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Key Messages

- As there is no universal definition of good governance that would be applicable to all people, societies and cultures equally it is simpler to understand through its key principles;

- Governance principles are important for a country to “govern”, or manage, its REDD+ process and a key feature contributing to the sustainability of REDD+;

- Characteristics of ‘effective’ governance structures’ generally includes enforcement of laws;

- Accountability mechanisms or the obligation of decision-makers to take responsibility for their actions is supported by systems that can be understood as a continuum with two systems at each end: regular feedback systems, and grievance and redress mechanisms.
INTRODUCTION

This module presents one the importance of good governance in the REDD+ processes. The module includes explanations about:

- Governance under the UNFCCC REDD+ decisions;
- Governance factors underlying drivers and barriers to (and potential of) “+” activities;
- Good governance to develop successful and effective national REDD+ strategies and policies and measures;
- Accountability mechanisms to monitor policies and measures (PAMs);
- Strengthening governance to implement NS/APS and PAMs;
- Governance safeguards;
- Managing REDD+ funds.

GOVERNANCE UNDER THE UNFCCC REDD+ DECISIONS

DEFINITION

Like so many hot buzzwords, governance has come to mean different things to different people. The concept of governance is a dynamic construct in which many people and actors have a say.

Although numerous attempts have been made to define governance, and mostly good governance, it is hard to capture all its importance, dimensions and dynamics in a single and succinct definition. However, governance is generally described to encompass the interaction of laws and other norms, institutions, and processes in a society; how decisions are being made; as well as how and if responsible actors or decision-makers are held to account (if at all). The term Governance describes how:

- A Society (people) organises how it lives together;
- It deals with different interests and opinions, which are grounded in norms and values;
- It deals with the distribution of resources;
- This is translated into rules, regulations, institutions and conditions which uphold a peaceful and mutually beneficial existence for all members of society.

Governance also encompasses who:

- Has the power to make decisions that affect natural resources and natural resource users and how those decisions are made;
- Has the power and responsibility to implement those decisions and how those decisions are implemented;
- Holds - or is held - accountable, and how, for implementation.

The Human Rights agenda provides the basis for the UN governance principles. The United Nations has worked on a definition on democratic governance for the Post 2015 Development Agenda1. However, there is no universal definition which would be applicable to all people, societies and cultures equally, so a common understanding and the priority to focus on domestic action is more important. Therefore good governance is often simpler to understand through its key principles, which include:

---

1 The Post-2015 Development Agenda refers to a process led by the United Nations that aims to help define the future global development framework that will succeed the Millennium Development Goals.
• Rule of law;
• Transparency and access to information;
• Accountability;
• Respect for rights;
• Participation / inclusiveness;
• Performance / effectiveness;
• Consensus seeking;
• Capacity;
• Anti-corruption;
• Gender equality.

**Reflection Point**

What is the difference between governance and government?

**Governance in the UNFCCC Text**

In all the 13 UNFCCC Decisions which relate to REDD+, from Bali to Warsaw, the word ‘governance’ is only mentioned in one: Decision 1/CP.16, “The Cancun Agreements: Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention”, which:

“Requests developing country Parties... to address, inter alia, the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, land tenure issues, forest governance issues, gender considerations... ensuring the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, inter alia indigenous peoples and local communities (paragraph 72)

“When undertaking the activities referred to in paragraph 70 of this decision, the following safeguards should be promoted and supported:

a. ... **Transparent and effective national forest governance structures**, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty; (Appendix 1, paragraph 2 [b])”

While the word itself is only mentioned twice, the concept of good governance is actually captured in the first four of the seven Cancun safeguards:

• Consistency with national forest programmes and international conventions;
• Transparency and effectiveness,
• Respect for knowledge and rights;
• Full and effective participation.

The concept of good governance and its principles is moreover necessary to address and respect the remaining three safeguards:

• Prevent conversion of natural forests and conserve biodiversity;
• Ensure social and environmental benefits;
• Address risk of reversals and reduce displacement of emissions.

A more in depth discussion on safeguards can be found in **Module 7: Safeguards**.

**Good Governance and REDD+**

Governance principles as outlined in the previous section are important for a country to “govern”, or manage, its REDD+ process and a key feature contributing to the sustainability of REDD+.

Therefore, good governance principles are applied at multiple levels (global/international, national, sub-national/state, province and local) but also adhered to throughout the different steps of REDD+ implementation. In summary, good governance for REDD+ can create an enabling environment for “governing” the REDD+ process successfully, helping ensure inclusive and meaningful participation during decision making, and promote equity, fairness, transparency and justice during all phases of REDD+. 
Figure 12.2 Importance of Addressing Governance in REDD+ Processes

Source: UN-REDD Programme

Figure 12.2 shows when to address governance issues in a national REDD+ process.

I. To understand the underlying factors that may drive certain drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, or impede effective conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks;
   – For example, governance analytics can point to weak enforcement capacities and corruption that lead to illegal logging;

II. To develop successful and effective national REDD+ strategies and policies and measures;
    – For example, how governance weaknesses and strengths can inform the feasibility of certain measures to address drivers;

III. To implement and monitor strategies and policies and measures;
     – For example by enhancing the institutional and collaborative capacity of REDD+ implementing national agencies, or for allowing for participatory monitoring of the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of such policies and measures, as well as to allow for adjustment of implemented PAMs that are not working according to the intended outcome;

IV. To ensure that safeguards are addressed and respected;

V. To manage REDD+ funds in a transparent and accountable manner, to avoid corruption risks such as undue influence, fraud or embezzlement.

Reflection Points

What would your key concerns be to lead this process based on the principles of good governance – from design, through implementation of strategy and PAMs and eventually when results-based payments are received?

What measures can be taken to ensure meaningful participation of stakeholders?

What would be key to ensure policy coherence and avoid conflicting policies across ministries?

How can REDD+ be institutionalized in a sustainable manner, so that it is not vulnerable to political change or individual turnover?
Throughout this module a number of issues cut across several steps of a REDD+ process.

**Participatory Governance**

Just as important as “governance analytics” is the need to consult, engage and collaborate with relevant stakeholders at various strategic stages. Public participation, supported by transparency and access to justice, is one of the most recognized principles of sustainable development. Since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 there has been consistency in international legal instruments dealing with the environment and socio-economic development, that active ‘participation’ by affected groups and civil society is not only desirable but necessary if sustainable development objectives are to be met.

Stakeholders can be grouped into government or public sector, civil society, private sector, the general public and consumers, and the external community, such as international financial institutions. They can also be rights-holders such as property owners, women, indigenous peoples and tribal groups, communities or individuals that hold traditional or formally recognized usufruct (and/or other) rights to land or resources that will be affected by the decisions being made. As the REDD+ decisions place specific emphasis on the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, this should be a priority issue for participatory governance. A more in-depth discussion on stakeholder engagement can be found in Module 11: Public Participation and Stakeholder Engagement.

**Gender Equality**

Actions can be taken at various steps to promote gender responsive REDD+ processes and good governance approaches. These actions can involve undertaking a gender analysis of drivers and/or an assessment of gender gaps/inequalities in policies, decision making, local practices and cultural norms; ensuring the active and equitable participation of women, youth, as well as other marginalized groups in consultations/workshops/trainings; fully integrating gender equality and women’s empowerment considerations in the development and implementation of a REDD+ Strategy; and developing and undertaking gender sensitive monitoring and reporting activities (e.g. use of gender indicators and sex disaggregated data). Such activities can be achieved through mobilizing gender expertise throughout the REDD+ process, including in planning, implementation and monitoring and reporting.

**Access to Information**

Effective participation by civil society and indigenous stakeholders, as well as effective cross-sectoral coordination is underpinned by access to and exchange of information. This pertains to all aspects of the development, design, implementation and monitoring of a national REDD+ strategy.

**Legal Frameworks**

Effective legal and regulatory frameworks are a key factor in the successful implementation of REDD+. Legal and regulatory provisions that are supportive of REDD+ objectives ensure that REDD+ requirements are addressed in a coherent way and in line with international provisions. For example, effective legislation that clarifies tenure and access rights to natural resources may help reduce pressure on forest resources and reduce dispute risks during the implementation phase. In preparing for REDD+, countries may seek to build upon or adapt their existing policies, laws and regulations, possibly through the adoption of new texts, in order to establish national and/or sub-national legal frameworks supportive of REDD+. 
**GOVERNANCE FACTORS UNDERLYING DRIVERS AND BARRIERS TO (AND POTENTIAL OF) “+” ACTIVITIES**

As seen in Module 3: Drivers of Deforestation and Forest Degradation, preparing for effective and efficient REDD+ implementation requires strong analytical foundations on which countries can build their vision for REDD+, and make informed and strategic decisions that will shape a critical pathway to implement that vision.

In order to implement REDD+ activities effectively, countries should seek to understand and address the direct and related indirect drivers of deforestation and forest degradation (DDFD). They should also understand the dynamics of and barriers to forest conservation, enhancement of forest carbon stocks and sustainable management of forests.

Indirect drivers’ (also called ‘underlying causes’ or ‘driving forces’) can be related to international drivers (e.g. markets, commodity prices), national factors (e.g. population growth, domestic markets, national policies, fiscal framework, but also governance) and local circumstances (e.g. change in household behaviour).

Similarly, barriers to the ‘+’ activities of REDD+ (forest conservation, enhancement of forest carbon stocks & sustainable management of forests), refer to the various obstacles to the implementation of these activities. Barriers may be very diverse, and include governance weaknesses such as lack of participation, corruption, inappropriate legal frameworks, weak enforcement of existing laws etc.

Identification of the various agents of deforestation and forest degradation is also key to in-depth analysis of drivers and barriers. It may for example be useful to map various decision-makers and other influential actors, such as customary or decentralized administrative authorities, and the formal or informal ways in which they impact the drivers and their incentives and barriers to change their current practice. This mapping may be done for example through an “institutional and context analyses” (see Annex 1).

Activities to analyze drivers and barriers also need to be conducted in a participatory and gender sensitive manner in order to ensure that they are accurate and have ownership from a broad range of stakeholders. This includes ensuring: a complete understanding of stakeholders’ rights; access to information; recognition of livelihood and subsistence activities of stakeholders that may be significantly impacted by REDD+ management decisions. Lack of participation also often results in a lack of a gender perspective, detailed in the next section.

Studies\(^2\) and processes to understand the “governance factors of drivers and barriers” could help countries understand the likelihood and potential impacts of current practices and future risks and benefits. Example of governance related underlying drivers and barriers are highlighted below.

---

**Box 12.4 Understanding Drivers and Barriers from a Governance Lens**

- What governance deficits facilitate deforestation and forest degradation, and create barriers to conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of carbon stocks?
- What governance enablers facilitate good forest stewardship and land use planning?
- How are these governance factors evolving?

---

**Box 12.5 The Human Rights-based Approach**

The Human Rights-based approach (HRBA) is a process which applies a number of core principles aimed at ensuring the full enjoyment of human rights by pointing on both procedural and substantive rights. The HBRA points to both procedural and substantive rights:

**Procedural rights** refer to, for example, right to participation, right to Free, prior and informed Consent (FPIC), right to representation or development.

**Substantative rights** refer to, for example right to lands, territories, and resources.

The failure to apply both procedural and substantive rights are governance weaknesses that can affect drivers and + activities.

---

\(^2\) These studies can be stand alone or included in broader studies on drivers and barriers that take into account other underlying causes
LACK OF PARTICIPATION

The UNFCCC text recognizes the need for the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, but specifically indigenous peoples and local communities, and the need to deal with them as separate relevant stakeholders, because they may have poorly recognised rights related to the use and ownership of forests and are more vulnerable to being left out of decision-making processes. This is why the REDD+ decisions emphasise the full and effective participation of these groups and make note of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which includes reference to the right to right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC).

This reflects a core concept of the Human rights-based approach (see box 12.5) and a key aspect of good governance, i.e. the promotion of the interaction between state actors and citizens, including equitably women and men, who are able to exercise their legal rights, address their interests and have them mediated with dialogues with state actors. But, equally important, examining participation – or lack of - can help understand the underlying cases of deforestation and forest degradation, including corruption, illegal forest conversion, forest ownership and access rights. A more in depth discussion on participation can be found in Module 11: Public Awareness and Stakeholder Engagement.

An example of the lack of deliberative and inclusive process can be seen in the case of Nepal as a factor enhancing the four main drivers identified at the national level, i.e. illegal logging, encroachment, fuelwood collection and roads (see Figure 12.6).

Figure 12.6 Country example of DDFD driven by poor participation - Nepal

![Table](image)

Source: [www.tinyurl.com/nepal-drivers-redd](http://www.tinyurl.com/nepal-drivers-redd)

In another example from Malawi, it has been found that Traditional Authorities that are mandated to protect forest reserves under customary law are not accepted by formal government structures. This leads to conflict between these actors, resulting in corrupt practices and contributes to DDFD.

GENDER PERSPECTIVE

The UNFCCC text Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 72, refers to the need to address, inter alia gender considerations when developing national REDD+ strategies (see text box 12.7 for gender terms). When identifying drivers and governance enabling factors to address these drivers, gender-differentiated roles, actions and perspectives should be considered. This means the roles, actions and perspectives of all stakeholders, including women, men and youth. This is particularly important for women as they are often the primary users of forests.

There are many reasons why a gender perspective is important to understand and address drivers and barriers.
First, the lack of gender perspective has been shown, for example to be a barrier to conservation or reforestation.

- In Kenya for example, local men involved in planning a fuelwood tree planting project assumed that women would fulfil their traditional role of providing water for seedlings. After the seedlings were distributed, the men discovered that the women were unwilling to do the extra hours of water-collecting required by the project. Furthermore, the women were not particularly interested in the trees designated to be planted. The failure to consult women in the planning phase of the project meant that their concerns were ignored. Not surprisingly, they were indifferent to its success, and the seedlings died for lack of water. However, the second phase of the project incorporated women’s interests by providing the trees they preferred. They then agreed to help, and this time the project was successful.³

Conversely, it has been shown that a higher proportion of women participants in local institutions of forest governance is related to significantly greater improvements in forest conservation.⁴ In addition, women’s practices such as traditional agroforestry systems and tree planting can help identify barriers to sustainable management of forests or reforestation.

Second, the analysis of drivers of deforestation and degradation (as well as barriers to conservation) can be enriched by information known by local communities and indigenous groups, especially women and youth within them, through their forest patrolling and monitoring activities, or even through their gathering of plants or fuelwood.

Therefore, these groups can also be an informative source of knowledge in identifying drivers of deforestation and forest degradation around their communities, as well as a resource in identifying corresponding possible solutions. Understanding the varying roles played by men and women can enable a more accurate analysis of the problem — who is driving deforestation, why, where and how — and also help identify potential solutions. This can help formulate governance interventions that are applicable and relevant at both national and local levels.

Finally, given various social, economic and cultural inequalities and legal impediments, particularly within the forest sector, women and often other marginalized groups, such as the poor, youth, handicapped, etc., within many societies continue to experience ongoing exclusion that limit their ability to fully participate, contribute

⁴ Agarwal, B. “Gender and Green Governance: The Political Economy of Women’s Presence Within and Beyond Community Forestry” 2010
to and benefit from REDD+ action. More specifically, these inequalities can also lead to them having unequal access to information and legal processes; not being involved in decision-making on benefit sharing mechanisms and financing structures; and being excluded from REDD+ benefits due to weak rights to land and forests. As women typically rely more on forests than men do, and that rural women engage in multiple economic activities that are key to the survival of households, it is therefore critical that deliberate, explicit and meaningful efforts are taken to ensure REDD+ governance systems and programmes are inclusive, fair and mainstream gender both in policy and in practice. In fact, promoting sustainability of and building long-term support for REDD+ processes is often connected to its ability to demonstrate and distribute corresponding benefits equitably and fairly.\(^5\)

The UN-REDD Vietnam Programme Gender Analysis\(^6\) noted that there was a continuing need to transform gender relations and foster women’s empowerment by recognizing, supporting and rewarding women’s roles in forest management and protection. It also noted that strategies to address the identified gaps in the analysis should be based on the notion that women are not victims, but rather powerful agents of change, due in strong part to their roles as stewards and managers of forest resources.

\begin{boxedminipage}{0.6\textwidth}
\textbf{Reflection Point}

Could you think of an example where gender inequality be an indirect cause of deforestation or forest degradation? Or alternatively, where women’s enhanced participation has contributed positively to enhanced conservation, management of forests or forest carbon stocks?
\end{boxedminipage}

\section*{Weak Enforcement Capacities and Corruption That Lead to Unsustainable or Illegal Logging}

Characteristics of ‘effective’ governance structures generally includes enforcement of laws. Failure to enforce laws include both capacity and governance issues. For example, bribes between illegal loggers and forest managers, and/or collusion with direct involvement of government officials facilitating forest degradation are commonly identified causes of illegal forest activities. In Indonesia, although the 2014 Indonesian Forest Governance Index report in a slight improvement on cases of forestry crimes being filed in court compared against the low number of cases that are then investigated, and even fewer resulting in a conviction, there is clearly a connection between weak law enforcement capacity and continued corrupt practices allowing perpetrators to operate and continue deforestation at an undesirable speed.\(^7\)

\begin{itemize}
  \item In Kenya, for example, the 2013 REDD+ Corruption Risk Assessment has highlighted how governance issues corruption has historically contributed to deforestation and degradation;
\end{itemize}


\(^7\) The Executive Summary of the 2014 Indonesian Forest Governance Index is available here: http://tinyurl.com/FGI-Indonesia2014. A “multi-door approach”, put in place to allow for harder punishment perpetrators of forest crimes through sanctions according to different laws was established to address this issue.
The difficulties of the Kenya Forest Services in promoting forest conservation and managing relocation of people they deemed as “squatters”;
- The risks of county governments using community forest lands as “open land” that can be used for patronage purposes;

- Corruption suspected in the allocation of forested areas to biofuel, oil or mining companies (causing deforestation) without restrictions to limit environmental impact too lenient and eventually ignored;
- Bribes between illegal loggers and forest managers, and/or collusion with direct involvement of government officials facilitating forest degradation;
- The lack of capacity of Charcoal Producer Associations (CPA)s to check the origin and source of charcoal, and acceptance of fraudulent documentation as CPAs depend on licensing for their funding;
- In Panama, weakness of forest management institutions and conflicts between institutions, institutional bureaucracy and poor transparency and corruption are among the identified underlying drivers of deforestation through commercial and fuelwood extraction;
- In Nepal, as seen in Figure 12.9 below, poor transparency, corruption and law enforcement were also highlighted as catalyzing direct drivers.

**Figure 12.9 Country example of corruption and law enforcement-related drivers - Nepal**

These issues are often exacerbated by limited extension of services (due to low financial and human capacity), that lead to unenforced laws and regulations and often open up opportunities for illegal activities.

---

8 “Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el medio ambiente - Pnuma Proyecto ONU-REDD+ Panama”
Weak tenure rights

In addition to procedural rights (see box 12.5), substantive rights such as tenure rights are important to consider in analyses of drivers. UNFCCC decisions state that “when developing (phase 1) and implementing (phase 2) of their National strategies and actions plans, countries are requested to address, inter alia, land tenure issues.”

While secure tenure creates a sense of ownership and can serve as an incentive to protect forests and invest in their sustainable management, the opposite tends to be true as well: weak tenure security often results in poor management and loss of the resource. Clear enforceable rights of exclusion are a key element of forest tenure that allows the rights holder to resist outside interference. Likewise, clear and secure tenure increases accountability since the rights holder is also the bearer of responsibility, and has been found to reduce certain drivers.

Honduras and Guatemala have for example recognized the need to strengthen tenure systems as part of their REDD+ readiness process.

In many UN-REDD partner countries, customary tenure rights over forests are an important consideration. Customary use rights may be understood as the access, control and use of land according to long-standing principles, values, customs and traditions, including seasonal or cyclical use, which operate outside the formal legal system. These rights are associated with traditional land administration institutions and customary law that define how rights are allocated and protected. When forest land that is considered under a National REDD+ Strategy is customarily owned or occupied, e.g. when there is overlap of logging or agricultural concessions and illegal logging on customary lands, the full participation of customary landholders is essential.

In Sri Lanka, stakeholders are examining the link between proposed strategies under REDD+ and the links to and implications for tenure, as a first step in gaining a better understanding of the issues within the context of REDD+. In Cambodia, REDD+ stakeholders were involved in piloting a new tool for mapping community tenure called Open Tenure. This tablet-based application is used by the community members themselves to record their tenure rights, with data stored on a web-based server. For a list of countries undertaking assessments of their land tenure systems to inform the development of REDD+ policies and measures, see Annex 1.

Reflection point

Do you have an example of how weak tenure or customary use rights aggravate a specific driver of deforestation or degradation, or constitutes a barrier to conservation, sustainable management of reforestation activities?

---

9 D1/CP.16, para 72
10 World Resources Institute and the Rights and Resources Initiative “Securing Rights, Combating Climate Change: How Strengthening Community Forest Rights Mitigates Climate Change.”
Lack of transparency can lead to misinformation and abuses, that themselves exacerbate certain drivers of barriers to conservation or enhancement activities.

In the Philippines\textsuperscript{11}, risks identified through a Corruption Risk Assessment for REDD+\textsuperscript{12} were related to illegal issuance of permits (resource utilization permits, cutting permits and small scale mining permits) by local chief executives, the municipal council and congressional representatives as well as local government units. These were deemed most important in terms of both likelihood and impacts on drivers.

Similarly, in Indonesia\textsuperscript{13}, it was shown that forest licenses can play a role to regulate high forestry and land sector emissions in Indonesia, not only because of the 52 million hectares covered by licenses, but also for governance reasons. First, because when licensing takes a long time and is deemed too costly (in terms of time lost as well as formal and informal fees), people or companies applying for the license may attempt to recuperate those costs by exploiting the forest under their current license without abiding by the established standards, or outside of the authorized areas or range of activities. Second, because informal fees can allow licenses to be granted in areas such as protected forests or conservation forests, in violation of regulations. An in-depth evaluation of the regulations on the online forest permit system allowed to point to a) weaknesses that allow permits to be granted inappropriately, which for example results in a higher number of plantation permits or such permits granted in inappropriate areas, thus contributing to deforestation and b) systemic strengths (such as online automated systems at the national level that reduce face to face interactions and thus opportunities for bribes), which could be expanded to provincial and district levels.

Weak, incomplete or conflicting laws

“Effective” governance also relates to the enhancement of laws and regulations related to governance and the sustainable use of forests, the lack of which can enhance drivers. This may, for example, start with identifying inconsistencies in terminology relevant to forestry matters and gaps and overlaps between sectoral laws is important. Actions to address drivers or barriers to + activities can be affected by definitions of words and terms such as forests, forest conservation, trees, deforestation, ecosystem services, etc., so it is important to make sure that this terminology is harmonised. To remedy this situation, legislators may adapt existing definitions or include new ones in national laws.

For example:

- In Myanmar the Ministry of Environmental Concern and Forestry’s Forest Department defines land with trees outside the legal forest estate as “Public Forest Land” whereas the Agricultural Department defines the same land as “Vacant, Fallow and Virgin Land”;
- In Mexico, the term ‘environmental services’ was redefined to emphasize the relationship of their benefits with the functionality of the natural ecosystem and the individuals settled in the territory. In addition, it is now recognized that environmental services are regulated by the Forest Sustainable Development Law;
- Honduras carried out various reforms to solve land categorization conflicts between the Law on Forestry, Protected Areas and Wildlife, the Agrarian Reform Law and the Law on the Protection of the Coffee Activity;\textsuperscript{14}
- In Nepal, conflicts between the Forest Act (1993) and the Local Self Governance Act (LSGA, 1999) have led to negative environmental consequences including deforestation and forest degradation. The LSGA gives certain rights to local governments to prepare and implement forest management plans and imposes various taxes on forest products whereas the Forest Act invests such rights in the District Forest Officers (DFO) and local communities.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{11} Hyperlink: www.tinyurl.com/philippines-redd-cra
\textsuperscript{12} Op cited
\textsuperscript{13} www.tinyurl.com/indonesia-redd-permits
\textsuperscript{14} “Ley de Protección a la actividad cafetalera”, adopted by Decree (decreto 199-95).
COORDINATION

“Effective governance” also relates to having adequate institutions and administrative frameworks. Conversely, a lack of coordination between different state agencies may result in ineffective application of measures that affect drivers of deforestation and degradation. For example, in Viet Nam and Lao PDR forest agencies are responsible for administrative fines (minor infractions) while major crimes are the responsibility of the prosecution service, but they have no incentives to take action.

Another example lies in a lack of coordination with enforcement bodies. If the police, public prosecutors office or the Judiciary are not informed about challenges, they cannot be part of the response. The exclusion of such bodies often doesn’t happen on purpose but is rather caused by lack of information and business as usual.

GOOD GOVERNANCE TO DESIGN AND FINE TUNE NATIONAL REDD+ STRATEGIES AND REDD+ POLICIES AND MEASURES

DESIGNING “ENABLING PAMs”

PAMs are discussed in depth in Module 8: Policies Actions and Measures. In the same way that drivers may be divided into ‘direct’ and ‘underlying’ drivers for practical purposes, they may be split into ‘direct’ and ‘enabling’ interventions. Enabling interventions may target underlying drivers, such as capacity building, land use planning and, of relevance here, governance programmes.

Examples of “enabling governance PAMs” include:

- Strengthening of forest law enforcement (for example through joint patrolling, better trainings on collective evidence, increase sanctions when acts of malpractices are detected, training public prosecutors to improve the prosecution of offences in the forestry and wildlife sectors16, improvement in coordination between enforcement agencies17);
- Improvement of tenure security, including of indigenous peoples’ lands and women’s and men’s land use and access rights;
- Improvement of transparency to reduce undue influence when forest licenses or permits are issued.

REFLECTION POINT

Can you think of an example of an “enabling governance PAM” in your country? Would it affect more than one direct driver? Which additional benefits would this “enabling governance PAM” bring about?

PRIORITIZING “FEASIBLE” POLICIES AND MEASURES

In Module 8: Policies and Measures, the “multi-dimensional selection process for PAMs” was presented. A Ministry or entity in charge of REDD+ needs to engage in multi-dimensional decision analysis and weigh different options against each other to determine trade-offs for each option on the table and to clearly assess benefits and risk. Some of these dimensions refer to governance, such as:

- Governance barriers and opportunities,
  - Will there be political resistance to a certain measure if some corrupt actors stand to lose;
  - Should a particular PAM be preferred (in the first iteration of a national REDD+ strategy) over another if the existing law or regulation it builds on has been in the past exceptionally transparent and accepted or opaque and poorly enforced;
  - Does a PAM under consideration rely on a clear legal framework or are there loopholes to address first?

17 Ibid (Ghana. See also Indonesia Multi Door Approach to Tackle forest Crime)
What degree of local communities’ knowledge, skills and participation is needed to implement one “labour intensive” PAM versus another? Policy coherence: for example, when fiscal subsidies that enhance forest loss, such as those to the palm oil or timber sector, conflict and overwhelm the potential financial support provided to reducing deforestation. This can sometimes result from a lack of oversight from designated national institutions, such as parliaments;

What has been the engagement to date of political decision makers in the REDD+ design and decision process? Comprehensive assessments and studies (i.e. stakeholder mapping (see stakeholder engagement module) , cost benefit analysis, social impact assessments) are important to be available for the decision-making (see example in text box 12.9).

**Strategically engaging with the right agents /Participatory Decision-Making**

Strategic engagement of the appropriate agents (both civil society or cross sectoral ministries) is key again here to develop the most appropriate set of REDD+ policies and measures. The actors here may be the same as those consulted during the drivers analysis process, but their interest and commitment will be higher, or their opposition stronger, as the design and fine tuning process could lead to the design of actions that has effects and consequences on their own institutions. Here again, such engagement is predicated on some governance principles:

- A basic legal framework must exist: appropriate legal frameworks can institutionalize policies and actions that can enable cross-sectoral policies and commitments, as well as the right for indigenous peoples and civil society participation in public affairs, and a right to access to public information. At times this may necessitate legal reform, especially when the current legal frameworks puts a barrier to cross-sectoral coordination, especially regarding institutional mandates. Traditional authorities and laws should be considered as well. In any decentralized system of forest governance, legislation and guidelines that clearly define property rights and management responsibilities are crucial for effectively integrating cross-sectoral demands on forests;
- Access to information: a critical question is whether stakeholders have the information, as well as skills, capacity and tools to effectively participate in discussions and decision-making. For example, statistics on subsidies that have an impact on forests may be known by the Ministry in charge of agriculture, but not shared with the Ministry/Department of Forestry, making the fiscal incentives reform all the more complex;
- Institutional arrangements, such as the interaction between the legislative, judicial and executive, is important.

**Box 12.11 Prioritizing actions based on actors’ analyses**

Country Y has decided that the first iteration of its national REDD+ strategy would focus solely on deforestation caused by cattle (beef) ranching, one of the major drivers in the country. Several policy options are contemplated such as a) removing tax incentives and subsidies intended to support expansion of beef production; b) providing training and financial support to more intensive production based on improved breeds, feeds, pastures and animal health; c) removing land titling schemes that encouraged deforestation by allowing expropriation of “under-utilized” forest lands and awarding farmers and ranchers legal ownership of lands that they have cleared and occupied; and/or d) discouraging road construction and improvement in most forest areas*

**Strengthening governance to implement NS/APs and PAMs**

While it is initiated with the design and fine tuning of policies and measures, further institutional strengthening may be needed to promote performance effectiveness, i.e. the effective implementation of policies and measures. This can entail, for example:

---
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CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT FOR INSTITUTIONS IMPLEMENTING REDD+, NOT ONLY IN TERMS OF KNOWLEDGE BUT ALSO HUMAN RESOURCES AND TRAININGS

Certain policies and measures will need more “boots on the ground”. Indonesia is for example strengthening its law enforcement on forest crimes through a multi-pronged approach, and training a number of stakeholders, from forest guards to the judiciary, to apply this approach. Elsewhere, strengthening the ability of existing indigenous organizations to monitor REDD+ forest activities may prove one of the most cost effective detection and enforcement measures.

STRENGTHENING COLLABORATIVE CAPACITIES TO IMPROVE IMPLEMENTATION

Strengthening capacities can happen at different levels:

I. Functional capacities, i.e. management capacities needed to formulate, implement and review policies, strategies, programmes and projects. In other words, these are the cross-cutting capacities needed to ‘get things done’;

II. Technical capacities, i.e. are those associated with particular areas of expertise and practice in specific sectors or themes;

III. Collaborative capacity, i.e. having a clear vision and strategy to enable collective thinking, adaptive planning, and implementation beyond money, personnel, skills, and equipment. Collaboration between different agencies, for example including public agencies and the private sector, can encourage sustainable investments by sharing risks and rewards, providing loans and credit, or providing needed capacity building. Collaboration may range from provision of information to another organization; sharing of personnel; collaboration on joint research projects with other stakeholders; collaboration on joint grant or funding proposal; creation of an interagency taskforce; signing a MOU; and sharing and permitting or regulating activities. New institutional arrangements may be needed to support better collaboration between sectors.

REFLECTION POINT

Once a suitable regulatory system or legal framework is in place to appropriately deal with REDD+ implementation, what is the best way to ensure this is implemented?

For a particular ministry or, indigenous peoples’ group or civil society organization, can you provide an example of how capacities needed to design policies and measures, are different from capacities needed to implement them?

ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS TO MONITOR POLICIES AND MEASURES

Accountability mechanisms, or the obligation of decision-makers to take responsibility for their actions, is supported by systems that can be understood as a continuum with two systems at each end: regular feedback systems, and grievance and redress mechanisms. Monitoring PAMS is essential for accountability systems, as it allows for adjusting those that are not working according to the intended outcome and/or that have unintended negative impacts on stakeholders.

REGULAR FEEDBACK SYSTEMS

Regular feedback systems can be made possible by platforms described in Text box 2, participatory social impact analysis and policy audits, or social audits to assist in monitoring and improvement, paired with government public and timely responses (positive or negative) to suggestions emanating from these processes.


As REDD+ policies and measures seek to induce positive shifts in current practice and use of forest resources, countries will need to monitor those shifts, i.e. evaluating if the legal, administrative and financial means have produced the expected effects and meet the ultimate objectives. This is different but complementary to the objectives of a National Forest Monitoring Framework. Safeguards (see section below) are another way to ensure accountability.

**WHAT TO MONITOR?**

*Module 8: Policies and Measures* discussed tracking implementation. Supporting countries to tracking implementation of PAMs would empower national governmental and non-governmental actors to monitor their performance (see box 12.12), including:

- Their relevance: whether the objectives of the PAMs cover the multiple dimensions of the issues;
- Their usefulness: examine if the intervention has had not only the expected results, but also examine collateral effects, including negative ones;
- Their internal coherence: are different PAMs with the same objectives complementary or redundant;
- Their external coherence: are the PAMs aligned with and contributing to the country’s national development strategy, or other sectoral PAMs, including governance and fiscal measures;
- Their strategic relevance or efficacy: can the results be attributed to the PAM, or are they a “happy coincidence”;
- Their cost-effectiveness: are costs reasonable compared to other PAMs implemented concurrently? Are efforts (inputs, resources) needed for results to be delivered;
- Their sustainability over time: are policies and measures embedded sufficiently that they will be able to survive changes in government? Can they be sustained without external funding;
- Their capacity building component: have the PAMs allowed to enhance the capacities of the institutions implementing them.

**WHO MONITORS PAMs?**

Depending on the country context, a range of approaches can be used to monitor PAMs:

- **REDD+ national steering bodies, boards or agencies** are the primary actors to monitor the effectiveness of PAMs. They can be supported in this task by either Multi-stakeholder platforms (including indigenous peoples, civil society, REDD+ agencies and donors) or governmental or non-governmental bodies with more independence from the national REDD+ decision-making process, for example through social audits;

- **Government oversight bodies**, such as Court of Accounts (Brazil), or more specific bodies such as Anti-Corruption Agencies, play a role in monitoring different aspects of the performance of PAMs;

- **Parliaments** have a role to play in ensuring the coherence between one policy and another from another sector;
  - As the lawmaker, a parliament is responsible for debating and ratifying legislation that would govern a national REDD+ program. For example, parliaments can ensure that fiscal incentives such as subsidies to the palm oil sector does not dwarf parallel efforts to reduce deforestation caused by palm oil plantations;
  - Parliamentarians, when legitimately elected representatives of the people, can provide a forum for the concerns of diverse social actors (including indigenous peoples, local communities and CSOs), and can ensure that their concerns are reflected in the law-making and budget allocations processes;

---

— Parliaments have a unique role when it comes to oversight of the national REDD+ process, both related to the financial and the legislative process. By adopting and monitoring state budgets, Parliaments serve as a check on executive power, and can help ensure the transparent, equitable and accountable management of the REDD+ funds in a country.

**Reflection Point**

Given the governance structure of your country, who do you think should be in charge of monitoring PAMs in your country? What mechanisms could support or complement this?

What could the role of the judiciary be in REDD+ for accountability systems?

**Enabling Conditions for Effective Monitoring of PAMs**

As seen above, effective monitoring of PAMs depends upon access to timely and relevant information as well as appropriate legal frameworks, which can institutionalize policies and actions to support monitoring.

**Grievance and Redress Systems (GRM)**

Grievance and redress systems i.e. fair, transparent and accountable organizational systems and resources established by national government agencies to receive and address concerns about the impact of their policies, programmes and operations on external stakeholders, including women, men and youth. The stakeholder input handled through these systems and procedures may be called “grievances,” “complaints,” “feedback,” or other terms.

GRMs act as recourse for situations in which stakeholders have a concern about the organization’s actual or potential impacts on them. GRMs can be the first line of response to stakeholder concerns that have not been prevented by proactive stakeholder engagement or effective safeguards. GRM are discussed in more detail in Module 11: Public Awareness and Stakeholder Engagement.

**Safeguards**

The Cancun safeguards, UNFCCC Decision 1/CP.16, Annex I, paragraph 2, embody the principles of good governance and prescribe good governance arrangements in the application of actions and policies and measures in the national strategy/action plan as defined by a government and throughout REDD+ implementation. Information on how countries address and respect these safeguards is generated (Safeguard Information System), and a summary of this information is required by the UNFCCC to qualify for results based payments. See Module 7: Safeguards.

A country approach to safeguards provides a framework for addressing and respecting safeguards in a way that is consistent and harmonious with national policy goals, and builds on existing governance arrangements. At a minimum, REDD+ countries are asked, when undertaking the five REDD+ activities, to promote and support the Cancun Safeguards. A country approach operationalizes the safeguards through three core elements:-

I. Policies, laws and regulations (PLRs) which define, on paper, what needs to be done in order to support REDD+ activity implementation of REDD+ actions in a manner consistent with Cancun (and other) safeguards, i.e. how safeguards are being addressed. PLRs can also include corporate environmental and social responsibility policies, industry standards and customary norms of indigenous peoples and local communities depending on the country’s legal system;

II. Institutional arrangements - their mandates, procedures and capacities to ensure that the relevant PLRs are actually implemented in practice and outcomes are demonstrated, i.e. how safeguards are being respected. Such arrangements are typically institutionalized within public, private or civil society sectors, but may also involve arrangements to strengthen the individual capacities of citizens, including, including indigenous peoples and local communities, to implement and enforce relevant PLRs; and

---

III. Information systems which collect and make available information on how REDD+ safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout REDD+ implementation.

The Durban decision on safeguards provided for a summary of information, and the UNFCCC Warsaw provided clarity on timing and frequency of such submission, i.e. after the start of implementation of activities and in line with national communications (and voluntarily through the UNFCCC REDD+ Web platform).

**Assessment of Benefits and Risks of Policies and Measures within the Rubric of the Cancun Safeguards**

An assessment and identification of risks and benefits of the policies and measures (for example using the UN-REDD Benefits and Risk Assessment Framework (BeRT) tool presented in Module 7: Safeguards) identified by the government should be undertaken and include a determination of how the countries PLRs already address and mitigate risk or promote benefits. This assessment, which can be iterative, can bring out the gaps and can inform decisions on which actions to include in a REDD+ Strategy.

For example, Cancun Safeguard (b) is about transparent, effective forest governance and sovereignty. If this safeguard were to be ‘unpacked’ or ‘clarified’ in a country context it could cover issues such as:

- Access to information;
- Accountability;
- Land tenure;
- Equitable distribution of benefits (overlaps with Safeguards (b) and (c));
- Enforcement of the rule of law;
- Adequate access to justice, including procedures that can provide effective remedy for infringement of rights, and to resolve disputes (i.e., grievance mechanisms) (NB: overlaps with Safeguard (c));
- Gender equality;
- Coherency of national/subnational legal, policy and regulatory framework for transparent and effective forest governance;
- Corruption risks;
- Resource allocation/capacity to meet institutional mandate;
- Participation in decision-making processes (overlaps with Safeguards (c) and (d)).

An assessment of the policies and measures would generate questions such as:

- Will the candidate REDD+ actions/PAMS generate and share relevant and timely information (i.e. financial information, information about decision-making processes, bidding and procurement processes, etc.) with stakeholders in the appropriate language and format;
- Will it set up new, or enhanced existing forest organizational decision-making structures, with clear and defined roles and responsibilities;
- Will it be monitored against a set of clear, measurable and time-bound targets?
- Is it framed and codified by legal/regulatory systems that are provided the means to be enforceable? And can it create and apply appropriate sanctions;
- Can it be safeguarded against corruption risks through additional specific detection, prevention and sanction measures;
- Does it have the appropriate capacities (individual, institutional, collaborative, financial capacities) to be effectively implemented;
- Does it have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls;
- Does it equitably impact women, men and youth’s abilities to participate in design, implementation and/or to access to opportunities and benefits? Or affect stakeholders, including women, men and youth’s abilities to use, develop and protect natural resources?

At the same time, an analysis of the existing policies, laws and regulations would also need to be considered, and gaps ascertained, for example through the following questions for the same safeguard.

- Are the PLRs or other measures in place to provide access to timely relevant and usable information about REDD+ actions, establish organizational decision making structures, and evaluate the effectiveness of REDD+ actions on a regular basis;
  - For example: information allowing the monitoring of the discrepancies between the volumes of allowed timber and the volumes actually sold at auctions to help point to irregularities that drive forest degradation through illegal logging or the presence of clear and realistic forest
management target and objectives to monitor whether goals are achieved and take corrective action, if not;

- Do they include or propose approaches to ensure the accountability of bodies representing stakeholders;
  - For example, systems to help promote trust and participation of local stakeholders in REDD+ activities, such as reforestation efforts by local communities, including both women and men;
- Can they prevent, detect, and sanction abuses of power and corruption in the implementation of REDD+ actions;
  - For example for example, a multi-door approach to fighting forest crimes including illegal logging, as developed by Indonesia to help address illegal logging by utilizing several legislation (for example, an anti-money laundering legislation, forest legislation and anti-corruption law) to bring together intelligence and strengthen cases and sentences for those who have committed forest crimes.

COUNTRY EXAMPLES OF GOVERNANCE ANALYSES FEEDING INTO THE COUNTRY’S APPROACH TO SAFEGUARDS:

- In the Philippines, the top two risks of the Philippines REDD+ Corruption Risk Assessment (http://philippines-redd-cra) were related to illegal issuance of permits (resource utilization permits, cutting permits and small scale mining permits) by local chief executives, the municipal council and congressional representatives as well as local government units. These were deemed most important in terms of both likelihood and impact on drivers, and are now integrated into the development of the country’s safeguards policies laws and regulations;
- In Bhutan, the REDD+ corruption risk assessment is intended to inform the development of the country’s approach to the Cancun safeguards, especially on safeguard 2b, as it relates to governance strengths and weaknesses in commercial timber production and rural timber supply, illegal logging and forest crimes, and decentralization & community forestry;
- In Nigeria, the linkages and coordination between the availability of robust governance data (through Nigeria’s PGA work) and the country’s work on developing a Safeguards Information System have been carefully considered by ensuring that key stakeholders are being kept informed on the developments and availability of potentially relevant SIS data, which eventually may feed into governance related components of the nationally developed SIS. Nigeria has through extensive stakeholder consultations prioritized the following four governance challenges: broad and informed participation of REDD+ stakeholders; community organizing and cohesion in REDD+ implementation; harmonization of policy and legal framework for REDD+; and transparency and accountability of the REDD+ process and finance;
- In Vietnam, A PLR gap analysis was undertaken to provide options, priorities, milestones and recommendations on REDD+ safeguards in Vietnam. 60 potential PLRS would support the effective implementation of the Cancun Safeguards, but these exist on paper and practical effectiveness has not been assessed. For example, with respect to Safeguard b) – ‘transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty’ - access to information was seen has a gap and the LEP No. 55/2014/QH13 and the 2013 Draft Law on Access to Information is seen to be a way in which to address this gap.

REFLECTION POINTS:

What principles of good governance or particular issues would you highlight for your country under safeguard b (“transparent and effective forest governance”)?

What existing governance information system in your country could provide valuable information for information on REDD+ safeguards? Which stakeholders are involved in it this system to provide information?
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MANAGING REDD+ FUNDS IN A TRANSPARENT, EQUITABLE AND ACCOUNTABLE MANNER

Considering transparency and accountability risks and opportunities when designing and managing REDD+ funds has shown to decrease the risks of conflicts with stakeholders - by managing expectations on fund accessibility for example - and increase donors’ confidence, and hence the potential for Fund capitalization.

Appropriate legal frameworks, by institutionalizing policies and actions that can have an impact on REDD+ implementation can create financial incentives to address drivers of deforestation and degradation.

A number of generic good practices in REDD+ fund management arrangements have been highlighted\(^{24}\).

TRANSPARENCY

- The Fund operates with a clear set of minimum fiduciary standards (with specific criteria for assessment and procedures for addressing shortfalls);
- Financial accounts, donor contributions and expenditures are made publically available in a timely and accessible manner. In particular, sufficient data is available to easily determine the reconciliation of disbursement and payments;
- Usage of the publically available information is monitored to ensure that it reaches the intended stakeholders.

PARTICIPATION AND DECISIONS TO GOVERN REDD+ FUNDS

- Documents are circulated with agreed upon deadlines and publicly available in the appropriate languages, and regular open information sessions are held with civil society to keep an open dialogue;
- There is a balance of power between donor and recipient countries in the decision-making process to disburse funds, with representation or other accountability mechanism from civil society organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities;
- The Fund has clear guidelines on conflicts on interest in its by-laws to prevent individual in the governance structure and their family from receiving economic gains by requiring proper disclosure, refraining from voting and sanctioning breaches; and to prevent conflicts of interest resulting from the roles played by the same entity (e.g. a Ministry voting when authorizing payments to itself).

OVERSIGHT, COMPLAINTS AND REDRESS

- Responsibilities for managing and monitoring corruption risks\(^ {25}\) are clear and provided capacities to operate without fear of retribution;
- An official independent investigative body provides clear oversight over financial management and deals with allegations of fraud, misuse and other corrupt practices;
- Internal and external independent financial, performance and impact audits are regularly conducted;
- Preventive systems (including capacity building, spot checks, and careful monitoring) are emphasized; sanctions are applied fairly and appropriate;
- Complaints and redress systems are accessible and may be used by groups as well as individuals.

EQUITY

- Definitions of REDD+ beneficiaries expanded to include indigenous groups, communities, women, or youth, who not have customary ownership over land and the resources on the land or do not own land, but may have use rights over the resources as well as play either a direct or indirect role in forest management and

\(^{24}\) See, among others: Global Witness 2012 « Safeguarding REDD+ Finance »; UNDP 2013 "Background Note on UNDP’s support to Countries on REDD+ Finance and National REDD+ Funds" as well as the feedback provided to the UN-REDD Secretariat by its Policy Board Members

\(^{25}\) Including, but not limited to trainings, per diems, salaries, vehicles, recruitment processes, travels, overheads, etc. See page 145 of UNDP 2013
use. Vietnam’s REDD+ gender analysis cited above highlighted a gap in equity in fund design, governance and management;

- Those who participate in forest conservation & REDD+ activities are rewarded, through equitable benefit sharing (benefits understood here as both monetary and non-monetary benefits, including up-front payments, milestone payments, royalties, institutional capacity building, education and training). The UN-REDD Vietnam Programme Gender Analysis (2013) found that, among other findings, that women have struggled to gain access to benefits from payment for ecosystem services and community forestry projects, of which can in part be accountable to the fact that they lack land ownership and rights.26

**Country Examples**

A number of national REDD+ Funds have integrated considerations on transparency and accountability in selecting the modalities for receiving REDD+ funds and/or designing their REDD+ fund management systems. For example:

- DRC has integrated in the Operational Manual of its National REDD+ Fund a number of measures related to proactive information disclosure, detection, reporting and sanction of misuses. For example, the Technical Committee that submits advices and recommendations includes civil society experts, the review of proposals is characterized by a double blind process where the identity of the reviewers is kept anonymous to avoid collusion, a financial micro evaluation of implementing entities is undertaken by a third party, and a multi-channel complaints mechanism is established;

- Brazil’s Amazon Fund is generally considered as demonstrating high standards of transparency and accountability. The Brazilian Economic and Social National Development Bank was entrusted with managing the funds for its ability to meet high standards of transparency and accountability through strong financial management capacities. Very high transparency on disbursement has been observed. Observers have however noted that robust fiduciary standards have made it more difficult for small organizations to access the Fund. Civil society representatives are active in the Multi stakeholder Guidance Committee (COFA) which is also composed of federal and state representatives. Monitoring and transparency are one of the eight principles against which project proposals are screened. The transparency of applications received and the projects being funded has increased substantially over time, in part as a result of guidance by COFA;

- The Congo Basin Forest Fund allows sub-national and local entities direct access to funds; when combined with stringent financial safeguards, this is considered an effective way to reduce risks of misallocation at national level.

---

26 The concept of carbon right is not covered at length here, since countries do not need to address this issue to access results-based payments for REDD* under the UNFCCC. Project-based approach to REDD+, however, require that countries define carbon ownership. Furthermore, results-based payment initiatives such as the FCPF carbon fund require that ER-Program entities be able to demonstrate title to emission reductions and transfer such titles to buyers. Note that there are challenges with operationalising the approach to rights over emission reduction since assessing emission reductions at a scale corresponding with land ownership may be technically very challenging and prohibitively expensive, except perhaps in countries of limited size or in countries where tenure is already well-defined.
CASE STUDY

EXERCISES

1. Link the main components of Good Governance on the Left to the 7 Safeguards for REDD+.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle of Good Governance</th>
<th>Safeguards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparency and access to information</td>
<td>a) Policy alignment (national &amp; international)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>b) Transparent and effective Forest governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for rights</td>
<td>c) Knowledge &amp; rights of indigenous peoples &amp; local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>d) Full &amp; effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular IP &amp; local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance effectiveness</td>
<td>e) Natural forest, biodiversity, social &amp; environmental benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of law</td>
<td>f) Address risk of reversals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality</td>
<td>g) Reduce displacement of emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus seeking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The following are some of the key principles of good governance, but they have been scrambled. Unscramble the letters and take the letters in parenthesis to get the secret word.

ATACBIUCONITLY  A_ ( ) _ N _ _ _ _ _ _
WFOR LU ELA _U_ _ _ F _ ( ) _
CANITPROPIAT ( ) _ _ T _ _ _ _ A _ _ _
ECPRREOFMNA _E_ _ _ _ _ _ ( ) _ C _
FRTHEER PSI SCTORG _ S _ _ ( ) _ _ O _ _ _ _ S
QGNYEE EDRAULT _ _ D _ _ _ _ _ ) L _ _
UCOT-RRNNAITPOI _ _ ( ) _ _ OR _ _ _ _ _ _
RPEYTRAACNNS _ _ N _ _ A _ _ _ _ _

Answer: _ _ _ _ _ _ _

ANNEX 1: TOOLS AND APPROACHES

Various tools can be used to assess how well each component performs against each element describe in Figure 12.2, for example:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools and approaches</th>
<th>Examples in (country) <em>(indicate work completed by May 2015)</em></th>
<th>Suitable /adaptable to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysing governance causes to drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional and context analysis</td>
<td>Argentina, Cote d’Ivoire, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory governance assessment</td>
<td>Nigeria, Viet Nam, Indonesia</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption risk assessment</td>
<td>Kenya, Bhutan, Philippines, Nepal, Peru</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social audits for PAMs</td>
<td>Not piloted yet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender analysis</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea, Vietnam, Sri Lanka, Cambodia</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal assessments</td>
<td>Mexico, Kenya</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure assessment</td>
<td>Pakistan, Tunisia, Malawi, Benin, Vietnam, and Sri Lanka</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of existing GRMs</td>
<td>Suriname, Cambodia, Panama, Paraguay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>Costa Rica, Mexico, Vietnam and Zambia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BeRT</td>
<td>Republic of Congo, Peru</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>