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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADSDPP</td>
<td>Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development Protection Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWG – LCA</td>
<td>Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMU</td>
<td>Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit / Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADT</td>
<td>Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Convention on Biological Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBFM</td>
<td>Community-Based Forest Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCBA</td>
<td>Climate Community and Biodiversity Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Climate Change Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO</td>
<td>Climate Change Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoDE REDD</td>
<td>Community Development through REDD, Communities Developing REDD, and Conservation and Development through REDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP (13 – 16)</td>
<td>Conference of the Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENR</td>
<td>Department of Environment and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCPF</td>
<td>Forest Carbon Partnership Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLUP</td>
<td>Forest Land Use Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>Forest Management Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMU</td>
<td>Forest Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPIC</td>
<td>Free, Prior and Informed Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Forest Resources Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICI</td>
<td>International Climate Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEC</td>
<td>Information, Education and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IKSP</td>
<td>Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPs</td>
<td>Indigenous Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPRA</td>
<td>Indigenous Peoples Rights Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMA</td>
<td>Joint Management Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGU</td>
<td>Local Government Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOA</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoF</td>
<td>Ministry of Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRV</td>
<td>Measurement, Reporting and Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIP</td>
<td>National Commission on Indigenous Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTFP</td>
<td>Non Timber Forest Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PES</td>
<td>Payment for Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNRPS</td>
<td>Philippine National REDD-Plus Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POs</td>
<td>Peoples Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOFTC</td>
<td>Regional Community Forestry Training Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD-Plus</td>
<td>Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBSTA</td>
<td>Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>Social and Environmental Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESA</td>
<td>Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBMA</td>
<td>Subic Bay Metropolitan Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWG</td>
<td>Technical Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDRIP</td>
<td>United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN REDD</td>
<td>United Nations Collaborative initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCCCD</td>
<td>United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFF</td>
<td>United Nations Forum on Forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCS</td>
<td>Verified Carbon Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRD</td>
<td>Voluntary REDD-Plus Partnership Database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The **Regional Expert Workshop on Maximizing the Co-benefits of REDD-Plus Actions** held on September 26 – 29, 2011 at the Court Meridian Hotel, Subic Freeport Zone, Philippines was organized to provide a venue for sharing experiences among projects and to elaborate recommendations on how non-carbon benefits can be achieved from REDD-Plus activities at the country level. The workshop gathered individuals from ICI/REDD – Plus projects in South-East Asia and the Pacific, partners from indigenous peoples and local communities, government, and non-government organizations and key persons from the International Climate Initiative (ICI), the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ).

The Workshop was carried out through plenary discussions and parallel workshops. The plenary sessions were informed by inputs from guest speakers and resource persons, a survey on ICI projects’ efforts on co-benefits, and sharing of 11 ICI projects. On one hand, the parallel workshops focused on (a) integrating carbon and non-carbon impacts in MRV system and planning processes and how the ICI projects contribute to these, and (b) ICI projects’ contribution in the effective distribution of REDD-Plus benefits and how in REDD-Plus implementation sharing benefits comes together with sharing responsibilities.

From the Climate Change Commission and National Commission on Indigenous Peoples of the Philippines, as well as the BMU, the key messages are as follows: (a) cooperative action as key to success of efforts such as REDD-Plus, (b) ecological and environmental stability agenda is an opportunity to having REDD-Plus as a function of adaptation, (c) ICI’s REDD-Plus strategies are relevant to current approaches on having co-benefits and safeguards, (d) indigenous peoples should be considered as partners and not mere beneficiaries of REDD-Plus actions.

Survey results from 11 ICI projects’ specifically dealt with five types of co-benefits namely community development, synergies with adaptation needs, biodiversity impacts, synergies with ecosystem resilience, and economic co-benefits. It was concluded that (a) projects collaborate in the development of national REDD-Plus framework by implementing a broad array of activities, (b) there is unbalanced involvement of stakeholders at the national level, (c) various multi-stakeholder processes such as land use planning, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), and committee-type mechanisms can facilitate participation of stakeholders, (d) finance instruments such as taxes and subsidies or fees are relevant but unlikely to be used, and (e) potential synergies between REDD-Plus and potential adaptation needs do not seem to play a prominent role in most of the pilot projects.

Representatives from ICI projects provided an overview of where the projects are in terms of REDD-Plus actions as well as their contribution to the national REDD-Plus strategies. Areas of concern are on buffer zones, reforestation, baseline establishment, non-timber forest products, drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, biodiversity conservation, MRV systems, guidance on measuring forest degradation, participation of stakeholders, tools development, scale, dialogue processes and stakeholder readiness.

Detailed discussions in the parallel workshop on co-benefits provided lessons learned from various country contexts. The span of these lessons includes (1) harmonization of safeguard standards, (2) provision of guidance to operationalize safeguards, (3) mainstreaming of REDD-Plus co-benefits into cross-sectoral policy and planning frameworks, (4) facilitation of dialogue with driver industries (large-scale agriculture, logging, mining, infrastructure), (5) having multi-stakeholder support structure at all levels, (6) strengthening of existing structures and mechanisms especially on benefit sharing, (7) involvement of REDD-Plus national technical experts in international negotiations, (8) identification of economic drivers that REDD-Plus can’t compete with, (9) consideration of landscape approach and coming up
with systematic biodiversity monitoring, (10) looking at increasing number of mining
tenements, (11) intensifying Information, Education and Communication (IEC) on REDD-
Plus and benefit-sharing, and (12) adoption of precautionary principle for critical areas in the
context of inter-generational responsibility.

Recommendations forwarded by the participants in the parallel workshop on the integration
of non-carbon impacts of REDD-Plus in MRV systems and planning processes include: (1)
institutionalize complementation between projects (joint biodiversity assessment), (2)
regulate data accessibility, (3) include safeguards at the start of MRV development, (4)
clarity of functions and authority among agencies, (5) have projects that plan and share to
ensure that their results feed back into the national REDD-Plus design; (6) be proactive and
not wait for parallel or stand-alone processes and activities, (7) use existing functional
structures instead of creating new ones, and (8) have convergence (Building “Golden
Bridges:” Let’s sit down and talk) and information/knowledge sharing.

To summarize the results of discussions in both the plenary and parallel workshops, the
participants came up with key messages that were sent to the REDD-Plus Partnership for
consideration:

1. Encourage countries to mainstream co-benefits management into cross-sectoral policy
   frameworks / planning processes,
2. Promote cost-effective approaches to monitoring co-benefits and safeguards, keeping
   systems robust and simple,
3. Encourage REDD-Plus Partnership countries to review, update and actively contribute to
   the Voluntary REDD-Plus Database in order to optimize its use as a strategic tool for
   safeguards and co-benefits,
4. Provide generic categories for non-carbon impacts that are then left to country-specific
definition,
5. Provide guidance on operationalizing safeguards and managing co-benefits,
6. Strengthen existing structures and mechanisms for safeguards and for maximizing co-
   benefits involving multi-stakeholder approaches,
7. Encourage on-going efforts on harmonization of co-benefit management and safeguard
   standards,
8. Support dialogue with industries driving deforestation (e.g. large-scale agriculture,
   logging, mining, and infrastructure) in order to stimulate compliance with safeguards.

The Workshop was concluded with the organizers and participants looking forward to
positive results of various REDD-Plus actions as well as continuing sharing of experiences
as a platform for improved implementation of projects.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Recognizing the high contribution of the forest sector to global greenhouse gas emissions, Parties under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) have agreed in 2007 to implement the concept of reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD). As such, Parties were encouraged to explore innovative policy approaches, carry out demonstration activities and feedback the results into the international policy discussion on forest and climate protection. Since then, the concept of REDD has been expanded to REDD-Plus, comprising reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks. The REDD-Plus approach shall develop frame conditions and performance-based incentives for forest protection and sustainable forest management in developing countries while simultaneously achieving co-benefits of REDD-Plus actions.

After the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties (COP) 16 in Cancun, ensuring co-benefits and safeguards of REDD-Plus actions has been consistently taken up in various international discussions. From the outcome of the Ad Hoc Working Group on long-term Cooperative Action (LCA) under the Convention, the agreed guidance as stipulated in the Annex I includes: (i) taking into account the multiple functions of forests and other ecosystems; (ii) implementation in the context of sustainable development and reducing poverty; and (iii) consistency with adaptation needs of the country. Countries also agreed that when undertaking REDD-Plus activities, “safeguards” should be promoted and supported, i.e. that REDD-Plus actions should, among others, (i) complement or be consistent with relevant international conventions and agreements; (ii) respect the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples (IPs) and members of local communities, (iii) be based on the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders; (iv) be consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity.

It can be said therefore that in reference to the LCA text in Cancun, countries recognize that forests do not only store carbon but also provide important non-carbon benefits, namely: biodiversity conservation, adaptation, ecosystem services, and livelihoods for local communities. Finally, REDD-Plus activities can provide benefits to local communities and enhance equity through well-designed benefit-sharing mechanisms.

The International Climate Initiative (ICI) of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), has supported climate protection projects on the area of preservation and sustainable use of natural carbon sinks / REDD-Plus. With several REDD-Plus projects under the ICI in the Asia and Pacific region, the “Regional Expert Workshop on Maximizing the Co-benefits of REDD-Plus Actions” was organized as a venue for sharing experiences among projects and to elaborate recommendations on how non-carbon benefits can be achieved in REDD-Plus activities at the country level. The workshop was organised by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) on behalf of BMU in collaboration with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), a partner government agency of BMU in the Philippines.

---

1 See http://www.international-climate-initiative.com
1.2 Participants

The workshop gathered individuals from 11 ICI projects in 9 countries of South-East Asia and the Pacific represented by experts from project management teams, partners from indigenous peoples and local communities, government, and non-government organizations. Being involved in various REDD-Plus-related activities, the workshop gave them the opportunity to learn lessons on how co-benefits can be generated and how safeguards can be ensured in REDD-Plus implementation. (Please refer to Annex 1 for List of Participants.)

1.3 Objectives

The workshop had four major objectives as follows:

1. Provide a conceptual overview on non-carbon impacts of REDD-Plus and how these are relevant for defining REDD-Plus strategies at the country level.
2. Carry out a comparative analysis of the emerging REDD-Plus strategies and regulations of countries in the region in terms of how countries
   2.1. employ safeguards regarding biodiversity impacts of REDD-Plus measures and regarding participatory planning processes for REDD-Plus measures;
   2.2. mainstream non-carbon impacts into MRV systems;
   2.3. are set to maximize benefits on biodiversity and socio-economic impacts;
   2.4. involve indigenous peoples and local communities in implementing REDD-Plus activities.
3. Discuss and map how the ICI-funded REDD-Plus activities in the region contribute to the same topics.
4. Generate a contribution to the REDD-Plus Partnership on the same topics.
5. Share experiences among ICI REDD-Plus projects and generate recommendations for improvements.

1.4 Methodology

The workshop was designed to serve as a platform for participants to discuss issues, processes, and recommendations on REDD-Plus co-benefits and safeguards. It also provided a venue for exchange of knowledge and enhancement of South-South cooperation.

As an input to the workshop and to prepare for discussions during the event a background paper on Maximizing the Co-benefits of REDD-Plus Actions was elaborated by a team of experts and sent to participants beforehand. Using a questionnaire, information on ICI projects and their involvement in national REDD-Plus actions was collected before the workshop. The questionnaire contained two parts: (1) on the countries’ emerging REDD-Plus strategies, and (2) on the contributions that the individual projects make to these emerging REDD-Plus strategies. This feedback from projects was analysed by a team of experts and from BMU as an input for presentation in the workshop.

During the event plenary sessions were carried out to solicit background information on the BMU ICI and its linkages to the Interim REDD-Plus Partnership, on the participating projects and their activities with regard to REDD-Plus co-benefits and safeguards, on interests of Indigenous Peoples and opportunities for development as well as on REDD-Plus strategies,
MRV systems and planning processes... (For details please refer to Annex 2 for the Workshop Agenda.) For detailed discussions on integration of non-carbon impacts of REDD-Plus in MRV systems and planning processes, and distribution and sharing of REDD-Plus benefits and responsibilities, participants had parallel workshop sessions. With regards to specific concerns and interests of indigenous peoples, a third workshop session was organized. The working sessions were assisted by resource persons, facilitators and documenters. (Please refer to Annex 3 for Workshop Group Assignments.)

Additional information on ICI projects was also presented through posters, project banners and other knowledge products. In addition, BMU and representatives from ICI projects had bilateral meetings to collect feedback, and to address concerns on the ICI-strategy and its project management.

A brief on the relevant activities of indigenous peoples in the vicinity was provided for in a field trip. Relative to this, cultural presentations were organized to show the various aspects of indigenous peoples’ way of life so that the field trip could focus on the identified forestry activities. However, due to a typhoon hitting the Subic area the field trip had to be cancelled. (Please refer to Annex 4 for a copy of the Brief).

At the end of the workshop key messages for the REDD-Plus Partnership were jointly elaborated and sent to the meeting of the REDD-Plus Partnership that was held at the same time in the framework of UNFCCC climate talks in Panama.

2.0 WORKSHOP RESULTS

The workshop consisted of inputs by resource persons and discussions during the plenary and of group work in parallel workshop sessions. The highlights of presentations and discussions are outlined below. Details can be taken from the specific Annexes.

2.1 REDD-Plus actions and ICI projects’ feedback based on the questionnaire [Ref: Dr. Till Neeff, ICI Programme Office and Mr. Joerg Seifert-Granzin, Mesa Consult (Annex 5)]

The Cancun Agreements present both risks and rewards in discussing REDD-Plus. Though it is clear that everyone recognizes the importance of the issues, it is yet to be

---

2 Due to a typhoon hitting the Subic area there were power interruptions in between sessions, hence adjustments had to be made to the planned programme.
seen how countries will deal with these issues. It is important to look at how countries can be assisted in finding solutions to these concerns. Some of the important concepts that can be gleaned from the official text and international discussion are: (a) Full and effective participation, (b) respect to traditional rights and interests of IPs and local communities, (c) Adaptation needs, (d) Sustainable management of forests, (e) Multiple functions of forests, (f) National sustainable development needs, (g) Reducing poverty, (h) Information on how safeguards are addressed, and (i) Integration of national action into international conventions and agreements.

As countries recognize that REDD-Plus has non-carbon impacts, necessary safeguards should be in place to protect the benefits and avoid negative implications. These impacts could be in in terms of conservation of biodiversity, protection of ecosystem services, community benefits, economic benefits, and adaptation needs. It is important to look at other options and alternatives. As such, safeguards for REDD-Plus can be administrative procedures that relate to non-carbon impacts. These may include (a) participative strategy, development, and planning, (b) participative implementation, (c) account for rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, (d) Maximizing of co-benefits, and (e) avoidance of negative non-carbon impacts.

Treatments of non-carbon impacts of REDD-Plus and corresponding safeguards may need a comprehensive approach rather than looking at these points as stand-alone elements. In fact, most of the time, they overlap and vary from one country to another. At some point, non-carbon impacts and safeguards may even have nuances in interpretations and therefore there is a need to clarify, for instance, the difference between co-benefits and non-carbon impacts, safeguard and issues beyond carbon, participation in implementation and participation in planning, as well as monitoring safeguards and monitoring co-benefits.

With reference to the three major phases of REDD-Plus, co-benefits and safeguards are relevant and therefore should be considered accordingly. For instance, integrating non-carbon impacts into MRV systems in order to optimize REDD-Plus strategies and track the benefits. Other options for addressing co-benefits and safeguards may be applied to building blocks of strategy development, planning, implementation and monitoring.

**Results of the questionnaires:** All 11 ICI projects participated in the pre-workshop survey (1) on the countries’ emerging REDD-Plus strategies, and (2) on the contributions that the individual projects make to these emerging REDD-Plus strategies.

---

3 Phase 1: Strategy Development, Phase 2: Capacity Building, Phase 3: Results-Based Action
In terms of relevance of non-carbon benefits in framing REDD-Plus activities, there were indications that governments consider economic benefits and community development as very important. However, synergies with adaptation needs of communities and with ecosystem resilience were unimportant in identifying and planning activities. This can be attributed to the ICI projects’ two-track approach, mitigation and adaptation. The planning stage usually focuses on the mitigation.

On gaps, it was emphasized that the counterparts lack human resources to support activities as well as sufficient baseline data. On early stage at least at national level, ICI projects contribute in defining carbon rights, looking at options for benefit-sharing, and ensuring participatory processes.

A concern was raised on the missing actors which vary from country to country. Some examples are: Indonesia: private sector; Philippines: several national level agencies (agriculture, mining, etc); Papua New Guinea: land/resource owners, academe; Thailand: IPs and local communities or corresponding institutions; Pacific: churches.

On integrating experiences from pilot projects to national level discussion and consequently to the international arena and vice versa, it was recognized that there is no clear working mechanism in most if not all countries. Results of initial REDD-Plus activities that are related to international discussions have not been concretely shared by countries, particularly in expected submissions to the UNFCCC.

Results also show a broad range of policy instruments and how these instruments are perceived, how relevant, and whether they are supposed to be used at the national level. Some of these are Payment for Environmental Service (PES), special sectoral laws and regulations, and transfer of responsibility to community authorities. These are coupled with projects that are operating in demonstration mode, borrowing from Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) schemes, using introduced carbon standards from voluntary markets, expecting that incentive payments play an important role. However, the conventional setting of fiscal instruments that regulates the use of resources is not in the radar of these projects and not within the national implementation framework. Although projects consider fees, taxes (incentives) relevant, it is not likely that these fiscal instruments are being used within the National REDD-Plus framework. In addition, the two main dimensions of policy planning which are land use planning and sector planning, are unlikely to be part of the policy portfolio despite their relevance. This could mean that REDD-Plus is working only in the forestry domain (forest conservation) and not so much in the point of view of an integrated development plan.

It was concluded that (a) projects collaborate in the development of national REDD-Plus framework by implementing a broad array of activities, (b) there is unbalanced involvement of stakeholders at the national level, (c) various multi-stakeholder
processes such as land use planning, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), and committee-type mechanisms can facilitate participation of stakeholders, (d) finance instruments such as taxes and subsidies or fees are relevant but unlikely to be used, and (e) potential synergies between REDD-Plus and potential adaptation needs don’t seem to play a prominent role in most of the pilot projects.

**From the participants,** it was: (a) clarified that private sector may not be associated with oil palm plantation for areas such as Vietnam and Lao PDR, (b) expressed that the questionnaire did not capture what REDD-Plus can do, particularly in terms of addressing adaptation strategies in the context of respective structures and participation of so called “missing actors”; (c) stated that it is difficult to say whether the government sector has not considered co-benefits and involvement of other sectors or decided not to pursue these, (d) recommended that local government units be enjoined to participate in REDD-Plus and mainstream discussion of REDD-Plus in academic curricula, (e) noted the lack of involvement of indigenous peoples, (f) observed that less and less technical experts are participating in international discussions while there is an increasing number of negotiators, funding being one of the major constraints, (g) shared that though collaborative mechanisms are working, political actions and lack of coherence in national agency agenda can break down a system which affects submissions to UNFCCC, (h) raised that there is a need for experts and negotiators to be abreast with related international treaties and resolutions such as those under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) and United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

**From the BMU,** it was emphasized that ICI set indigenous peoples and local communities as a priority. The ICI portfolio however, have yet to cover the missing actors who have been considered as drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, particularly the private sector in the extractive industries such as mining and those in conversion of forestlands into agricultural areas. Hence, the private sector involvement in REDD-Plus will be considered as a new component in the ICI portfolio.

### 2.2 REDD-Plus in ICI: Strategy, portfolio in Southeast Asia and Linkages to the Interim REDD-Plus Partnership [Ref: Ms. Daniela Göhler and Ms. Anika Busch, BMU, (Annex 6)]

There are three main windows under the ICI as the German commitment to the Fast Start Initiative, namely: Mitigation, Adaptation, and REDD-Plus. Of these, REDD-Plus co-benefits are gaining attention because of some overlap with biodiversity and adaptation.

The leading portfolio in REDD-Plus is on demonstration activities. This is followed by REDD-Plus infrastructure and strategy development. Ranked third and fourth are MRV and safeguards and benefit-sharing, respectively. Projects that directly reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are those that involve protected forests, forest management, reforestation and restoration, conservation of peat lands.

The ICI strategy on REDD-Plus is (a) looking at what is covered by REDD-Plus projects and other land use management projects that deal with ecosystems, (b) considering the alignment of REDD-Plus priorities with the Cancun Agreements, particularly on supporting national REDD-Plus strategies, robust national forest monitoring systems, and providing information on safeguards, (c) moving towards/strengthening the coordination with other international REDD-Plus initiatives such as FCPF and REDD-Plus Partnership, (d) facilitating regional projects’ sharing of experiences which is also a factor in avoiding leakage, (e) promoting synergy between climate protection and biodiversity conservation.
Given the above ICI strategy, the funding priorities are on (a) Establishment of national MRV systems, (b) Development of reference scenarios, (c) Application of safeguards, (d) Participation of local communities and indigenous peoples in planning and implementation of REDD-Plus, (e) Coordination of REDD-Plus measures (e.g. national registries), and (f) REDD-Plus governance (e.g. policy coherence, synergies with forest governance initiatives and biodiversity instruments). Hence, the ICI addresses up to Phase 2 of the three REDD-Plus phases.

As one of the points under the ICI strategy, it is imperative to link ICI projects to the REDD-Plus Partnership functions and the current discussions there. Results of the workshop will therefore be published on the REDD-Plus Partnership website aside from providing copies to partners and to bring them forward in some form in Durban.

ICI projects were informed of the following REDD-Plus Partnership functions: (a) Support UNFCCC negotiations, (b) Enable experience exchange, (c) Scale up action and finance, (d) Enhance transparency of financial transfers (e) Network, and (f) Close financing gaps. In addition, the topics that are being taken up by the Partnership were also laid out, namely: Improving Voluntary REDD-Plus Partnership Database (VRD), enhancing multilateral financing including safeguards, implementing MRV systems, developing reference levels, and identifying financing options.

### 2.3 REDD-Plus co-benefits and safeguards with reference to interests of Indigenous Peoples and opportunities for development [Ref: Atty. Jeannette Florita, National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP), Mr. Roberto Garcia, Subic Bay Metropolitan Authority (SBMA) and Workshop Participants Group 3]

The NCIP expressed the institution’s high regard to REDD-Plus. It was also stated that IPs have always been the faithful stewards and users of their ancestral domains. Given that most of the areas that are “REDDable” are in ancestral domains, it is the intention of the NCIP to assist, support and protect IPs in their wise use of the renewable resources in their ancestral domains. They should be partners and not mere beneficiaries in the sustainable use and development of resources found in those areas. Further, in the Philippines, the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) has provided levels of protection and promotion of rights and welfare of IPs in the Philippines. NCIP expressed willingness to cooperate in further elaboration of the IPRA for further understanding of the Philippine context.

On the part of the SBMA, a possible option would be to look at their recent initiative whereby a Joint Management Agreement (JMA) with the IPs whose Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title (CADT) covers the SBMA, has been forged. Being subject to an
FPIC process, this JMA could be an initiative towards modelling forms of benefit sharing with IPs.

The group of Indigenous Peoples from Philippines expressed their understanding of REDD-Plus. They think that REDD-Plus recognizes IPs' rights. In principle, REDD-Plus will be a big help in forest protection and conservation, as well as to IPs. Given these, however, they also presented their fears and recommendations. They are afraid that (a) Extent, level of responsibilities may not be clear and executed properly, (b) Agreements will not be clarified, (c) They have no participation in deciding on partners in implementation, who may not be known to them, (d) Their rights will be neglected/dishonored, (e) There will be loopholes that might lead to further degradation / disintegration of forest and the environment (based on previous experiences), (f) the process of implementation may tap “middle men” or layers and levels of transactions that will cause more difficulties, and (g) Implementation will encourage corruption.

A list of recommendations was also offered by the IP participants for REDD-Plus to succeed. These are the following: (a) Provide assistance in dissemination/cascading of information to the tribes, (b) Enable joint learning with Local Government Units (LGUs), (c) Respect their customs, traditions, calendars, and other indigenous knowledge, skills and practices (IKSP), (d) Consider the tribe’s personal/basic consumption needs, (e) For DENR to trim down requirements on acquiring permits, (f) Extend assistance in developing non-timber products and not prevent or prohibit them from using these products (developing and valuation), (g) Help promote their traditional species/products (i.e. organic rice), (h) Enforce strict implementation of policies on environmental protection, (i) Implement collective decision making, (j) LGUs should take part and provide support, and (k) Allow IPs to share in deciding what to plant by asking them what they want.

In the figures presented, REDD-Plus activities are implemented mostly in Ancestral Domains. Thus, FPIC is the process that indigenous peoples would like to adhere in REDD-Plus development and implementation. To achieve genuine FPIC for REDD-Plus, there are at least four considerations, namely, success stories, safeguards, existing issues and existing benefits. Examples of success stories are practice and recognition of traditional justice systems, having Schools of Living Tradition, enhancement and promotion of traditional festivals, implementation of “back to culture” programs, and transformation of community members from illegal loggers to responsible resource users. The safeguards that can be adopted include conservation and protection of genetic pools, observance of IKSP and IP calendars, and Assisted Natural Regeneration. Based on the representation of participants, some of the existing issues faced by IPs are suspended implementation
of ecotourism agreements with LGUs, verbal agreement between IPs and government entities not religiously followed, non-observance of IP calendars vs. supply and demand (i.e. planting, harvesting, etc.), conflict between protected area zoning and IP zoning management (e.g. restricted area), slow processing and extensive documentation requirement (e.g. transport permits for forest products), Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development Protection Plan (ADSDPP) of IPs and approved Forest Land Use Planning (FLUP) of the municipality are contradicting and unharmonious (mining, dams, etc.), awarding of Certificate of Land Ownership Agreement within CADT without consent of IPs, patenting of medicinal remedies (Bioprospecting/Intellectual Property Right). Finally, the IPs gave the following examples on existing benefits: engagement of IPs on seedling production, royalty payments through JMA.

2.4 REDD-Plus co-benefits and safeguards based on UNFCCC outcome documents, on-going efforts and lessons from early action [Ref: Dr. Chandra Silori, The Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC) (Annex 7), Plenary discussion]

“Safeguards” is defined as mechanisms to prevent and address undue harm to the environment and people at the earliest possible planning stage. Safeguards can also be policies and measures that aim to address both direct and indirect impacts to communities and ecosystems, by identifying, analysing and ultimately working to manage risks and opportunities. Hence, for REDD-Plus to succeed safeguards should be in place.

Development of the concept of safeguards has started in the international discussion last June 2009 in Bonn until it became part of the Cancun Agreements. In relation to this, various organizations, working globally and in specific sectors have become references in terms of their own initiatives on safeguards and setting of standards. Some of these are the UN-REDD Program, World Bank, CCBA and CARE, Rainforest Alliance, Forestry Steward Council, and bilateral agreements. The standards developed by these organizations and initiatives vary in terms of emphasis and coverage but basically deal with policies, land tenure, participation, capacity building, mechanisms and land uses, where rights is a cross-cutting aspect. Given this, there is a modality that safeguards are customized and MRVed to be appropriate and tracked.

With the initial actions on the ground, some of the concerns that have been gathered are (a) who has the power in access and control of resources, (b) how REDD-Plus is understood being a complicated concept, (c) benefit sharing, (d) ownership of carbon, (e) trust, and (f) diversity of local stakeholders.

On FPIC, it was pointed out that it is not a fast tract process. Communities should be enabled to understand their rights and their fulfilment. A good team of facilitators should be fielded to ensure understanding on REDD-Plus and an iterative process of FPIC. A great deal of effort should be carried out towards full disclosure and balanced information within an open and transparent consultative process. One particular means that can be a good reference is RECOFTC’s three-prong approach that involves capacity building, principled-based activities, and offer of training packages.

Towards development of safeguards, opportunities should be seen at the negotiations, the level of participation of IPs, installation of structures at national level, and identification of benefits.

MRV is discussed in safeguards as the Cancun Agreements mentioned MRV of support as well as providing information on governance wherein a whole Annex is devoted to encourage parties to support and promote safeguards.
2.5 Contributions of ICI projects to respective national REDD-Plus strategies [Ref: Project Presentations (Annex 8), Plenary discussion]

The projects are in various stages of implementation. Areas of concern are on buffer zones, reforestation, baseline establishment, non-timber forest products, drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, biodiversity conservation, MRV systems, guidance on measuring forest degradation, participation of stakeholders, tools development, scale, dialogue processes and stakeholder readiness.

2.6 Workshop Group 1: Integration of non-carbon impacts of REDD-Plus in MRV Systems and planning processes [Annex 9, Table of Workshop Group 1 Output]

The Philippines reported on resource use rights. This can be mainstreamed in the preparation of ADSDPPs through concrete statements. Methods such as participatory rapid appraisal, community mapping, and forest resources inventory can be utilized to draw such articulation from IPs. Contribution of the projects or from support groups can be in the form of customary laws/guidelines, technical assistance, policies and capacity building activities. These processes can be organized with the following responsible agencies and organizations: NCIP, DENR, GIZ, LGUs, Peoples Organizations (POs) and NGOs. The requirements to achieve the resource use rights would be FPIC, maps/zones, and results of natural resources inventories.

Indonesia discussed socio-economic impact. This can be integrated in setting up of a socio-economic baseline, collection of demographic data, identification of Non Timber Forest Products (NTFPs), and analysis of environmental services (INVEST). Methods such as simultaneous setting up with main MRV system and trend analysis from the past series data can be utilized to incorporate socio-economic aspects. The project can contribute in the conduct of socio-economic survey and INVEST with the following responsible agency and organizations: National Standard Agency, universities and research institutions, and consulting firms/ experts. The requirements to achieve this integration would be data inventory and adequate funding.

Thailand presented tiger population recovery. This can be integrated in the tiger and prey population survey through complementation with wildlife population monitoring. The project can support in terms of funds and provide a structure for developing appropriate MRV. It is expected that the Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation will be responsible for this. Needed prerequisite for the process would be knowing the appropriate level of detail and training in monitoring principles.

Cambodia talked about biodiversity conservation. Accordingly, this can be part of forest monitoring for habitat coverage, national Red List and species monitoring programs through complementation with core MRV for habitat coverage, and biodiversity monitoring in plots or aligning with ground truthing. The project can contribute in the coming up with protocols for forests/habitat coverage, biodiversity baseline, and monitoring, as well as linking this to community patrols. This process will be taken on by the Department of Environment and Conservation. Requirements for completion of the undertaking would be satellite imagery and protocols for baselines and monitoring accepted for national REDD-Plus and MRV.

Fiji expounded on land conflict settlement. This will be incorporated in the planning process during complementary data review by looking at numbers of land registration and registration processes. The project can assist in the demarcation, crafting of management plan and preparation of registration with the Lands Department and the
REDD Coordinator as responsible office and person. Given this, it is a requirement to optimize data storage.

2.7 Workshop Group 2: Distribution and sharing of REDD-Plus benefits and responsibilities [Annex 9, Table of Workshop Group 2 Output]

The Mekong sub-region identified four REDD-Plus actions, one of which is sustainable forest management that results to economic benefits. This is likely to be shared from the state through the Ministry of Finance to forest owners (title holders) and subcontractors (households, communities) through individual collective incentives and payment for performance. Income from these can be used for mobility such as motorbikes and for cable TV as source of information and entertainment. This process must be handled by a trustee of any trust funds.

The Philippines described forest land use planning (FLUP), an approach to ensure proper allocation of land use and to serve as a basis to forge co-management agreements between LGUs and DENR. FLUP will also used be for REDD-Plus action that will bring about protected ecosystem services. These shall be shared from DENR, POs, and Provincial LGUs to Municipal LGUs and other POs through technical assistance from DENR, Municipal Technical Working Groups and Municipal Inspection Team. Proceeds will be used for proper allocation and management of land. DENR, LGUs and Congress will be responsible for this process.

Indonesia presented one REDD-Plus action for each of the three projects represented in the workshop. One of these actions is a multi-stakeholder consultation on program and planning development including implementation and monitoring which was identified as an action that will result to good governance. This process will be shared among the Forest Management Unit (FMU), District and Provincial Forestry Service and other relevant agencies and communities through public consultations and workshops. As such, this will be used for good governance described as transparent, participatory, and accountable on special plan and FPIC practices. The responsible office here will be the forest service together with local stakeholders.

Fiji- Pacific Islands discussed FPIC as a REDD-Plus action in all phases of implementation. This way, the FPIC process will be strengthened as applied to other development processes. The lessons and experiences from this will be shared from resources owners to the Ministry of Indigenous Affairs which will be used for respecting the rights of IPs through institutional processes. Hence, the Ministry of Indigenous Affairs will be the responsible office for this action.
2.8 Lessons learned and what needs to be done

From the remarks of Director Neria Andin of Forest Management Bureau (FMB), co-hosting an initiative such as the workshop is a manifestation of a lesson learned from cooperative action. Acknowledging the support of the BMU and GIZ, she emphasized that active support and participation are important elements in ensuring success of REDD-Plus actions. DENR should continue to document lessons as it implements REDD-Plus and contributes in knowledge sharing for forest policy development and project evaluation. It is a challenge, however, to bring REDD-Plus inputs from national level into the international scene. REDD-Plus has also become part of the climate related policy discussion in the ASEAN arena.

The Climate Change Commission through its Vice Chairperson, Secretary Mary Ann Lucille Sering, looks at REDD-Plus as a concern and an opportunity. REDD-Plus could not be readily seen and labelled as such in the National Climate Change Action Plan of the Philippines but it has been considered under the ecological and environmental stability component. As such, to a certain extent, mitigation becomes a function of adaptation. With REDD-Plus, forests will become center of all activities related to climate change, with particular mention to food and water, population, health and environment. Implementing REDD-Plus therefore requires multi-stakeholder participation which has been a process that Philippines is doing. The government for its part will be working through a cabinet cluster for climate change that meets every month while recognizing the authority of the CCC as oversight on climate change and DENR-FMB as technical and operations arm for REDD-Plus.

From the workshop groups, lessons were aggregated according to regions and countries, as follows:

**Mekong region:** (1) Harmonization is required between safeguard standards, (2) Guidance is required to operationalize safeguards, (3) REDD-Plus co-benefits need to be mainstreamed into cross-sectoral policy and planning frameworks, (4) Facilitate dialogue with driver industries (large-scale agriculture, logging, mining, infrastructure), and tapping into their experience on standards as stakeholders (participation).

**Pacific:** (1) Need to have a multi-stakeholder support structure (all levels, including resource owner head), (2) Need to strengthen existing structures and mechanisms especially benefit sharing, (3) Need to involve REDD-Plus national technical experts in international negotiations, (4) Clear identification of economic drivers that REDD-Plus can’t compete with.

**Indonesia:** (1) Landscape level management is dynamic and complex, hence need to develop landscape forest management unit and come up with systematic biodiversity
monitoring, (2) Need to have forest carbon accounting and land use mapping (for site level) by developing multi-stakeholder collaboration and protecting peatland forest from fires.

2.8.1 Philippines: (1) Increasing number of mining tenements and applicants pose great and grave risks to communities and the environment, (2) Need to have frequent and in-depth Information, Education and Communication (IEC) on benefit-sharing, (3) As an archipelagic country of steep topographies, viability of extractive industries should be guided by precautionary principle, as it is only through forest conservation that inter-generational responsibility is observed, (4) Intensive IEC focusing on misconception about REDD-Plus.

2.8.2 Common ideas from Workshop Group 1: (1) Institutionalization of complementation between projects (joint biodiversity assessment), (2) Regulation of data accessibility, (3) Inclusion of safeguards at the start of MRV development, (4) Clarification of functions and authority among agencies, (5) Planning and sharing of projects to ensure that their results feed back into the national REDD-Plus design; (6) Being proactive and by not waiting for parallel or stand-alone processes and activities, (7) Use existing functional structures instead of creating new ones, and (8) Having convergence (Building “Golden Bridges:” Let’s sit down and talk) and information/knowledge sharing.

2.9 Key messages for the REDD-Plus Partnership

From the discussions of lessons learned and workshop groups, taking into account the engagement of the REDD-Plus Partnership on non-carbon impacts of REDD-Plus actions, and safeguards, the participants came up with the following messages for consideration of the REDD-Plus Partnership:

9. Encourage countries to mainstream co-benefits management into cross-sectoral policy frameworks / planning processes,
10. Promote cost-effective approaches to monitoring co-benefits and safeguards, keeping systems robust and simple,
11. Encourage REDD-Plus Partnership countries to review, update and actively contribute to the Voluntary REDD-Plus Database in order to optimize its use as a strategic tool for safeguards and co-benefits,
12. Provide generic categories for non-carbon impacts that are then left to country-specific definition,
13. Provide guidance on operationalizing safeguards and managing co-benefits,
14. Strengthen existing structures and mechanisms for safeguards and for maximizing co-benefits involving multi-stakeholder approaches,
15. Encourage on-going efforts on harmonization of co-benefit management and safeguard standards,
16. Support dialogue with industries driving deforestation (e.g. large-scale agriculture, logging, mining, infrastructure) in order to stimulate compliance with safeguards.

These messages were sent to the meeting of the Interim REDD-Plus Partnership that held in parallel a workshop on safeguards on 28 September in the frame of the Climate Talks in Panama. The messages were presented there by the Philippines representative to the REDD-Plus Partnership.
3.0 FINAL MESSAGES IN RELATION TO OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

Dr. Bernd-Markus Liss, GIZ

In his final message Dr. Bernd-Markus Liss, GIZ Principal Advisor on REDD-Plus in the Philippines, outlined that the workshop was particularly important for the BMU ICI, and that it was specifically beneficial to the Philippines as it provided inputs from the indigenous peoples. This will be reflected in the IP Summit this October, where GIZ together with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources will have an input on what REDD-Plus particularly means for IPs. The workshop had provided for detailed assessments of REDD-Plus co-benefits and safeguards. These will be elaborated further in the report. The background paper will be further refined with the inputs from the workshop. The workshop has shown that there are some diverse opinions on the meaning of co-benefits and that there is no standard definition. This was the first workshop at the regional level that discussed co-benefits of REDD-Plus. With the experience of the projects and the expertise gathered very practical inputs to the MRV systems could be generated. The workshop results will be forwarded to the REDD-Plus Partnership and through the Partnership further be provided as an input to the discussion in the UNFCCC COP 17 later this year in Durban. He encouraged everyone to get in touch with those who will be negotiating in Durban so that through the related constituents recommendations on how to maximize co-benefits and to ensure safeguards in REDD-Plus actions will find their way into the official negotiations. Finally he thanked everybody who had contributed to the success of the workshop.

Anika Busch, BMU

In her remarks, Ms. Anika Busch thanked everyone for this memorable workshop. This was the first regional workshop that the BMU has organized. It is very important to BMU and hopefully, this workshop can be replicated in other regions. She expressed her satisfaction with the good outcomes and discussions which now could be forwarded to the REDD-Plus Partnership and can be contributed to other negotiations. Ms. Busch
Daniela Göhler, BMU

Ms. Daniela Göhler thanked the Philippine government, DENR, FMB, the ICI project in the Philippines and all participants who dedicated their time and resources to make this event happen. To her, this workshop had fulfilled the objective to better connect, bring into contact and initiate exchange among ICI projects about their work and REDD-Plus issues. The workshop provided good discussions and hopefully, the exchange will provide an opportunity to know who to contact from other ICI projects in the future. The workshop also achieved the objective to elicit contributions from ICI projects that will link to international discussions. Lastly, she acknowledged that the workshop had enabled her to learn a lot about ICI projects and helped to get in closer touch with what happens on the ground as she is at the very end of the line of responsibility and thus, distant from project implementation. She was confident to now know more about the projects and be able to better contribute in facilitating projects. She invited participants to feel free to contact her anytime. She also said that if there are any side events planned related to ICI projects, BMU will be happy to engage and motivate participation from others.

Datu Abdelwin Sangkula, NTFP-Exchange Programme/ CoDe REDD) Philippines

Datu Abdelwin Sangkula first of all, thanked the organisers for the invitation to participate in the workshop. CoDe REDD has been in the forefront of developing the Philippine National REDD-Plus Strategy (PNRPS) and is happy to have been able to mobilize a lot of sectors to work together and develop the strategy. He expressed happiness that some of the perspectives of the IPs and local communities have been included, not only as a requirement, but as part and parcel of initiating activities in every region and locality. CoDe REDD will continue their efforts and coordination and hopefully, further cement the relationship between civil society organizations and other agencies especially DENR. In the context of the Philippines, they would like to convey this message to the NCIP who is at the forefront of this effort.
Mr. Lagumbay on behalf of the Forest Management Bureau expressed his gratitude to the BMU, the organizers and all of the participants. He hoped that the group will see each other again in future initiatives under REDD-Plus and that by that time, everybody was able to implement their respective MRV systems. With that, he commended everybody for the job well done.

Participants agreed to stay in touch and to use the network of ICI REDD-Plus projects for more communication and learning on technical and policy issues with regard to REDD-Plus co-benefits and safeguards.