether all current public concession |
| | are available in digital formats. | records are stored in digital format, or whether the information |
| | | system relies on hard copies of documents. If the system includes |
| | | both types of documentation, researchers could also assess how far |
| | | back digitally available records go, and if there are any efforts to |
| | | update older hard copies to ensure the entire system is stored |
| | | online. |
| 4. | Completeness. Records | Researchers should review the types of information that are stored |
| | contain comprehensive legal | for each concession record in the information system. Relevant |
| | and spatial information about | legal information may include a copy of the contract laying out |
| | the concession. | terms, rights, and conditions of the concessions, as well as records |
| | | of compliance with laws relating to financial disclosure, payment of |
| | | taxes and fees, and monitoring. Relevant spatial information may |
| | | include concession boundaries, forest cover, and spatial plans |
| | | detailing how the concession area will be used for different |
| | | purposes. |
| 5. | Accuracy. Records are | To assess accuracy of records, researchers will likely need to |
| | accurate and up-to-date. | conduct some field verification of information found within the |
| | | concession information system, or work with government staff to |

| | learn how often information is put into the system and what protocols exist for ensuring it is up-to-date. |
|--|--|
| 6. Accessibility . Records are freely accessible by the public. | Records may be publicly accessible online or by request in the offices of the agency responsible for administering the system. Researchers should keep track of their attempts to access these records and any challenges they encounter when requesting information. |

| 23. Management of information about concessions | | | |
|---|----------|-------------|-------------|
| Object of assessment: | | | |
| EOQ | Y/N | Explanation | |
| Legal basis | 1/IN | Explanation | |
| Centralized system | | | |
| Digitized system | | | |
| Completeness | | | |
| Accuracy | | | |
| Accessibility | | | |
| Additional notes: | | | |
| Additional notes. | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Values | | | Select |
| Not applicable/assessed | | | |
| Zero to one elements of quality | | | Low |
| Two elements of quality | | | Low-Medium |
| Three elements of quality | | | Medium |
| Four elements of quality | | | Medium-High |
| Five or more elements of quality | | | High |
| Documentation: | | | |
| Researcher name and organi | zation | : | |
| Secondary sources: | | | |
| Record the following: document of | r sourc | e title, | |
| author or organization, date publ | ished, c | hapter or | |
| page, website (if relevant) | | | |
| Primary sources: | | | |
| For each of the above conducted, | record: | | |
| - Interviewee/participant name(s |) and ti | tle | |
| - Institution/company/organizati | | | |
| -Location and date of interview | | | |