



# MAP OF SBSTA SUBMISSIONS: REDD+ SAFEGUARD INFORMATION SYSTEM

GAIA LARSEN, DANIELA REY, AND FLORENCE DAVIET

## SUMMARY

*In December 2010, the 16th Conference of the Parties (COP 16) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) requested the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technical Advice (SBSTA) to develop guidance relating to paragraph 71(d) of the Cancun Agreements in time for COP 17 in Durban, December 2011.*

Paragraph 71(d) speaks to a system to provide information on how the safeguards in Annex 1 of the Cancun Agreements are being addressed and respected (termed the “safeguard information system” or SIS).<sup>1</sup>

In June 2011, SBSTA discussed the development of a guidance document on the SIS, and invited Parties and accredited Observers to submit their views on such guidance.<sup>2</sup> Submissions were welcomed on: characteristics; design; provision of information; potential barriers, if any, to providing information on addressing and respecting safeguards; and other relevant issues.

SBSTA received 26 submissions in total, 14 from Parties and 12 from Observers. Several submissions represent the view of more than one Party or Observer. While most submissions followed the structure suggested by SBSTA in June, they often covered substantively different topics under each heading. In an effort to bring greater clarity to discussions surrounding the SIS, ClientEarth and the World Resources Institute (WRI) have divided the

## CONTENTS

Summary.....	1
Key Findings.....	2
Notes and References.....	29
Acknowledgments.....	31

**Disclaimer:** World Resources Institute Working Papers contain preliminary research, analysis, findings, and recommendations. They are circulated to stimulate timely discussion and critical feedback and to influence ongoing debate on emerging issues. Most working papers are eventually published in another form and their content may be revised.

**Suggested Citation:** Larsen, Gaia et al. 2012. “Map of SBSTA Submissions: REDD+ Safeguard Information System.” WRI Working Paper. World Resources Institute, Washington DC. Available online at <http://www.wri.org/gfi>

---

information in the submissions into four categories:

1. The Role of the Safeguard Information System
2. The Type of Information that Parties Should Provide
3. How to Collect and Provide Information
4. Other Elements of the International Safeguard System

A summary of our key findings for each category is provided below. Tables of the specific language from Party submissions make up the rest of the document. In some cases it was difficult to be certain of the exact meaning of the language included in the submissions.<sup>3</sup> Every effort has been made to accurately reflect, in this abbreviated format, the views contained in the submissions. ClientEarth and WRI regret any misrepresentation of those views that may have occurred in an effort to achieve brevity, clarity and comparability.

## KEY FINDINGS

### 1. The Role of the Safeguard Information System

**Purpose:** Many submissions (10) state specifically that the purpose of the SIS is to provide regular information to national and international actors on how the REDD+ safeguards are being addressed and respected.<sup>4</sup> They indicate that provision of this information can, among other things, help promote the sustainability of REDD+ initiatives (5)<sup>5</sup> and transparency (3),<sup>6</sup> and guard against unintended social and environmental harms (4).<sup>7</sup> Some submissions (6) state that another purpose of the SIS is to provide information to donors and investors on the impact of REDD+ financing.<sup>8</sup>

**Qualities:** Submissions emphasize that an SIS should be: transparent (17),<sup>9</sup> participatory (14),<sup>10</sup> complete (11),<sup>11</sup> consistent (8),<sup>12</sup> comparable (8),<sup>13</sup> accurate (6),<sup>14</sup> accountable (5),<sup>15</sup> and gender-sensitive (7).<sup>16</sup> A number of submissions (5) recognize that systems for providing information should be developed according to national circumstances.<sup>17</sup>

### 2. Types of Information that Parties Should Provide

**Interpreting the Safeguards:** Some submissions (6) mention a need for further guidance on what it means to implement the REDD+ safeguards.<sup>18</sup> Others (8) begin to provide an understanding of the meaning of the safeguards.<sup>19</sup>

**Information to Provide:** Nearly all (20) of the submissions list information that they feel countries should be required to provide in an SIS,<sup>20</sup> including: an assessment of the national SIS and plans for improvement (6);<sup>21</sup> stakeholders affected by activities related to REDD+ and their participation in decision making (11);<sup>22</sup> laws, policies or regulations in place to implement the safeguards (7);<sup>23</sup> the effectiveness of these legal frameworks and gaps, barriers and challenges to implementation (9);<sup>24</sup> potential impacts on natural forests and biodiversity (5);<sup>25</sup> other relevant international instruments (5);<sup>26</sup> dispute resolution and grievance mechanisms (6);<sup>27</sup> and how the country gathered the information and verified its accuracy (9).<sup>28</sup>

### 3. How to Collect and Provide Information

**Collecting information:** Many submissions highlight the need for a participatory process in designing the SIS, and collecting and assessing the information (14).<sup>29</sup> Some submissions (4) call for an official entity to be responsible for the national SIS,<sup>30</sup> while others (8) call for several different actors to be involved in collection and monitoring, including local communities.<sup>31</sup> Several submissions (8) call for independent multi-stakeholder assessments of the information,<sup>32</sup> and a few (5) call for independent collection of data and/or oversight by expert bodies or commissions.<sup>33</sup>

**Harmonization:** Most of the submissions (16) encourage countries to take advantage of existing institutions already collecting and providing relevant data, including those providing information to other relevant international agreements or processes.<sup>34</sup>

**Data Collection Tools:** Many of the submissions call for guidance on data collection tools. For instance, some mention the creation of national indicators (11),<sup>35</sup> and suggest that SBSTA should provide guidance on the development of these indicators (6).<sup>36</sup> A few submissions (3) emphasize the need for a common reporting template.<sup>37</sup> Several submissions (7) emphasize that information should be publicly and readily available in a format useful to all stakeholders.<sup>38</sup>

## 4. Other Elements of the International Safeguard System

Reporting format: Others (5) recommend a core set of information requirements for comparability.<sup>39</sup> Half (13) of the submissions suggest that information should be consistent with established UNFCCC reporting requirements, such as Biennial Reports or National Communications,<sup>40</sup> while a couple (2) submissions recommend that information be integrated with NAMAs/NAPAs.<sup>41</sup> A number of submissions (10) recommend linking reporting to other relevant international agreements.<sup>42</sup> Others (3) suggest that timing and format for providing information should remain more flexible.<sup>43</sup> One submission (from Belize et al.) positions itself between these standpoints by suggesting reporting through existing systems but according to national capacity and support received.<sup>44</sup> A couple (2) submissions recommend interim reporting during the fast start finance period.<sup>45</sup>

Support: Half (13) of the submissions emphasize the need to provide support to developing countries to enable them to implement a sound SIS.<sup>46</sup> A couple (2) submissions suggest that the design of the SIS will be subject to the level of support received,<sup>47</sup> while a few (3) suggest a feedback loop to ensure continuous improvement.<sup>48</sup> One submission (Switzerland) suggests prioritization for LDCs,<sup>49</sup> while a few (3) emphasize that funding should be adequate and predictable.<sup>50</sup> A couple (2) submissions call for Annex I countries to report on the support they provide.<sup>51</sup>

Review and Compliance: A third (9) of the submissions mention linking the SIS to some form of monitoring, review, compliance and/or dispute resolution systems at the international level.<sup>52</sup> A few (3) submissions recommend that the SIS be integrated into the broader MRV framework under the UNFCCC,<sup>53</sup> while others (2) express preference for an SIS separate from the MRV system.<sup>54</sup>

Table 1a | **The Role of the Safeguard Information System (Parties)**

PARTY	PURPOSE OF THE SIS	QUALITIES
Australia	The “effective implementation of SIS is key to achieving the goals [REDD+]” Information systems “at the national scale should draw on sub-national and project information” and should “include the institutions, processes and data through which information on safeguards is collected, assessed and reported.”	“Transparency, consistency, comparability, completeness and accuracy,” and “full and effective participation of all relevant stakeholders.”
Belize et al.55		The SIS should be: “Consistent with the elements identified in paragraph 1 of Annex I to decision 1/CP.16; Flexible, including taking into account national circumstances and evolving conditions in the country; Nationally led and developed, respect national sovereignty, legislation, diversity and socio-economic conditions; Consistent with national development priorities, strategies, institutions, processes, so as to build upon existing infrastructure and national expertise. Furthermore, transparency, regularity, consistency, reliability and broad participation should be guiding principles of the system.” Guidance should “take into account national circumstances and should not be a prejudice to official national information systems.”
Brazil	“The purpose of the national information systems on safeguards is to provide clear, easily accessible and reliable information on how the safeguards...are being addressed and respected.” “Brazil supports the idea that systems to provide information on how the safeguards are treated and respected should be developed nationally, according to the circumstances of each developing country. Rather than having a single system to be implemented by all Parties, each country will develop its own [SIS], oriented by general guidance to be provided by SBSTA and the COP. Hence, the importance of the COP to agree on clear general principles and workable guidance.”	“[I]t is important to ensure consistency of the information (that is, information is based on a clear and informed set of assumptions, methodologies, and guidance) and completeness in the sense that all the safeguards should be addressed.”
Colombia & Mexico	“The purpose of the System should be to inform stakeholders about how the safeguards...are being addressed and respected, in the sense of minimizing the adverse and negative impacts, potentiate the positive ones, and assist in promoting good practices.” “[W]e support the idea that the system to provide information on how the safeguards are treated and respected should be developed nationally, respecting the capabilities and circumstances of each developing nation. This means that a specific country will have its own system, oriented by general guidance and principles to be provided by SBSTA and the COP, and not by a single system that will be required to be implemented by all countries. Thus, it is of utmost importance that the COP agrees on clear general principles and workable guidance.”	“The national system should contain publicly available (transparency) data and information relevant to indicate how the safeguards are being addressed and respected.” “[I]t is important to ensure consistency of the information (that is, the information based on the same set of assumptions, methodologies, guidance) and completeness in the sense that all the safeguards should be addressed.”
Costa Rica	“An information system on the implementation of safeguards for REDD+ can contribute significantly to improve the political and social conditions for the full functioning of the national strategies for REDD+ in our developing countries and to strengthen their linkages with other national sustainable development objectives.” “Developing countries that choose to implement REDD+ strategies on a voluntarily manner are also assuming a national commitment. That is an official commitment by Governments which in turn implies the obligation to report on the status of the implementation of the strategy.”	The SIS “will be fully aligned with the principles and guidance set out in Paragraph 1 of Annex I of the Decision 1/CP16, as well as with any additional guidance derived from such decision and any further elaboration of those provision[s] adopted by the [COP]... It is unnecessary for SBSTA to spend time and resources to discuss guidelines already contained in these instruments, such as: a. transparency; b. full and effective participation of stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities; c. consideration of national circumstances and capabilities of developing country parties and the level of support received; d. respect for national sovereignty; e. promotion of environmental integrity; f. consistency with national development priorities.” “The information system must be able to provide accurate, timely, reliable, and complete information on the various elements and sub-elements that can be identified in each of the safeguards.” “The system for providing information on safeguards...must correspond to the different phases...until reaching the stage of full implementation (results-based).” “[The] design and implementation of the system should be progressive and consistent with the provision of financial resources, as set forth in decision 1/CP.16.”

Table 1a | **The Role of the Safeguard Information System (Parties) cont.**

PARTY	PURPOSE OF THE SIS	QUALITIES
El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, Dominican Republic <sup>56</sup>	The SIS should allow an evaluation of the contribution of the national REDD strategy or plan towards the objectives and goals established in the national and regional forest strategies and plans, as well as the objectives of the international agreements on climate change, biodiversity, wetlands, and desertification. In the case of climate change, the SIS must evaluate the contribution of REDD+ to climate change adaptation of ecosystems and indigenous peoples and local community livelihoods linked to those ecosystems.	
European Union	“The purposes of systems for providing information on how safeguards are addressed and respected are to build confidence and transparency that countries can assess social and environmental effects of REDD+ actions and to facilitate dialogue among national and international actors.” They should “aim to support national strategies/action plans in defining and delivering expected outcomes” and “need to satisfy two distinct purposes: (i) supporting national REDD+ strategies/action plans in defining expected outcomes and showing and helping to verify how they are being delivered, and (ii) satisfying the accountability needs of donors on the use of finance.” “A system implies a structure of institutions and processes to enable regular provision of information.”	“[P]rinciples that are relevant include: transparency, consistency over time, accuracy, international comparability, [and] complete coverage of the safeguards. Further characteristics include the involvement of stakeholders, reliability of information, regularity, and reflection of national circumstances as well as existing national arrangements and institutions.” The system “should be simple and not over-burdensome, and aim for continuous improvement.” It should “conform to broad COP guidelines,” but not be “imposed from the outside.”
India		
Indonesia	“Given the fact that safeguards are needed in all phases of REDD+ implementation, the system should allow access for information on how safeguards... are being addressed and respected. Furthermore, the system should accommodate different levels and scales in the implementation of the seven elements of safeguards.”	
Indonesia et al. <sup>57</sup>	“[T]he system should ... allow access, based on national policy and circumstances, to information on how safeguards are addressed and respected.”	“Development and operationalization of the system should be transparent and should encourage broad participation.”
Japan	“One role of ‘systems for providing information on how safeguards are addressed and respected’ is to enhance transparency, including maintain accessibility, of activities on safeguards referred in paragraph 2 in Appendix I to Decision 1/CP.16 and to improve and promote activities on safeguards.”	“In order to enable to review and assess implementation of REDD-plus activities, it is necessary for developing countries to provide transparent, consistent, comparable, accurate and complete information and to continuously improve them, in accordance with capacity and phases.” “Access to information should be maintained,” and “the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders should be encouraged.” “The information should be continuously provided and updated, and the quality should be improved.”

Table 1a | **The Role of the Safeguard Information System (Parties) cont.**

PARTY	PURPOSE OF THE SIS	QUALITIES
Norway	<p>“As Parties have been progressing on REDD+ preparation and implementation; social, environmental and governance safeguards are increasingly seen as sustainability elements contributing to successful REDD+ outcomes. Norway believes that the ability to provide information on safeguard processes and outcomes will be critical if REDD+ is to succeed and the capital needed to run a global incentive structure for REDD+ as agreed in the full implementation phase is to be raised. Robust and informative guidance developed by SBSTA should be valuable and useful to REDD+ countries in developing national systems to provide information on safeguards. The guidance should also provide for transparency and predictability to domestic as well as international communities on what information to expect regarding how safeguards are addressed and respected in a country undertaking REDD+ activities. The guidance may also contribute to fruitful cooperation between REDD+ countries.” “A system to provide information, as well as the provision of information, serves at least two purposes: a) to inform and strengthen the policy work and implementation of REDD+ policies, and b) to satisfy the needs of financial contributors on the use of finance and implications of policies and activities.”</p>	<p>“Broader principles that are relevant for the development of a system for information, and the provision on information, on how safeguards are addressed and respected include: transparency, involvement of stakeholders, reliability of information, regularity, consistency over time, accuracy, international comparability, and complete coverage in addressing each of the seven safeguards as described in paragraph 2 of Appendix I to Decision 1/CP.16. In addition, alignment with the provision of related information to other relevant international agreements needs to be ensured.”</p>
Philippines		<p>“The system shall be transparent in collecting and sharing information, comprehensive in coverage and be in accordance with gender and rights consideration and the application of safeguards in particular the full and effective participation of stakeholders, particularly indigenous peoples and local communities, and the independent verification of information. The system shall place equal value to non-carbon information as with carbon information. The system shall promote equitable benefit and responsibility sharing.”</p>
Switzerland	<p>“Switzerland considers [the safeguard information] system to be a requirement for success [of REDD+].” “They must provide a reliable and comparable basis on which both national and international assessment of the social and environmental benefits, as well as governance aspects of REDD+ actions, can be made.”</p>	<p>The SIS should “be based on transparent, accurate, and reliable sources (accountability) and methods of social, environmental and governance information.” “Ensuring participation in, quality, and on-going improvement of information systems for safeguards is essential to providing constant feedback and continued finance of REDD+ programs and will ultimately consolidate their credibility.”</p>
United States	<p>A “system for providing information” is seen “as referring to national systems that should reflect countries’ specific circumstances.”</p>	<p>The SIS “should include the full and effective participation of stakeholders, in a manner consistent with national sovereignty.” “Transparency of data collection, sharing of information, and opportunities for stakeholder review – this will increase credibility and accuracy.” “Participatory in nature – involving affected stakeholders and local experts in design and implementation of the system.”</p>



Table 1b | **The Role of the Safeguard Information System (Observers)**

OBSERVER	PURPOSE OF THE SIS	QUALITIES
Accra Caucus (AC)	“REDD is established as a performance-based mechanism... Fulfilling the safeguards... contributes to that performance – enhancing the sustainability and permanence of reduced deforestation. Thus ensuring that forest communities and peoples are at the heart of REDD design and implementation contributes to enhancing the long term sustainability of REDD from a financial, environmental and social perspective. The converse is also true. Countries that fail to invest in safeguards will find... REDD income will be continuously eroded, as they fail to achieve the improvements in forest governance necessary to permanently reduce deforestation and receive performance based income linked to this.”	“Priority must be given to agreeing [to] those elements of the system that will enhance implementation of the safeguard at national level.” This includes that the information system must be “participatory in its design and implementation” and “must provide for transparent information-sharing that allows the different REDD actor to be held accountable for their actions.”
Climate Action Network (CAN)	“Th[e] safeguard information system will significantly improve the overall implementation and effectiveness of REDD+ by encouraging learning from experience. Information sharing between REDD+ countries... provide[s] an opportunity for countries to align and coordinate their existing systems and fill gaps where necessary” and “build confidence amongst REDD+ countries that benefits and burdens are being shared equitably, as well as building confidence and trust with donors, thereby increasing the ability of REDD+ countries to leverage financial support.” “The intent [of the SIS] is to ensure information is not merely provided on an ad-hoc basis.”	“[S]afeguards information should be provided in a transparent, consistent, comparable, complete and accurate way” and “... should be participatory in nature.” “Information should be provided in a way that is consistent over time; to enable tracking of the on-going application of the safeguards.” “Information provided at the international level should be comparable.” The SIS should be “designed in a way that ensures full and effective participation of all relevant stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities, and considering gender equity, as well as non-governmental organisations and experts.” “The quality of the data collected should be constantly improved.”
Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)		“[S]afeguards information should be provided in a transparent, consistent, comparable, complete and accurate way” and “... should be participatory in nature.” “Information should be provided in a way that is consistent over time; to enable tracking of the on-going application of the safeguards.” “Information provided at the international level should be comparable.” The SIS should be “designed in a way that ensures full and effective participation of all relevant stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities, and considering gender equity, as well as non-governmental organisations and experts.” “The quality of the data collected should be constantly improved.”
ClientEarth (CE) & World Resources Institute (WRI)	“We understand the information system called for in paragraph 71(d) of decision 1/CP.16 to be part of an international safeguard system. Our understanding is that this information system is meant to help ensure that Parties meet the objectives of the REDD+ safeguards—that is, that their domestic safeguard systems are adequate. The safeguard information system centers on a process whereby REDD+ countries report to the international community on how they are meeting the requirements embodied in the REDD+ safeguards. It is not currently clear which institution(s) will oversee implementation of the international safeguard system and what non-compliance or dispute resolution mechanisms might be associated with the information system.”	
Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL)		
Ecosystem Climate Alliance (ECA)	“An information system is understood to be the set of institutions and processes through which information is collected, verified, assessed, published and fed back into relevant institutions and local communities. Guidance, therefore, must address how relevant information is collected and its quality assured, and then how that information is provided and fed back to enable a response and constructive change.” Also see CAN submission language.	See CAN information above.

Table 1b | **The Role of the Safeguard Information System (Observers) *cont.***

OBSERVER	PURPOSE OF THE SIS	QUALITIES
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	“The information generated by the [national forest monitoring system] would serve a range of purposes, including to: Facilitate the improvement of national REDD+ strategies and action plans; Demonstrate progress towards national development goals; Help ensure accountability to domestic stakeholders; Provide information to the UNFCCC on a regular basis, and demonstrate credibility and legitimacy; Report to donors and investors on the use of finance and the impacts of REDD+ activities.”	“The [national forest monitoring system] should be able to provide complete information, including with regards to the UNFCCC safeguards;” such a system should “generate and compile all the information needed to demonstrate how all the safeguards are being addressed and respected” and “provide information on a regular basis and in a consistent manner.”
Forest Peoples Programme (FPP)	“The effectiveness and sustainability of any REDD+ program, project and action is best ensured by means of a reliable and robust system of information on safeguards that will have to be embedded into a rights-based architecture aimed at ensuring the respect of safeguards.” In addition, “[a]ll this information will be key to . . . contributing to identifying areas of capacity building and further technical assistance.” “If a system of information on safeguards is also meant to be a dynamic process of improvement, then FPIC and an independent recourse mechanism are mutually supportive. National systems that do not currently have such a system should elaborate actions undertaken toward the setting up of such mechanisms.”	The SIS “should be effective, transparent, reliable and participatory and based on the following pillars: Respect of highest standards contained in international human rights, environmental and social obligations, standards and instruments (including at national level); Free Prior Informed Consent, independent recourse mechanisms and parallel reporting by indigenous peoples.”
IPAM et al.58		“Information should be collected and reported in a transparent and comparable manner,” “should be consistent over time to enable tracking of ongoing application of safeguards,” and “should be complete and comprehensive, covering all actions undertaken to address both social and environmental safeguards.” “The [SIS] should ensure full and effective participation of all relevant stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities,” and it should consider gender equity and engage non-governmental organisations and experts.” The system should include incentives for continuously moving towards higher quality information.”
World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (WB FCPF)	“The objective of [the World Bank safeguard] policies is to prevent and mitigate harm to people and the natural environment in the development process as well as to provide benefits to different stakeholder groups. The effectiveness and development impact of World Bank-supported projects and programs has substantially increased as a result of safeguards application. Moreover, safeguard policies have often provided a platform for the participation of stakeholders in project design, and have provided the means for building ownership among Indigenous Peoples and local communities.”	“There is a need to observe national sovereignty. . . . But there is also the need to ensure quality and consistency across countries; therefore, it becomes more a question of drawing on the most forward-looking elements of these national-level systems in creating a truly international system—underlain by solid standards (initially, the safeguards listed in Annex I themselves)—for informing on safeguards in REDD+. As the Annex I safeguards are defined further, the differences between them and country-specific normative frameworks could become more apparent, making the need for such an overarching international system all the more important.”
Women’s Environment and Development Organization (WEDO)		“Gender blind implementation could jeopardize the achievement of safeguard goals related to land and natural resource use; full and effective consultation and participation; fair access to information; education to enable decision-making and consent; and equitable distribution of benefits.”



Table 1b | **The Role of the Safeguard Information System (Observers) *cont.***

OBSERVER	PURPOSE OF THE SIS	QUALITIES
World Wild-life Fund (WWF)	<p>“For REDD+ to succeed, WWF believes that the following fundamental questions must be answered: 1. Is REDD+ demonstrably contributing to significant and permanent greenhouse gas emission reductions, with national goals working toward a global objective? 2. Is REDD+ maintaining and/or enhancing biodiversity and ecosystem services? 3. Is REDD+ contributing to sustainable and equitable livelihoods, by addressing the underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation? 4. Is REDD+ recognizing and respecting the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, implemented with the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, including their Free, Prior, &amp; Informed Consent of actions affecting their lands, territories and resources? 5. Is REDD+ mobilizing immediate, adequate and predictable resources for action in an equitable, transparent, participatory and coordinated manner?”</p>	<p>The SIS should have characteristics reflecting transparency, comparability, consistency, accuracy, and full and effective participation of all relevant stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities. Gender equity should also be considered.<sup>58</sup></p>

Table 2a | **Types of Information that Parties Should Provide (Parties)**

PARTY	DEFINING THE MEANING OF THE SAFEGUARDS	TYPES OF INFORMATION COUNTRIES SHOULD PROVIDE
Australia	<p>The safeguards aim to: “ensure that that implementation of an international REDD+ mechanism does not result in negative, unintended social, economic or environmental impacts;” “promote the sustainability of a REDD+ mechanism by addressing environmental integrity;” “afford local and indigenous communities with strong ties to the land... the opportunity to apply local knowledge;” and “help ensure the sustainability of REDD+ activities beyond the initial stages of project development.”</p>	<p>Parties should report: “Description of design and structure of SIS; details on the legislation, policies and governance arrangements in place to support, or of relevance to safeguards; description of how national circumstances apply to safeguards... including, but not limited to: identification of natural forests and other areas important to biodiversity and a description of how these areas have been defined, application of existing international frameworks such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation or the Convention on Biological Diversity, [and] identification of relevant stakeholders, in particular indigenous and local communities; [and] actions taken to address safeguards and future plans for improvement.” “The SIS should include an initial assessment drawing on all available data. This initial assessment can then provide the basis for ongoing review and progress.”</p>
Belize et al.		<p>“Information on how the safeguards... are being respected throughout implementation of REDD+ activities should be provided only for supported actions and should be consistent with the level of development of the national REDD+ strategy and its agreed phases.”</p>
Brazil		<p>“The type of data and information to be included in the systems of information should be a national decision, guided by the general principles agreed by the COP, and should allow for broad participation and be separate and independent from MRV systems.”</p>
Colombia & Mexico		<p>“The type of data and information to be included in the system of information should be a national decision, guided by the general principles agreed by the COP, and should not generate unnecessary barriers so as to promote the broad participation of countries in the REDD+ mechanism.” “The information should be relevant for local, regional, national and international stakeholders.” “Each participating country shall inform about the arrangements and responsibilities for the design, implementation, operation and maintenance of the system, as well as organization of the data and information provided.”</p>
Costa Rica		<p>Parties should report “information on how safeguards are addressed and respected” and “information on the number of complaints received and their resolution.”</p>

Table 2a | **Types of Information that Parties Should Provide (Parties) cont.**

PARTY	DEFINING THE MEANING OF THE SAFEGUARDS	TYPES OF INFORMATION COUNTRIES SHOULD PROVIDE
El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, Dominican Republic <sup>59</sup>	The submission calls for a clear concept of the REDD+ safeguards	The submission provides a specific list of types of information for each safeguard that Parties should report on. In general, the submission refers to quantitative and qualitative information, including: the number of ratified international conventions relevant to indigenous peoples, quantity of financial resources provided to local representatives to monitor, report and verify REDD+ projects and to solve conflicts, quantity of property titles, agreements, concessions provided to indigenous peoples and local communities under REDD+ projects, number of inter-sectoral dialogue tables on REDD+ in which indigenous peoples and local communities participate, etc. <sup>60</sup>
European Union	“Regional processes to contribute to promoting sharing of experience on the application of safeguards, and to developing further guidance as may be appropriate in the regional context” should be encouraged.	“Parties should describe the relevant barriers for the application of safeguards and the steps undertaken to overcome those barriers.” “Potential implementation barriers may relate to: the extent of legal or other provisions in place to deliver safeguards in principle, the extent to which these provisions are implemented in practice... to show how the provisions are working, the extent to which the populations affected by REDD+ activities can access relevant information and recourse mechanisms, [and] the challenge of developing indicators for all seven safeguards and implementing and maintaining information systems.” They should report: for safeguard (a) the “contribution of REDD+ actions to achieving objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international agreements and processes;” for safeguard (b) a “description of policy, legal, institutional and regulatory frameworks, including on law enforcement;” for safeguard (c) an “identification of different right holders and their rights and description how those rights are respected;” for safeguard (d) a “description of participatory process for the design and implementation of a national REDD+ strategy or action plan and how this process was applied, including a description of systems to disseminate and receive information;” for safeguard (e) an “identification of the positive and negative impacts of a national REDD+ strategy or action plan on biodiversity and ecosystem services and identification and monitoring of natural forest;” for safeguard (f) a “description of the actions and liabilities;” for safeguard (g) a “description of the actions and identification of significant sources, and the collection of data on, the displacement of emissions.”
India		Reports should contain: “(i) Forest carbon stock accounts at the national level. (ii) Period of report. (iii) During report period: a. Area brought under i. Reforestation, ii. Improvement in forest cover/natural regeneration [and] iii. Agroforestry/tree cover on non-forest lands/afforestation; b. Initiatives to reduce use of fuelwood [including] i. Number of improved wood-burning cookstoves distributed [and] ii. CNG units distributed; c. Forest and wooded area conserved [including] i. Soil and water conservation measures, ii. Fire protection measures [and] iii. Cases of illegal felling; d. Area of forest diverted for developmental works [including] i. Extent and brief description of forest land diverted, ii. Compensatory mitigation measures planned/taken with description [and] iii. Policies, laws, guidelines, rules, etc. regulating/restraining diversion of forest land. (iv) Certificate that activities, actions and initiatives described in (iii) above are in consonance with national forest policy/programmes, national REDD-plus framework and strategies, and are not detrimental to the quality and extent of the natural forests. (v) Number of panchayats, gram sabhas, local communities, Joint Forest management Committees, Eco-development Committees, Forest Protection Committees with due representation of women participating in the REDD-plus activities. (vi) Number and description of capacity building initiatives for stakeholders undertaken (vii) Relevant new laws, policies, guidelines, protocols, government orders, executive instructions implemented during the report period.”
Indonesia	“The safeguards and guidance, for REDD+ implementation as appears in the Annex 1 of the Decision 1/CP. 16 are conceptually logical but practically challenging to be implemented. Indonesia considers that it is necessary to translate the safeguards into practical elements to enable REDD+ countries to effectively implement them within the context of national legislation and specific circumstances.”	

Table 2a | **Types of Information that Parties Should Provide (Parties) *cont.***

PARTY	DEFINING THE MEANING OF THE SAFEGUARDS	TYPES OF INFORMATION COUNTRIES SHOULD PROVIDE
Indonesia et al.		
Japan		<p>“All safeguards referred in paragraph 2 of Appendix I to Decision 1/CP.16 should be treated in the systems, taking into account national circumstances and phases.” “It is necessary to report progress of development of the systems and on information on safeguards regularly.”</p>
Norway	<p>“The development of a solid and unambiguous understanding of safeguards within the UNFCCC might facilitate the work on safeguards related to other bodies and organisations.” “The term ‘addressed’ relates to policy measures which are planned, implemented, or has been implemented relating to the safeguards; that is action that is intended, is taking place or has taken place. The term thus implies descriptions of policy. The term ‘respected’ implies the achievement of a certain result. This is because when it may be concluded that the safeguards are ‘respected’, the outcome of any actions is known. The term ‘respected’ therefore mandates a description of the situation in relation to each safeguard. It is Norway’s understanding that both these terms are equally important, though both might not be equally relevant to the information provided on all safeguards.”</p>	<p>“Norway believes each Party should develop a system that fits its national circumstances. Nonetheless, Norway would see merit in each Party, when providing information on how the safeguards are addressed and respected, also providing information on how the system is built up and functions. That is, the system should provide meta-information: on how the information on the safeguards has been collected, i.e. a description of the methodologies applied; how participation of indigenous peoples and other relevant groups in the collection of the information has been catered for; what sort of quality assurance system has been applied to the information once collected; and when and where the information is from. The relationship to subnational systems should be elaborated when applicable.”</p>
Philippines		<p>“Its scope shall, at the least, include the following types of information: information on how REDD-Plus safeguards are applied, an independent assessment and verification of the information provided, and actions taken in response to the assessment.”</p>
Switzerland	<p>The “strengthening of governance and monitoring structures, particularly local and national forest governance programs will be required.” “National legislation and its enforcement, particularly concerning land tenure and the governance of natural resources must evolve to more effectively address REDD+ safeguards.”</p>	
United States		<p>“In their reporting, each Party should provide information on the manner in which each of the safeguards referred to in paragraph 2 of 1/CP.16 is being addressed and respected. We would not consider it sufficient for Parties to pick and choose the elements identified in paragraph 2. Information on how the full and effective participation of stakeholders has been addressed should be included in the reporting. Qualitative and, where appropriate, quantitative information showing that safeguards are being addressed and respected should be provided to the Parties in sufficient detail for other Parties to have confidence that safeguards are being adequately addressed and respected. . . We recommend that countries be requested to report transparently on any barriers to addressing/respecting safeguards.”</p>

Table 2b | **Types of Information that Parties Should Provide (Observers)**

OBSERVER	DEFINING THE MEANING OF THE SAFEGUARDS	TYPES OF INFORMATION COUNTRIES SHOULD PROVIDE
AC	<p>National laws provide an enabling framework for the REDD+ safeguards, but additional regulations are needed to fill in the gaps where “existing laws have failed to guarantee protection to date.” “SBSTA should highlight the key elements of full effective participation, including ensuring that structures exist for relevant rights and stakeholder groups to participate at all levels, and devoting sufficient time and resources for such participation.” “The need for practical guidance on safeguards is urgent.”</p>	
CAN		<p>The SIS should include the following information: “(i) An initial assessment of how the safeguards are addressed and respected, that then allows for an ongoing assessment of progress over time; (ii) For each of the safeguards, information on the action(s) undertaken to address that safeguard is being addressed and respected throughout all REDD related activities, along with data on the results of that action (i.e. the extent to which the safeguard is respected); (iii) Information to assess the reliability of that data, such as: (a) the source of the information, such as whether it is data collected remotely or through field research/ground-truthing, (b) the identity of the source, at least in general terms, such as whether the information has been provided by local communities, indigenous peoples, international NGOs, the private sector, etc. [and] (c) any steps taken to verify the information or ensure its accuracy, including any independent audit or analysis undertaken; (iv) Any response to the information, including steps taken by the REDD+ country to improve implementation; (v) Information that allows for an assessment of how the safeguards have been implemented over time; and (vi) Where the information prioritizes certain aspects, or uses indicators, the process used to arrive at this priority list and/or choice of indicators.” “[T]he level and purpose of finance provided specifically to support implementation of the safeguards should also be published.” To allow tracking progress over time “data could be provided on the number of civil society complaints lodged against a particular REDD+ activity. This data should include updating information on how those complaints have been dealt with and resolved over time.”</p>
CBD	<p>“There is a confusing proliferation of terms in the context of safeguards: principles, criteria, standards, policies, etc. The meaning of these terms differs although they are often used interchangeably. ...[T]here are several different emerging approaches to implementing REDD-plus safeguards, and there is a need to develop a common understanding.” “Many national level policies, laws, regulations, etc., which are applicable to REDD-plus biodiversity safeguards already exist, although they were not developed specifically for that purpose (e.g., forest and protected area legislation). Such policies, including those based on traditional ecological and local knowledge, should be considered as a basis for REDD-plus efforts.” “There are gaps in existing and emerging safeguard approaches. Inter alia, applying the precautionary approach to natural resource management; the principle of free prior and informed consent; spatially explicit identification of forest areas of high biodiversity value; and a monitoring system with national baselines are key principles/criteria that are not sufficiently addressed in some of the existing frameworks.... there is a need to recognise the components of biodiversity: ecosystems, species and genetic diversity.” “The rights of indigenous peoples and local communities regarding customary use of traditional territories, land and natural resources should be ensured through national legislation/instruments.”</p>	<p>“Essential information for biodiversity safeguards will include (i) location, extent, composition and changes over time of natural forests, and (ii) location, extent, composition, and changes over time of high biodiversity areas.” “The primary indicators for measuring REDD-plus biodiversity impacts... at national level should focus in particular on (i) fragmentation and connectivity of forests; (ii) status and trends of protected areas; and (iii) area of degraded habitat or ecosystem restored; (iv) distribution of invasive alien species; as well as (v) area of forests under sustainable management.”</p>

Table 2b | **Types of Information that Parties Should Provide (Observers) cont.**

OBSERVER	DEFINING THE MEANING OF THE SAFEGUARDS	TYPES OF INFORMATION COUNTRIES SHOULD PROVIDE
CE & WRI	<p>"In order to develop national REDD+ safeguard systems, countries will need to interpret the language of the COP decisions in more detail. Developing a full interpretation will require a domestic process and assessment of domestic circumstances, including which relevant international and regional instruments the country has ratified. Language included in existing international and regional instruments provides a starting point for this interpretation. This is especially the case of REDD+ safeguards (a) through (e)." SBSTA should "provide an initial list of the relevant international instruments related to each safeguard;" "provide guidance to help Parties interpret the safeguards, which at a minimum would include language from the international instruments<sup>61</sup> that reflect the same human rights, environmental, and governance objectives described in the REDD+ safeguards;" and "recommend to Parties that a process for interpreting safeguards (f) and (g) be undertaken once the international GHG accounting rules for REDD+ have been defined and there is a better understanding of how displacement and reversals will be addressed."</p>	<p>SBSTA should "provide a list of the basic components of a safeguard system and a recommendation that Parties undertake a review and assessment of the current systems and measures they have in place to ensure that they are protecting and implementing the rights and objectives described in the REDD+ safeguards.... This will at a minimum include: a) laws and policies, including administrative procedures; b) institutions and their capacity to implement existing provisions; c) enforcement measures, including monitoring systems; d) grievance and recourse mechanisms; and e) how these systems, institutions, and mechanisms work in practice." SBSTA should request that Parties report their assessment of existing systems and measures to implement safeguards and how such a review was undertaken. Specifically, SBSTA should suggest that Parties "engage stakeholders in the assessment process and that they make publicly available: 1) their assessment, including the questions considered and the analysis undertaken; and 2) information describing the steps or actions Parties plan to undertake to address any gaps identified. SBSTA should request that Parties describe whether and how activities to develop and implement the safeguards are consistent with measures to be taken relating to relevant international instruments that the country has ratified or decided to apply voluntarily. This information could then be used to track the development and implementation of the safeguard system over time."</p>
CIEL		
ECA		<p>"[T]he SIS should describe actions taken to address and respect the safeguards as well as information tracking the extent to which the safeguards are continuously being adhered to in practice." "The SIS... should include the following: (i) An initial assessment of how the safeguards are addressed and respected, that then allows for an ongoing assessment of progress over time; (ii) The institutions responsible for ensuring the safeguards are being addressed and respected; (iii) How domestic laws, policies and procedures support the safeguards being addressed and respected; (iv) International agreements or institutions the country has ratified that are also relevant to the implementation of the safeguards, including agreements or instruments that provide reporting mechanisms which can support the SIS; (v) Information should be provided on the extent to which all REDD+ activities are carried out in accordance with the safeguards, including how those activities impact or affect the implementation of the safeguards; (vi) For each of the safeguards, information should be provided on the specific action(s) taken to ensure that the safeguard is being addressed and respected throughout all REDD+ related activities; (vii) For each safeguard, information should be provided that allows for tracking the extent to which the safeguard is continuously adhered to in practice. This would include identifying obstacles to be overcome and uncontrolled drivers of deforestation/forest degradation that need to be addressed, to ensure that the safeguards can be addressed and respected over time; (viii) Information to assess reliability of data...; (ix) Any response to the information, including steps taken by the REDD+ country to respond to the information and improve implementation; (x) Information collected with consistent frequency that allows for an assessment of how the safeguards have been implemented over time; and (xi) Where the information prioritizes certain aspects, or uses indicators, the process used to arrive at this priority list and/or choice of indicators and the analysis to demonstrate that prioritization or indicators are representative." "Information on the level and purpose of finance provided specifically to support implementation to the safeguards could also be provided." "Parties should indicate how the information provided... has been independently verified and assessed at national level, with stakeholder participation in the process." "Data should also track stakeholder assessments of the SIS. For example, data could be provided on the number of complaints lodged against a particular REDD+ activity by civil society, indigenous groups and local communities. This data should include updating information on how those complaints have been dealt with and resolved over time."</p>

Table 2b | **Types of Information that Parties Should Provide (Observers) cont.**

OBSERVER	DEFINING THE MEANING OF THE SAFEGUARDS	TYPES OF INFORMATION COUNTRIES SHOULD PROVIDE
FAO		<p>“[E]vidence of a safeguard being respected will differ from information on how it is being addressed. A national system should generate and compile all the information needed to demonstrate how all the safeguards are being addressed and respected.”</p>
FPP	<p>“SBSTA should produce guidance on the SIS that include information on how and extent by which the safeguards are being addressed and respected.” The rights of indigenous peoples to be secured “throughout the REDD cycle, programs and projects are: Rights to land, territories and natural resources; Right to Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC); Rights to traditional knowledge and practices; Rights to self determination and exercise of customary laws, governance and customary land use and forest management; Rights to full and effective participation on decision-making on matters that affect Indigenous Peoples and local communities; Rights to law enforcement and conflict resolution through traditional governance systems, with local monitoring and reporting of infringements; Rights to full and effective participation and consultation of indigenous peoples and local communities, and timely access to adequate information in culturally appropriate manner; Right to equitable benefit sharing.”</p>	<p>“In particular the SIS should provide data aimed at an assessment of the extent by which indigenous peoples rights are being recognized and respected at the national level throughout the whole process (from design, to planning, to decision-making, implementation, MRV), with a view to evaluate the level of accomplishment of the preconditions (milestones) setup for the Readiness and implementation phases of REDD+.” It should also include: A) “a clear assessment of the degree of implementation of the safeguards, and actions undertaken to prevent harm to indigenous peoples taking into due account gender-related concerns, including measures to respect the right to Free Prior Informed Consent, as well as actions undertaken to redress and compensate for any harm inflicted as a consequence of REDD policies, programmes and actions;” B) “an assessment of the level of compliance of existing national legislation to international obligations and standards related to indigenous peoples and human rights such as the UNDRIP and ILO 169;” C) “an assessment of the extent by which the REDD country has secured or intends to secure . . . indigenous peoples rights throughout the REDD cycle, programs and projects;” D) “degree and modalities of indigenous peoples’ participation in the definition of the criteria and ToRs for the SIS at the national level, and measures to ensure indigenous peoples’ participation throughout the whole process of gathering, analyzing, producing information for the SIS.” “The scope and nature of the type of information to be retrieved and communicated varies according to phase. During the readiness phase, most of the activity related to the SIS will be relevant to a methodological analysis and strategic assessment (such as in the SESAs and ESMF of the FCPF) and thus the SIS would need to identify those policy actions implemented, or that would need to be implemented, to respect and protect indigenous peoples. In the implementation phase the need to directly assess the level of compliance to the actual Cancun safeguards is more evident and stringent and the SIS would then have to contain an assessment of the degree by which these policies and legislation, as well as safeguards, are respected.” “The SIS should also report on any claim to the recourse mechanism, or to other competent bodies, that generates from the lack of compliance of safeguards and inform about its resolution.”</p>
IPAM et al.		<p>“Published information should include: An assessment of how the safeguards are addressed and respected; Information on the action(s) undertaken to address and respect each safeguard; Information to track outcomes related to the safeguards; Information to assess reliability of data, such as: the type of information; the source of information (e.g., collected remotely, through field research, etc), at least in general terms; steps taken to verify the information or ensure its accuracy; and any additional underlying information that documents these steps that have been taken. Actions taken in response to the outcomes of the information assessment.”</p>



Table 2b | **Types of Information that Parties Should Provide (Observers) cont.**

OBSERVER	DEFINING THE MEANING OF THE SAFEGUARDS	TYPES OF INFORMATION COUNTRIES SHOULD PROVIDE
WB FCPF	<p>“The FCPF’s experience with the development of the Common Approach has shown that it is possible to build cross-sectoral consensus around the characteristics and design of a single safeguards framework, including key aspects of an information system on safeguards implementation as noted below: Principles and objectives; Substantive and procedural requirements (including those related to stakeholder consultation and participation and the disclosure of information); Mechanisms for providing information; and Mechanisms for grievance redress.” “In the case of the World Bank, the ten safeguard policies are entirely inclusive of the safeguard principles and protections embodied in the safeguards listed in Annex I to the decision 1/CP.16, as follows: (a) is covered by Operational Policy (OP) 4.01 on Environmental Assessment and OP 4.36 on Forests; (b) is covered by OP 4.36 on Forests; (c) is covered by OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples; (d) is covered by Operational Policy (OP) 4.01 on Environmental Assessment, OP 4.04 on Natural Habitats, OP 4.36 on Forests, OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples, and OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement; (e) is covered by OP 4.04 on Natural Habitats and OP 4.36 on Forests; (f) is covered by OP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment, OP 4.04 on Natural Habitats, and OP 4.36 on Forests; and (g) is covered by OP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment (Annex A).”</p>	<p>“A closer look at the specific steps that would constitute SESA in the context of Readiness provides a clearer idea of (i) the types of relevant information that may be provided; (ii) the likeliest sources of that information; and (iii) effective vehicles for summarizing and conveying that information: a situational diagnostic that includes (among other things) stakeholder mapping, in order to ensure the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders in such upstream processes such as the identification of chief drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, as provided for in para. 72 of decision 1/CP.16; the ranking by relevant stakeholders of environmental and social issues in relation to the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, in a way that eventually contributes to the identification and refinement of responses to those drivers in the form of a national REDD+ strategy or action plan; the identification of legal, regulatory, institutional, and capacity gaps for managing the environmental and social priorities determined earlier, together with the formulation of recommendations to fill those gaps; and the preparation of the ESMF for managing potential environmental and social impacts and risks and boosting benefits in relation to the national REDD+ strategy and related activities. All of this requires proper documentation as the process unfolds, as well as when the REDD+ strategy that is finally decided on is being implemented and the associated impacts and risks are being addressed.”</p>
WEDO	<p>This submission includes principles and criteria to ensure REDD+ safeguards are gender-sensitive, drawing on international agreements. The principles include: “ensure women’s rights own or inherit land;” “ensure that women receive information and proper trainings related to all REDD+ activities.... and have the tools and knowledge needed to engage;” “guarantee the full and effective participation of women, as primary stakeholders;” “stakeholders should be defined to “specifically include women;” “ensure that women—both on their own and as members of indigenous and forest-dependent communities—are provided fair and appropriate compensation, incentives, benefits and revenues generated by REDD+ activities.”</p>	
WWF		<p>“It [Information] should be complete and comprehensive, covering all actions undertaken to address both social and environmental safeguards.” “Types of information to be collected...should be determined with full and effective participation of stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities.” Published information should include: “An assessment of how the safeguards are addressed and respected; Information on the action(s) undertaken to address and respect each safeguard; Information to track outcomes related to the safeguards; Information to assess reliability of data, such as: the type of information; the source of information (e.g., collected remotely, through field research, etc), at least in general terms; steps taken to verify the information or ensure its accuracy; and any additional underlying information that documents these steps that have been taken. Actions taken in response to the outcomes of the information assessment.”</p>

Table 3a | **How to Collect and Provide Information (Parties)**

PARTY	HOW TO COLLECT & ASSESS INFORMATION	HARMONIZATION & EFFICIENCY	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
Australia	<p>“The design of the SIS should...include opportunity for regular reviews to facilitate ongoing improvement. These reviews should provide for the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, and international partners.”</p>		
Belize et al.	<p>“Responsibility for the system on informing how safeguards are addressed and respected should remain with the relevant national authorities,” the National Focal Point to the UNFCCC. “The collection...of information provided should be in conformity with relevant decisions by the Parties along with relevant national regulations, procedures and modalities related to the implementation of the safeguards (scope, standard, methods for gathering and processing information, presentation and assessment).” “Providing and gathering information and participation of stakeholders should be adjusted to the existing national processes and modalities.”</p>	<p>Information systems “should prioritize strengthening and build on existing national and international systems, institutions and methodologies for monitoring and reporting on environmental, social and governance issues.” The system “may: embody and reinforce the guidance and rules of existing environment and human rights treaties, particularly UNDRIP and FLEGT, when relevant; draw upon and complement relevant standards, for instance those of the voluntary forest carbon market; use experience and analysis from multiple-benefit forest carbon and other land-use projects (i.e. REDD+ Social and Environmental Safeguards developed by Brazil and other individual countries, Social Impact Analysis, Development Indicators, etc.)”</p>	
Brazil	<p>“To ensure transparency, national systems should contain publicly accessible data and information that are relevant for indicating how the safeguards are being addressed and respected.” “Brazil has an important experience with a system for providing information on how the official rates of gross deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon are produced. Different stakeholders, including NGOs, state environmental agencies and others, can readily and easily access the data used and the information generated, including from previous years.” “The design of national systems should be flexible enough to accommodate for changing needs for information across time, and be adaptable to technical changes, if necessary.”</p>	<p>“To ensure efficiency and cost-effectiveness, national information systems should cater information needed in an integrated and coordinated way. This can be achieved by building information systems on existing data and institutions, so that they compliment or are consistent with the objectives of the country’s national forest programme and relevant data sets and processes.”</p>	<p>“Using the internet as a vehicle of information, all the data, including nearly 240 satellite images, and the results of analysis of satellite imagery at a state level is presented, thus allowing any interested person, agency or organization to reproduce the results obtained...This data will be instrumental for addressing the safeguard about non-conversion of natural forests to implement other REDD+ activities.”</p>
Colombia & Mexico	<p>“Each participating country shall identify the national agencies and organizations in charge of providing data and information, while ensuring effective stakeholder involvement at all stages of development of the System, from its design to its effective implementation.” “All those interested should have access to clear, easily accessible and well structured information... All the information deemed to be relevant to inform how the safeguards are being treated and respected should be shared openly.” “The system should be designed with a view to accommodate for changing needs for information in the future, and be adaptable to technical changes, if necessary.”</p>	<p>“To ensure efficiency and cost-effectiveness, the national information system should cater information needed in an integrated and coordinated way. This can be achieved by building the information system on existing data and institutions, so that it complements or is consistent with the objectives of the country’s national forest program and relevant data sets and processes.”</p>	

Table 3a | **How to Collect and Provide Information (Parties) cont.**

PARTY	HOW TO COLLECT & ASSESS INFORMATION	HARMONIZATION & EFFICIENCY	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
Costa Rica	<p>“The entity responsible for REDD+ will be responsible for managing the information system,” together with “other authorities or relevant institutions who will be involved in accordance with their legal mandates in areas related to REDD+, in particular national authorities in the forestry, biodiversity and protected areas fields.” Information “must be generated by official mechanisms established in each country, or that will be required to be created, when they are absent or are inadequate to provide the information that adequately reflects how safeguards are addressed and respected.” Through a relevant national authority, “information quality (relevance, consistency, objectivity, comparability in time) and implementation of the [SIS] must be consistent with existing national regulations and procedures relating to official information.” The SIS must “include an accessible and open space for the participation of stakeholders to submit their complaints if affecting legitimate rights as a result of the implementation of REDD+ measures and activities.” And the “final design of...an information system must be legitimized with relevant stakeholders.”</p>	<p>“For reasons of efficiency in public investments Parties will use as appropriate and to the extent possible, the existent relevant and official sources and mechanisms of information to generate data on the safeguards.”</p>	
El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, Dominican Republic <sup>62</sup>	<p>National technical committees of the UNFCCC, local governments, CBD and Ramsar focal points, national forestry service, relevant national Secretaries and Ministries, financing institutions, universities and research centres. Also mentioned, independent forest monitoring.</p>		<p>The SIS should incorporate verifiable indicators.</p>
European Union	<p>“Developing countries should ensure the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders in the design of their national information system.” “Independent monitoring including broad stakeholder consultation has proved to be an effective tool in providing reliable information in the Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) program and it should be part of the information systems.” “Guidance for national information systems should address what information is needed, how it is collected, processed, made available and published.”</p>	<p>“The system should build on existing institutions, processes and mechanisms where possible, including those under relevant agreements and processes, and where available existing sources of information should be integrated into the system.” Information systems should be in the “context of national legislation and policies, including national REDD+ strategies, broader development and adaptation strategies and biodiversity strategies and action plans.”</p>	<p>“Developing countries should develop and apply national indicators, quantified where possible, for the different safeguards to operationalize the provision of information on the safeguards.” However a potential challenge will be “developing indicators for all seven safeguards and implementing and maintaining information systems.”</p>
India			
Indonesia	<p>“In order to maintain transparency and inclusiveness in the development of the system for information provision on safeguards, there is a need to carry out consultation processes at both policy and technical levels involving all stakeholders.”</p>		
Indonesia et al.			

Table 3a | **How to Collect and Provide Information (Parties) cont.**

PARTY	HOW TO COLLECT & ASSESS INFORMATION	HARMONIZATION & EFFICIENCY	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
Japan	<p>“Access to information should be maintained, including access by relevant stakeholders,” and “full and effective participation should be encouraged.” “It is necessary to strengthen capacity, including capacity for information collection, maintenance and improvement of the systems, and governance to maintain the systems.” “Full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders should be encouraged to set criteria and/or indicators and to collect and accumulate information on safeguards.”</p>	<p>“It is efficient to use information under the existing international framework including UNFF, FAO, ITTO and CBD; existing national systems for collecting and reporting the information; and national forest monitoring system referred in paragraph 71(c) of Decision 1/CP.16.”</p>	<p>“Accountable criteria and/or indicators on safeguards should be set by using quantitative and qualitative methods, taking into account of national circumstances, according to available guidance and relevant international conventions and agreements. These may include not only outcome based indicators but also qualitative ones, such as policy measures and degree of their implementation.” “As information gained could be different among ground levels, local levels and national level, criteria and/or indicators should be set at each level so that safeguard measures will be implementable.”</p>
Norway	<p>“It is Norway’s understanding that the participation of relevant stakeholders as described in the Cancun Agreement Annex I also covers the participation in the gathering of information for the safeguards information system.”</p>	<p>“Norway recognises the importance of adjusting to existing national institutions and using existing systems when possible and practicable. The safeguards information system should be developed in the context of national legislation and policies.”</p>	
Philippines	<p>“National and subnational institutions shall be responsible for the collection and sharing of information.” “The collection of information should cover the forest management unit, subnational and the national level, with feedback mechanisms towards sharing reviewed and independently verified information to stakeholders transparently.”</p>	<p>“The system should be harmonized with and mainstreamed alongside relevant monitoring systems, including but not limited to forest, biodiversity, and socio-economic monitoring.”</p>	<p>“Efforts towards enhancing the quality of data and information collected should be promoted and incentivized. This includes the development and use of community participatory monitoring processes as well as determination of monitoring indicators.”</p>
Switzerland	<p>Information “should be contributed to by multiple sources, including relevant stakeholders, particularly indigenous peoples and local communities.” The SIS “should combine on-the-ground information collection, including local recollection and analysis of information with institutional (top-down) perspectives and analytical tools.”</p>	<p>“The collection and type of information provided should be in conformity with relevant decisions by the Parties along with the relevant national regulations, procedures and modalities related to the implementation of safeguards (scope, standard, methods for gathering and processing information, presentation and assessment). Local institutions and existing information systems on forest related activities should be used.”</p>	<p>Parties “need international guidelines or general principles that each country can adapt to its respective capacity and circumstances.” Parties should “draw on existing data sets, analysis, systems, guidance and frameworks for information provision on social, environmental and governance issues.”</p>
United States		<p>“Efficiency and simplicity so that information collection and sharing fits, to the extent possible, in existing institutions and processes.”</p>	<p>“[D]ifferent processes and systems may be required to collect data on different safeguards.” The system should be “empirical data based [and] use process and outcome indicators where those make sense.” It should involve “robust methods, QA/QC documented, metadata on how data were collected.”</p>

Table 3b | **How to Collect and Provide Information (Observers)**

OBSERVERS	HOW TO COLLECT & ASSESS INFORMATION	HARMONIZATION & EFFICIENCY	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
AC	<p>The analysis of gaps in national legislation and its implementation should be done in a participatory way. Those most likely to be affected by the failure to respect the safeguards must be “involved in identifying where existing laws have failed to guarantee protection to date.” “A multi-stakeholder national REDD safeguards body would be appropriate for managing a truly participatory system.” “Local rights- and stakeholders can be involved in defining the appropriate indicators for the safeguards, and a mechanism for monitoring, as well as a mechanism for grievance in the event of non-compliance, can generate the required information.”</p>	<p>Countries have existing obligations under existing international agreements. Very few of the REDD safeguards create new obligations. “Most of the safeguards refer to state obligations that are enshrined in existing legally and non-legally binding instruments<sup>63</sup> ... [which] carry with them reporting requirements, and a REDD safeguards reporting can be integrated into existing national reporting systems.”</p>	<p>“[A]n analysis of the gaps in national legislation is critical to the information system on safeguards.”</p>
CAN	<p>Information should be “collected from a range of sources.” The SIS should include “domestic multi-stakeholder review and analysis of how the safeguards are being respected” undertaken by “all relevant stakeholders, including by indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as by experts and the scientific community.” The assessment to identify the issues on which information should be provided should also include relevant stakeholders. Collected information that is “independently verified and reviewed by a multi-stakeholder body will carry greater legitimacy.” “[R]oles, mandates and responsibilities of each of the actors providing information need to be clearly laid in the governing statutes establishing the national information system and in the government arrangements for multi-stakeholder participation.” “Another tool Parties should consider ... is to use an officially designated independent monitor. The independent monitor could also act as the ‘buffer’ between government and local communities... The credibility of the process is improved further if the monitor’s report is subject to peer review and validation by a multi-stakeholder body. The monitor should, however, retain the right to publish any information collected...” “Guidance is needed from SBSTA to design and implement national systems for independent monitoring.” “Capacity building will be needed to ensure all stakeholders are able to participate fully and effectively in planning processes as well as implementation. Without capacity to participate, the quality and reliability of the information provided by stakeholders will be severely compromised.” “It may be necessary to establish an independent body to act as a buffer between those providing the information and the government. This body can collect, review and verify information, both improving the robustness of the information and providing the “whistleblower” with anonymity”. “A similar mechanism is recommended to protect whistleblowers working within the government and private sector companies engaged in REDD+ implementation.”</p>		<p>“Field-based collection of data is an important tool to test whether practice on the ground is consistent with policy as written down on paper... Ground-truthing in this way also improves the reliability of the information by allowing for the reconciliation of data collected from a range of sources and via a range of methods.” There should be “common guidance on the indicators to be employed, although the particular indicators may vary from country to country.”</p>

Table 3b | **How to Collect and Provide Information (Observers) cont.**

OBSERVERS	HOW TO COLLECT & ASSESS INFORMATION	HARMONIZATION & EFFICIENCY	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
CBD	<p>“Effective communication with all relevant stakeholders is crucial for the development and implementation of safeguards.” “Indigenous peoples and local communities can also be essential in cost-effective monitoring of impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity... There is generally a need to build further capacity and expertise to monitor biodiversity impacts of REDD-plus.” “In the framework of the principles of the conservation commons, there should be free and open access to biodiversity data and information for assessment purposes pursuant to CBD COP Decision X/7 and X/15.”</p>	<p>“Intersectoral coordination between and within Ministries is of utmost importance to ensure timely and effective application of safeguards. There is a need for synergies among the various relevant Ministries.” “There is a need for cross referencing the safeguard frameworks with processes and guidelines that have already been established.” “REDD-plus has already proved to be a catalyst for increased coordination and synergies between UNFCCC and CBD... However, collaboration at all levels needs to be further improved, in particular when discussing the development of financing mechanisms with relevance for biodiversity, land management and climate change; and regarding monitoring and reporting... The Rio conventions should enhance coordination and communication through the Secretariats.”</p>	<p>“[A] global indicator frameworks should be developed for implementation at the national level.” “Assessment of biodiversity impacts and related indicators should be simple, feasible, and cost-effective.” “There is a need to monitor the impacts for REDD-plus on indigenous peoples and local communities.... Indicators could include: (i) indicators on full and effective participation; (ii) status and trends of boundaries of indigenous territories, land tenure, and access rights; (iii) involuntary resettlements; (iv) changes in livelihoods and traditional knowledge related to REDD-plus, and (v) gender equality and rights and livelihoods of women. However... social indicators identified here are not necessarily indicators to be used at the global level.” “Identifying and realizing multiple benefits can be supported through the application of: spatially explicit tools, such as maps and ecological gap analyses, to identify synergies and tradeoffs among climate change, biodiversity, and social issues.”</p>
CE & WRI			<p>“SBSTA should provide guidance on existing sets of indicators/ guidelines that are available to assist Parties in their REDD safeguard assessment and reporting processes, such as indicators associated with other international and regional instruments.”</p>
CIEL			
ECA	<p>See CAN information above.</p>	<p>“The safeguards information systems should be part of an integrated REDD+ system for providing information on safeguards and MRV at national and international levels, and harmonized with other systems, so that synergies and efficiencies can be realized, the system will be cost effective, and data collection and provision will meet the needs of all relevant stakeholders, while respecting their rights. Consideration should also be given to harmonization, as appropriate, with other monitoring/ information systems for international and regional agreements that already collect and provide information relevant to the REDD+ safeguards and finance.”</p>	<p>“Modalities developed by indigenous peoples and local communities to retrieve and collect information, at community and project level, based on their traditional knowledge, values and practices, such as the Tebtebba initiative to develop community monitoring tools on REDD+ safeguards for indigenous peoples, would provide information which would contribute significantly to the quality of the data fed into the SIS.”</p>



Table 3b | **How to Collect and Provide Information (Observers) cont.**

OBSERVERS	HOW TO COLLECT & ASSESS INFORMATION	HARMONIZATION & EFFICIENCY	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
FAO	<p>“The collection and provision of information on REDD+ safeguards is an integral part of a ‘national forest monitoring system’ (NFMS) that addresses social, economic, environmental and governance issues.” “The [NFMS] should draw from existing datasets, information systems and processes relevant to REDD+, including inter alia the European Union’s Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) legality assurance systems (LAS), Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) and domestic collection of social statistics, etc.”</p>	<p>“Monitoring and information needs for REDD+ overlap with requirements for other policy areas related to, inter alia, forests, land use, land tenure, food security, biodiversity and rural livelihoods, including reporting to conventions and international arrangements for these policy areas. For efficiency reasons, the NFMS and related institutions should therefore be developed to serve multiple purposes, and synergies in data collection and analyses should be sought.”</p>	<p>“Generic guidance and a framework for indicators developed at international level would help to ensure consistency over time and across REDD+ countries. Country-specific indicators would then need to be developed through inclusive, participatory processes at national level. Existing processes and frameworks can be drawn on for the development of generic guidance and a framework for indicators at international level.”</p>
FPP	<p>A “truly participatory process of re-elaboration, analysis, monitoring, reporting and verification” should be used to ensure that the set of safeguards adopted at the international level are not weakened or readjusted at the national level. “Free Prior Informed consent, meant as an iterative process of interaction with indigenous peoples and indigenous communities can - among others - represent an effective modality to ensure constant monitoring and adjustment of REDD programmes and principles, as well as a mechanism to ensure continuous information feedback loops that can contribute to the objectivity and robustness of the information produced on the degree of compliance to the safeguards.” Direct engagement of Indigenous Peoples and their knowledge is important for monitoring and reporting on REDD+. Indigenous peoples should develop and adopt their “own reporting frameworks to assess the level of advancement of human rights and indigenous peoples’ rights” as recognized in other international agreements. The SIS should “include the contribution from parallel reporting carried out by Indigenous Peoples.”</p>	<p>“The SIS should build upon the frameworks and methodologies already developed by the OHCHR on the monitoring and assessment of implementation of human rights.” “Additional elements can be drawn from relevant work developed by the CBD (such as the Akwé:Kon Voluntary Guidelines and the REDD+ safeguards on biodiversity), as well as the UNREDD-FAO Guidelines for governance in REDD+.” “To facilitate their work, SBSTA could refer to accepted reports of UN appointed experts. For example, the 2011 Report of the UN High Commissioner on Human Rights.”</p>	<p>The SIS should be based on rights-based indicators. “SBSTA should provide guidance to countries to develop specific indicators on information related to the degree of implementation of indigenous peoples’ rights.” “[P]erformance indicators...would – among other things – assist both the national government, civil society, indigenous peoples and the international donor community to identify gaps and needs related to the obstacles to the full and effective implementation of safeguards.”</p>
IPAM et al.	<p>“Design of the system, including determination of the types of information to be collected...should be undertaken with the full and effective participation of stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities.” “Accuracy of the information should be maximized through independent verification and stakeholder participation...process.”</p>	<p>“The system should make use of national and sub-national institutions responsible for implementing REDD+; outputs of the information collection and review processes should be fed back into those institutions.” “The information system should be harmonized with other related monitoring systems, including forest monitoring.”</p>	<p>Should use of nationally appropriate indicators. “The design of the system, including determination of...relevant indicators, should be undertaken with the full and effective participation of stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities.”</p>
WB FCPF		<p>“WB advocates for the SESA approach to the application of safeguards to REDD+ activities. This provides for basing a safeguards monitoring and reporting system on widely known, thoroughly tested, and well-respected safeguard policy principles that work in tandem with national policy, legal, and regulatory frameworks is one way of ensuring quality and regularity, while also respecting sovereignty. SBSTA might consider drawing on this and related experiences to facilitate a similar process.”</p>	<p>“Basing a safeguards monitoring and reporting system on widely known, thoroughly tested, and well-respected safeguard policy principles that work in tandem with national policy, legal, and regulatory frameworks is one way of ensuring quality and regularity, while also respecting sovereignty.”</p>

Table 3b | **How to Collect and Provide Information (Observers) cont.**

OBSERVERS	HOW TO COLLECT & ASSESS INFORMATION	HARMONIZATION & EFFICIENCY	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS
WEDO			
WWF	<p>“The design of the system, including... relevant indicators... should be undertaken with the full and effective participation of stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and local communities.” “A process for independent review and verification of the information should be provided.”</p> <p>“Accuracy of the information should be maximized through independent verification and stakeholder participation.”</p>	<p>“The system should be built upon existing information and include incentives for continuously moving towards higher quality information over time.”</p>	

Table 4a | **Other Elements of the International Safeguard System (Parties)<sup>64</sup>**

PARTY	FORMAT AND TIMING FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION	SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION	REVIEW AND COMPLIANCE
Australia	<p>“The design of a national SIS should be integrated with existing data sets, and monitoring and reporting arrangements, some of which exist outside of UNFCCC processes,” to “avoid creating an increased reporting burden for developing country Parties.” “[R]eporting of information related to the SIS could be undertaken as part of national communications, and biennial update reports to the Conference of the Parties (COP) as provided for in the Cancun Agreements. Notwithstanding the reporting method selected, Parties... should report SIS information every two years at a minimum.”</p>		
Belize et al.	<p>“Information and reports should be publicly available and readily accessible.” “At the national level, developing countries should make the information publicly available, with particular attention to making the information available in affected communities. Information must be regularly updated and presented in a way that makes it useful and is easily accessible to stakeholders in-country. At the international level, the information from each national system should be provided through a common international structure, linked to and part of the broader system under the UNFCCC.” “Information on and analysis of respect for safeguards should be incorporated into national strategies and action plans.”</p>	<p>“The systems for providing information on how safeguards are respected should be an integral part of REDD+ strategy and therefore should be simultaneously developed and implemented in phases so that the financial sources and levels of complexity supporting the design and development of the system can be identified and dealt with progressively.” “[I]mplementation must be progressive and consistent with the financial support provided.”</p>	
Brazil	<p>“Provision of data and information for the system should be flexible; while for some of the safeguards data and information may be more frequently available, for others it may not. The timing for presentation of data and information should be defined domestically and respect national circumstances and challenges.” “Equally important is to maintain the system for information on safeguards separate from the MRV system.”</p>	<p>“Potential barriers include lack of data and information, lack of financial resources and capacity to generate information on how the safeguards are being treated and respected, and lack of the institutional arrangements necessary to ensure relevant data and information, including its dissemination to local communities and indigenous peoples.”</p>	

Table 4a | Other Elements of the International Safeguard System (Parties) *cont.*

PARTY	FORMAT AND TIMING FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION	SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION	REVIEW AND COMPLIANCE
Colombia & Mexico	<p>“The provision of data and information for the system should be flexible; while for some of the safeguards data and information may be more frequently available, for others it may not. Data and information addressing all the safeguards should be made available within a timeframe to be defined domestically and respecting national circumstances and capabilities.” “The data and information should flow continuously, as deemed appropriate.” “Equally important is to maintain the system of information on safeguards distinct from the MRV system to report on emissions and removals for carbon.”</p>	<p>“Potential barriers include lack of data and information, lack of financial resources and capacity to generate information on how the safeguards are being treated and respected [and] establishment of institutional arrangements necessary to ensure continuous flow of relevant data and information, including its dissemination to local communities and indigenous.”</p>	
Costa Rica	<p>The SIS “is not an independent element, but an integral part of REDD+ strategies... As a consequence, the [SIS] should be part of the overall information on the both REDD+ strategy in general and will address information needs for both internal and external legitimate stakeholders.” “The presentation of information shall be in accordance with the arrangements for reporting the [NAMAS]... and through national communications.” “[T]he periodicity of the provision of information on safeguards should be consistent with the reporting intervals of the REDD+ strategy in general.”</p>	<p>“In some cases, it is expected that the country does not have mechanisms for gathering information to respond specifically to each of the safeguards and its components and therefore must develop these mechanisms and instruments, in accordance with national regulations. Investments to be made in order to fill these gaps will then need to be financially supported. Some features of safeguards will require significant investments in the design and implementation processes (for example, measuring the social, economic and biodiversity benefits from REDD+) and then becomes more relevant to the principle that this system must be duly accompanied or supported by adequate and sustainable financial resources for start-up and monitoring.” “[D]esign of the system will also be consistent with the phase or stage of implementation of the REDD+ strategy and subject to the level of support received.”</p>	
El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, Dominican Republic <sup>65</sup>	<p>Actions to implement the REDD+ safeguards should be incorporated in the NAMAs and NAPAs with the input of focal points from relevant international conventions, to fulfill global environmental commitments. The use of several reporting requirements in other international instruments relevant to the REDD+ safeguards, such as biennial reports to CBD, reports to Ramsar, reports to meet 2020 Aichi Nagoya goals, national GGE inventories including LULUCF every two years, national communications to the UNFCCC. Also mentions use of any technical reports on the implementation bilateral and multilateral projects. Annual reports on the implementation of REDD+ projects should be made.</p>	<p>New resources, including technical capacity is required to comply with the safeguards. They must be incorporated in the processes for elaboration of National REDD+ Strategies, National Adaptation Plans (NAPAs) and National Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs). Likewise, NAPAs and NAMAs must incorporate actions to address and respect the REDD+ safeguards.</p>	<p>The concepts of measurement, notification and verification are essential to respect and address the safeguards, giving opportunity for a transparent oversight by expert bodies or commissions in charge of verifying how the safeguards are being addressed and respected.</p>

Table 4a | **Other Elements of the International Safeguard System (Parties) *cont.***

PARTY	FORMAT AND TIMING FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION	SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION	REVIEW AND COMPLIANCE
European Union	<p>“A summary of the information should be submitted as supplementary information to National Communications and biennial update reports.” “The guidance on how to report should strike a balance between: (1) the required flexibility to prioritise country specific issues and use existing national arrangements as a basis, and (2) the comparability of information provided by various countries.” “A core set of information requirements should be agreed to ensure international comparability.” “[C]onsistency with provision of related information to relevant international agreements needs to be ensured.” The Secretariat should “consult with the members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests and explore options to streamline the information requirements in relation to § 2 of the Appendix I to Decision 1/CP.16 with the reporting requirements of other relevant international agreements and processes.” International processes and existing monitoring schemes for biodiversity could provide useful lessons and experiences.</p>		<p>“Results-based payments require a system with independent review of core information to ensure compliance with the agreed requirements.”</p>
India			
Indonesia			<p>“Indonesia is of the view that seven elements of safeguards... have different levels and scales of implementation. REDD+ countries should establish a system to provide information relating to the implementation of the safeguards in their national policies. For example, actions to address the risks of reversals and actions to reduce displacement of emissions may be part of the MRV while other elements could remain as part of the system for information provision on safeguards.”</p>
Indonesia et al.			
Japan	<p>“Best practices” should be shared by countries “through a common platform, allowing for submissions through common reporting formats.” “It is necessary to report progress of development of the systems and information on safeguards regularly through the National Communication...While the information is provided internationally, it is also important to domestically publish the information to promote safeguards at all levels.”</p>	<p>“[I]nformation provided...could be used to identify capacity building needs on safeguards.” “When the systems are designed, it should be taken into account not only construction costs but also operational costs to maintain the systems.”</p>	<p>“It is necessary that bilateral and multilateral cooperation agencies examine the provided information and results of international review as mentioned in [the section on provision of information] above and support required safeguard related activities when they consider investing in and supporting REDD-plus activities.”</p>

Table 4a | **Other Elements of the International Safeguard System (Parties) *cont.***

PARTY	FORMAT AND TIMING FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION	SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION	REVIEW AND COMPLIANCE
Norway	<p>“The information should be provided to the UNFCCC Secretariat through the channel deemed most appropriate, such as the biennial update reports. Norway is of the opinion that the Cancun decision mandates the provision of information at regular intervals. This is related to the use of the term ‘throughout’ in para 71 (d), implying that the information must be provided at set times, with a set period of time between each provision of information. The information should be provided in one of the UN languages and should be made publicly available.”</p> <p>“A core set of information requirements would be recommendable to ensure international comparability. This would also facilitate exchange of lessons learnt. One example, based on Annex 1 para 2 (a), could be for SBSTA to indicate what international conventions and agreements the Parties may consider it relevant to provide information on. This would provide unambiguous guidance to the Parties, hopefully being helpful as to what considerations may be useful in their work on REDD+.”</p>		<p>“Results-based payments require a system with independent review of information to ensure fulfilment of safeguards.”</p>
Philippines	<p>“A common reporting format shall be used for the provision of information on how the safeguards are being addressed and implemented.” “Information must be easy to access and be readily available for all relevant stakeholders in keeping with the regular tracking of the application of safeguards over time.” “The frequency of the provision of information shall match that of national reporting requirements, and all forestry-related protocols shall be adjusted accordingly.”</p>	<p>“The Philippines recognizes possible technical as well as financial challenges in acquiring regular information on safeguards implementation. Further guidance and support towards cost-effective and harmonized data collection and reporting would be useful.”</p>	
Switzerland	<p>“Information on safeguards should be regularly reported... through existing systems such as national communications consistent with country capability and the level of technical and financial support received as part of the whole REDD+ strategy.”</p>	<p>“[S]upport must be provided for capacity building and through funding. More resources should be prioritized for LDCs than other countries with more resources.”</p>	<p>“Effective complying in addressing and respecting safeguards should be expected to vary according to national capacity and circumstances, but improvement should be required.”</p>
United States	<p>Safeguards should be reported on in the context of broader reporting on REDD+ and should be done by Parties in their “biennial reports referred to in paragraph 60(d) of decision 1/CP.16 as with other aspects of their activities under this sections of the Cancun Agreement.”</p>		

Table 4b | **Other Elements of the International Safeguard System (Observers)**

OBSERVERS	FORMAT AND TIMING FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION	SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION	REVIEW AND COMPLIANCE
AC	<p>“Most countries already have forest programmes that provide national or international reports (ex. ILO 169, UNDRIP, ICERD, CEDAW and the CBD). The conventions carry with them reporting requirements, and a REDD safeguards reporting can be integrated into existing national reporting systems.”</p>		<p>“The SIS must contain a complaints mechanism for non-compliance and other grievances that are not picked up by conventional monitoring tools.<sup>66</sup> This mechanism could be developed through local rights- and stakeholder participation.”</p>
CAN	<p>“Information must be presented in a way that makes it useful; presented regularly and be kept up to date;... allow for tracking over time how the safeguards have been implemented; and...made publically available through a common international structure.” “The Amazon Fund provides a useful example, where records of financial audits are published annually on the Amazon Fund website.” “REDD+ countries should also formally report through National Communications and Biennial update reports. Similarly, Annex I countries should formally report on the support provided for REDD+safeguards.” “During the fast start finance period ... provision should be made for interim reporting.” “As in other UNFCCC reporting processes, the information should be provided in a common reporting format and according to common guidance on the indicators to be employed, although the particular indicators may vary from country to country.” “The information published needs to be presented in a manner that allows stakeholders to properly analyse, sythesise and interpret the data. In particular, effective participation by stakeholders requires the information to be provided in a manner that is easy to access and use, including being made available in local languages.” In addition, information should be presented “in a manner that allows for an external assessment ... In particular, that assessment should be capable of identifying gaps and needs for the donor community to address with further support and technical assistance. It will also help ensure REDD+ countries are able to implement the safeguards in the most cost effective and efficient manner...” Information should be made available through a common international structure linked to existing or new structures being developed as part of the broader MRV framework under the UNFCCC.”</p>	<p>“Paragraph 69 and paragraph 2 of Appendix I to the Cancun Agreement provide that the safeguards should be promoted and supported. Further, paragraph 71 provides that support should be adequate and predictable. The intent of these provisions is to ensure developed countries provide adequate and predictable support for REDD+ actions, including support for the implementation of the safeguards and the SIS. In this context, it should be noted that support provided through the Green Climate Fund will also be subject to specific environmental and social safeguards. There should be consistency between these safeguards to ensure support for REDD+ activities provided through the Green Climate Fund also promote and support the REDD+ safeguards.” “To ensure independence, the multi-stakeholder review process should be provided with independent, reliable and sustained funding to avoid financial pressure being brought to bear on the process.”</p>	
CBD	<p>“The standards, guidance, and other related tools developed at the international level should be harmonized to help countries address safeguards.” “Reporting frameworks under UNFCCC and [CBD] are completely different and it is important to harmonize them as much as possible, to decrease the reporting burden on countries.”</p>	<p>“Financial support is required to support countries to meet the requirements for implementing safeguards... There is a need to further enhance capacity across the African region to integrate safeguards into the planning and implementation of REDD-plus.” “Sufficient financial incentives and technical capacity to ensure the application of relevant safeguards, and to achieve biodiversity benefits, are missing in most countries. Adequate technical and financial support should be delivered to REDD-plus countries to ensure the compliance of safeguards and the sustainability of these processes.” “For the development and application of relevant biodiversity safeguards, and for the assessment of REDD-plus impacts on biodiversity, developing countries will require adequate and predictable financial resources.”</p>	



Table 4b | Other Elements of the International Safeguard System (Observers) *cont.*

OBSERVERS	FORMAT AND TIMING FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION	SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION	REVIEW AND COMPLIANCE
CE & WRI	<p>“SBSTA should consider the reporting requirements in other international and regional instruments relevant to the REDD+ safeguards and recommend that the SBSTA design similar requirements, for example a reporting template, for the safeguard information system.” “SBSTA should encourage harmonization of reporting between the safeguard information system and other instruments, as appropriate.”</p>	<p>“SBSTA should encourage Parties to provide additional financial and technical support to REDD+ countries to ensure that these countries are able to implement the REDD+ safeguards, and encourage REDD+ countries to seek technical support from existing institutions linked to the relevant international and regional instruments.”</p>	<p>“As part of developing the SIS, SBSTA should identify the non-compliance processes and mechanisms and dispute settlement processes of other international instruments and the need to develop such processes in a UNFCCC context. SBSTA should recommend that the LCA create the legal framework for such processes and mechanisms and emphasize to Parties that such mechanisms should allow access to the public and non-governmental organizations.” “As part of developing the SIS, SBSTA should identify... Where direct communications between the UNFCCC and other relevant bodies could be implemented. SBSTA should also recommend that the LCA officially recognize the competency and jurisdiction of relevant bodies in applying measures directly related to the REDD+ safeguards, and the importance of considering relevant measures taken by these bodies when assessing Party compliance with the REDD+ safeguards.”</p>
CIEL	<p>“To minimize reporting burdens on Parties and utilize existing information, the Secretariat should compile information received from non-Parties. For example, information related to emissions displacement could be submitted by the UN Food and Agricultural Organization, information regarding biodiversity and REDD safeguards could be submitted by the Secretariate of the Convention on Biological Diversity, information regarding impacts to project-specific activities could be submitted by project proponents and local communities, and information regarding the rights of indigenous people could be submitted by the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous People.”</p>	<p>“Two percent of REDD+ funding should be designated to support the safeguard information system in order to ensure adequate and predictable funding. The funding could be used to support, inter alia, the administrative costs of an international information sharing system, document translation to ensure broad access to information, a grievance mechanism, capacity building at the national level.”</p>	
ECA	<p>“Information should be made publicly available, in a timely and culturally appropriate way.” To facilitate cost-effectiveness, “the information provided through the SIS should be accessible to donors and investors and presented in a manner that allows for an external assessment of how effective that support has been in achieving the objective of ensuring REDD+ activities are carried out in accordance with the REDD+ safeguards.” “[It] is expected that a REDD+ funding window under the GCF would apply the REDD+ safeguards and the SIS would therefore provide the information needed for monitoring and evaluation of those safeguards under the GCF. It would also be beneficial to harmonise the REDD+ database with databases created by other multilateral and bilateral REDD+ funding mechanisms.”</p>	<p>“The Cancun Agreement provides that the safeguards are to be promoted and supported. That support may take many forms, but is likely to consist in large part of direct financial support to implement the safeguards. In this case investors will need to assess the cost-effectiveness of their support, so as to guide future investment decisions.”</p>	<p>“The system should include an accountability mechanism that is independent, transparent, effective, and accessible to affected people, and available to respond to/address claims related to the information provided. This could potentially link to the establishment of conflict resolution and grievance mechanisms at various levels, as well as to the adoption of enablers to ensure Indigenous Peoples’ right to Free Prior and Informed Consent.”</p>

Table 4b | **Other Elements of the International Safeguard System (Observers) *cont.***

OBSERVERS	FORMAT AND TIMING FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION	SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION	REVIEW AND COMPLIANCE
FAO			
FPP	The contribution of information for parallel reporting by indigenous peoples should be duly supported in national and international REDD+ programmes and activities.		
IPAM et al.	Information must be “provided at regular intervals, potentially in coordination with related forest monitoring systems,” “made publically available,” “easily accessible,” and “presented in a way that meets the needs of various stakeholders.” “The frequency of reporting must support tracking of how safeguards are implemented over time.” “A common template should be provided to allow easy assessment. Standardized information should be complemented with more detailed information not contained in the common template.”		
WB FCPF	“It would be both possible and desirable for countries to work towards the development of a commonly agreed but suitably flexible and customized information format on safeguards.”		
WEDO			
WWF	“Information must be easily accessible and presented in a way that meets the needs of various stakeholders ...; [it] must be provided at regular intervals, potentially in coordination with other related monitoring systems; the frequency of reporting must support tracking how safeguards are implemented over time; a common template should be provided allowing for easy assessment...; information should be made publicly available.” “The information system should be harmonized with other related monitoring systems, such as information provided to the UNCBD. Parties should provide clarity on how guidance developed by SBSTA will be harmonized with guidance developed by multilateral REDD+ finance institutions such as FIP, FCPF, UNREDD and the GEF.” “Generic indicators should be used (common framework).”		

## NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. This paragraph speaks to “a system for providing information on how the safeguards referred to in appendix I to [the Cancun] decision are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of the activities referred to in paragraph 70 above, while respecting sovereignty.”
2. SBSTA also invited input on other elements of REDD, including reference levels and MRV. Please note that document only reviews submissions related to the safeguard information system.
3. For example, it was sometimes difficult to know when reading the submission if Parties/observers envisaged activities (like reviews) happening at the national and/or the international level.
4. See submissions from Brazil, Colombia/Mexico, EU, Indonesia, Indonesia et al., Norway, United States, AC, CE/WRI, FAO.
5. See submissions from Australia, Costa Rica, Norway, Switzerland, FPP.
6. See submissions from EU, Japan, Norway.
7. See submissions from Switzerland, AC, WB, WWF.
8. See submissions from EU, Japan, Norway, CAN, ECA, FAO.
9. See submissions from Australia, Colombia/Mexico, Costa Rica, EU, Japan, Indonesia et al., Norway, Philippines, Switzerland, USA, AC, CAN, CE/WRI, ECA, FPP, IPAM et al., WWF.
10. See submissions from Australia, Brazil, Columbia/Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador et al., EU, Indonesia et al., Norway, USA, AC, CAN, ECA, FPP, WWF.
11. See submissions from Australia, Brazil, Columbia/Mexico, Costa Rica, EU, Japan, Norway, CAN, ECA, IPAM et al., WWF.
12. See submissions from Australia, Belize et al., Brazil, Columbia/Mexico, Costa Rica, EU, CAN, ECA.
13. See submissions from the EU, Japan, Norway, Switzerland, CAN, ECA, IPAM et al., WWF.
14. See submissions from Australia, Costa Rica, EU, CAN, ECA, WWF.
15. See submissions from the EU, Philippines, Switzerland, AC, FAO. It is not always clear if these are the characteristics of a national system for providing information or a national and/or international system for collecting the information provided.
16. See submissions from Philippines, IPAM et al., CAN, CBD, ECA, WEDO, WWF.
17. See submissions from Belize et al., Brazil, Colombia/Mexico, Costa Rica, WB (FCPF).
18. See submissions from El Salvador et al., EU, Indonesia, AC, CE/WRI, FPP.
19. See submissions from Australia, Norway, Switzerland, CBD, CE/WRI, FPP, WB (FCPF), WEDO.
20. See submissions from Australia, Brazil, Colombia/Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador et al., EU, India, Japan, Philippines, Belize et al., USA, CAN, CBD, CE/WRI, ECA, FAO, FPP, IPAM et al., WB (FCPF), WWF.
21. See submissions from Australia, Japan, Norway, CAN, CE/WRI, ECA.
22. See submissions from Australia, El Salvador et al., EU, India, Norway, USA, CAN, CE/WRI, ECA, FPP, WB (FCPF). Most of these submissions refer specifically to indigenous peoples and local communities in particular.
23. See submissions from Australia, EU, India, AC, CAN, CE/WRI, WB (FCPF).
24. See submissions from the EU, Philippines, USA, CAN, ECA, FPP, IPAM et al., WB (FCPF), WWF.
25. See submissions from Australia, El Salvador et al., EU, India, CBD.
26. See submissions from Australia, El Salvador et al., CE/WRI, ECA, FPP. Several of these submissions expressly referred to international instruments on indigenous peoples’ rights.
27. See submissions from Costa Rica, El Salvador et al., EU, CAN, ECA, FPP.
28. See submissions from Australia, EU, Norway, Philippines, CAN, ECA, IPAM et al., WB (FCPF), WWF.
29. See submissions from Australia, Belize et al., Costa Rica, EU, Indonesia, Japan, Norway, AC, CAN, ECA, CBD, FPP, IPAM et al. and WWF.
30. See submissions from Belize et al., Costa Rica, Philippines, Colombia/Mexico.
31. See submissions from Belize et al., Norway, Philippines, Switzerland, CAN, ECA, FPP, CBD.
32. See submissions from the EU, Philippines, AC, CAN, ECA, IPAM et al., FPP, WWF. The submissions are not always clear on whether the review should occur at the national or international level.
33. See submissions from El Salvador et al., EU, CAN, ECA, FPP.
34. See submissions from Australia, Belize et al., Brazil, Colombia/Mexico, Costa Rica, EU, Japan, Norway, Switzerland, AC, CBD, ECA, FAO, FPP, IPAM et al., WWF.
35. See submissions from El Salvador et al., EU, Japan, Philippines, Switzerland, AC, CAN, CE/WRI, ECA, FPP, IPAM et al.
36. See submissions from Switzerland, CAN, CE/WRI, ECA, FAO and FPP.
37. See submissions from CE/WRI, IPAM et al., WWF.
38. See submissions from Brazil, Colombia/Mexico, Costa Rica, Japan, CAN, CBD, ECA.
39. See submissions from EU, Norway, CAN, ECA WWF.
40. See submissions from Australia, Belize et al., Costa Rica, EU, Japan, Norway, Switzerland, USA, AC, CAN, IPAM et al., WWF.

41. See submissions from Costa Rica and El Salvador et al.
42. See submissions from Australia, EU, Japan, Norway, El Salvador et al., AC, CBD, CE/WRI, CIEL, ECA. See also comments under “Harmonization and Efficiency.”
43. See submissions from Brazil, Colombia/Mexico, WB (FCPF).
44. See submission from Belize et al.
45. See submissions of CAN and ECA.
46. See submissions from Belize et al., Brazil, Colombia/Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador et al., Japan, Philippines, Switzerland, CAN, CBD, CE/WRI, CIEL, ECA .
47. See submission from Costa Rica and Belize et al.
48. See submissions from the Philippines, FPP, IPAM et al.
49. See submission of Switzerland.
50. See submissions from CAN, CBD, CIEL.
51. See submission from CAN and ECA.
52. See submissions from Japan, El Salvador et al., EU, Norway, Accra Caucus, CAN, CBD, ECA, CE/WRI.
53. See submissions from Indonesia (relating to safeguards (f) and (g) only), CAN, ECA.
54. See submissions from Brazil and Colombia/Mexico.
55. Belize, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Cote d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Gabon, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Congo, Solomon Islands, Togo, Uganda.
56. The text from El Salvador., Honduras, Panama and the Dominican Republic is based on an informal translation from Spanish.
57. Indonesia on behalf of Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam
58. Amazon Environmental Research Institute (IPAM), Conservation International (CI), Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Rainforest Alliance (RA), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Woods Hole Research Center (WHRC), World Vision International (WVI).
59. The text from El Salvador, Honduras, Panama and the Dominican Republic is based on an informal translation from Spanish.
60. The detailed recommendations on types of information are categorized by Safeguard. For safeguard A, Parties should report on: (1) Total area under REDD activities that allow recover or protect the land against desertification; (2) REDD+ activities that contribute to adaptation of forest ecosystems, to maintain high rates of biodiversity or increase such rates, establishment of ecological corridors between REDD+ protected areas; (3) Ecosystem services identified in REDD+ project areas; (4) Mangroves under conservation. For safeguard B, Parties should report on: (1) Opportunities of local representation in REDD+ projects, (2) number of non-governmental organizations involved in the REDD+

project, which endorse the activities and the implementation of the safeguards, (3) Quantity of financial resources provided to local representatives to monitor, report and verify REDD+ projects and to solve conflicts; (4) areas under forest contracts, agreements or concessions that provided legal security for planned REDD+ actions; (5) Amounts/payments provided for the for ecosystems services in REDD+ project areas; (6) number of institutions and organizations that know and understand REDD+. For safeguard C, Parties should report on: (1) Ratified international conventions relevant to indigenous rights, such as UNDRIP and ILO 169; (2) number of REDD+ projects that have express approval of indigenous peoples and local communities as a result of FPIC; (3) Number of traditional practices for hunting, fishing, agriculture and extraction of natural resources that are registered in the patent/property offices.; (4) Amount funds dedicated to recognize the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities practices in REDD+ processes; (5) Indigenous territories that are under a secure and legal regime, which provides for secure access, use, usufruct and tenure of the lands and their resources; (6) Financial resources oriented for the research and systematization of traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities. For safeguard D, Parties should report on: (1) Number of inter-sectoral dialogue tables on REDD+ in which indigenous peoples and local communities participate; (2) number of languages, to which REDD+ documents are translated into; (3) Quantity of field information verified for the functioning of geographical information systems and remote sensing for REDD+; (4) Number of technical and college professionals that are indigenous or African descendants, qualified to monitor REDD+ projects; (5) Number of good practices on forest management registered by indigenous peoples and local communities to execute REDD+; (6) Number of people consulted about REDD+ implementation, respecting PFIC of indigenous peoples; (7) Number of representatives from local communities and indigenous peoples in negotiation processes such as the Climate change COP; (8) Level of participation of local communities, indigenous peoples and African descendants in REDD+ verification activities. For safeguard E, Parties should report on: (1) Quantity of forest management plans that incorporate REDD+ activities in the conservation of natural forests; (2) Quantity of financial resources destined to the conservation of biodiversity in protected areas, biological corridors and other ecosystem services relevant to REDD+; (3) Number of payment for ecosystem services projects that are being implemented at national level; (4) Number of pilot REDD+ projects developed with local communities and indigenous peoples; (5) Quantification of the type (including mangroves) and quantity of forests available for REDD+; (6) Good practices from IPCC transferred to national conservation programmes on forests, biodiversity, ecosystem services and poverty al-

leviation; (7) Number of remote sensing systems in place for the monitoring of forests; (8) number of universities linked to information on REDD+. For safeguard F, Parties should report on: (1) Number of territorial planning plans implemented in the country; (2) Quantity of property titles, agreements, concessions provided to indigenous peoples and local communities under REDD+ projects; (3) Quantity of local committees set to solve conflicts with the implementation of REDD+ projects. For safeguard G, Parties should report on: (1) National monitoring systems implemented to estimate emissions related to forests; (2) Neighboring countries that have concluded the development of a national baseline; (3) establishment bilateral or multilateral conventions to implement good practices on LULUCF in shared areas; (4) area of interconnection in protected REDD+ areas; (5) Number of institutions linked to the implementation of good practices to prevent leakage in the context of REDD+; and (6) independent forest monitoring and MRV.

61. See the submission for the types of language this might include.
62. The text from El Salvador, Honduras, Panama and the Dominican Republic is based on an informal translation from Spanish.
63. See full list in the submission.
64. According to ClientEarth and WRI's definition of the International Safeguard System: "A fully functioning international system would include: a reporting system, non-compliance and dispute resolution processes, and an institution (or institutions) to oversee these elements."
65. The text from El Salvador, Honduras, Panama and the Dominican Republic is based on an informal translation from Spanish.
66. It is not completely clear if a national or international complaints mechanism is being alluded to here.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank those who took the time to meet with us in order to clarify their submissions during the UNFCCC meetings in Panama. We would also like to thank Joshua Roberts for his help with reviewing the submissions. This work was completed with support from the Climate and Land Use Alliance.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Gaia Larsen** is a Legal Fellow at WRI. She is an attorney specializing in international environmental law and sustainable development. Prior to joining WRI Gaia was a fellow at the Institute for Policy Integrity. She has previously worked for the World Federation of United Nations Associations, Ashoka, and the Lawyers' Environmental Action Team.

**Daniela Rey** is a lawyer at ClientEarth. She is specialized in international environmental law and focuses on legal and advocacy work aimed at ensuring the effective implementation of REDD+.

**Florence Daviet** is a co-manager of WRI's Governance of Forests Initiative Project. Since 2006, Ms. Daviet's work has been focused on how to design an effective and equitable international system for REDD+.

---

## ABOUT WRI

The World Resources Institute is a global environmental think tank that goes beyond research to put ideas into action. We work with governments, companies, and civil society to build solutions to urgent environmental challenges. WRI's transformative ideas protect the Earth and promote development because sustainability is essential to meeting human needs and fulfilling human aspirations in the future.

WRI spurs progress by providing practical strategies for change and effective tools to implement them. We measure our success in the form of new policies, products, and practices that shift the ways governments work, companies operate, and people act.

We operate globally because today's problems know no boundaries. We are avid communicators because people everywhere are inspired by ideas, empowered by knowledge, and moved to change by greater understanding. We provide innovative paths to a sustainable planet through work that is accurate, fair, and independent.

WRI organizes its work around four key goals:

**People & Ecosystems:** Reverse rapid degradation of ecosystems and assure their capacity to provide humans with needed goods and services.

**Governance:** Empower people and strengthen institutions to foster environmentally sound and socially equitable decision-making.

**Climate Protection:** Protect the global climate system from further harm due to emissions of greenhouse gases and help humanity and the natural world adapt to unavoidable climate change.

**Markets & Enterprise:** Harness markets and enterprise to expand economic opportunity and protect the environment.

In all its policy research and work with institutions, WRI tries to build bridges between ideas and action, meshing the insights of scientific research, economic and institutional analyses, and practical experience with the need for open and participatory decision-making.

## ABOUT CLIENTEARTH

ClientEarth is an organization of activist lawyers working in Europe and beyond to bring together law, science and policy to create pragmatic solutions to key environmental challenges.

ClientEarth's core competency is assessing the adequacy of legal and institutional frameworks to deliver effective environmental policies. This includes expertise in regulatory and administrative law as well as procedural environmental rights (i.e., the right to environmental information (transparency), the right to participate in environmental decision-making, and access to justice on environmental matters).