

Rights-based Approaches to REDD+



April
2012

*Report of a Conservation Initiative
on Human Rights Workshop*

January 24-26, 2012
Lima, Peru

Acknowledgement

This report was made possible with the generous financial and in-kind support of member organizations of the Conservation Initiative on Human Rights.

WWF gratefully acknowledges the support of the Government of Norway through a grant administered by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad). The views expressed herein are not intended to reflect the policy views of either of these entities or their affiliates.

Rights-Based Approaches to REDD+ Workshop Report

Conservation Initiative on Human Rights

24-26 January 2012
(Lima, Peru)

Background

The emergence of Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation, and conserving, sustainably managing and enhancing forest carbon stocks (REDD+) has generated great interest in the potential for REDD+ to increase international support for the forest stewardship activities of indigenous peoples and local communities. Potential benefits associated with REDD+ initiatives include strengthening of community land and resource rights, empowerment of community institutions, increased diversification of forest-based income and new livelihoods opportunities. At the same time, REDD+ has sparked concern about potential adverse impacts on indigenous and community rights and livelihoods, such as negative impacts on land and resource rights, increased centralization of forest management, inequitable benefit-sharing, lack of real participation and lack of FPIC. Concern about these risks has prompted enactment of safeguards under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and development of safeguards by donor initiatives. At the same time, experience is emerging from a range of practical efforts to “operationalize” community safeguards and benefits in the context of REDD+ readiness and pilot activities.

In this context, the Conservation Initiative on Human Rights (CIHR) organized a workshop on *Rights-based Approaches to REDD+* from January 24-26 in Lima, Peru. CIHR (www.conservation-rights.org) is a consortium of international conservation organizations - *BirdLife International, Conservation International, Fauna & Flora International, IUCN, The Nature Conservancy, Wetlands International, Wildlife Conservation Society* and *WWF* - that seek to improve the practice of conservation by promoting integration of human rights in conservation policy and practice.

The workshop brought together representatives from conservation NGOs, indigenous peoples' organizations, social development institutions and donor organizations to build common understandings of key rights and governance issues in REDD+, to learn about emerging best practices and challenges, and to generate recommendations to strengthen future work. The workshop focused in particular on emerging experience from the work of NGOs and civil society organizations to promote and support REDD+ activities consonant with internationally-recognized human rights. Participants shared experiences on practical efforts to date to integrate community safeguards and benefits in REDD+ readiness and pilot activities, and identified opportunities for collective efforts to promote rights-based approaches to REDD+ at Peru, Latin America regional and international levels.

Introductory Session

The introductory session included presentations on the CIHR, opening remarks, review of the workshop objectives and agenda, and a gathering of workshop expectations.

Jenny Springer (WWF) provided an introduction to the CIHR, highlighting objectives of the Initiative to develop and maintain a common set of human rights principles as they relate to conservation, support members to put in place management practices for implementing these principles, and promoting shared learning on rights-based approaches to conservation among member organizations, stakeholders and experts. Climate mitigation, especially REDD+, is one of the conservation contexts in which human and indigenous rights are currently most prominent, and is therefore one focus of CIHR efforts to promote learning and best practices and to consolidate its member organizations' joint contributions.

Opening remarks were presented by WWF-Peru and Conservation International-Peru offices' program directors, Daniel Arancibia and Luis Espinel. The relevance of rights-based approaches for both organizations was highlighted, along with examples of their national and regional initiatives addressing rights issues in conservation.

Kristen Walker Painemilla (CI) and Consuelo Espinosa (IUCN) presented the agenda and reviewed the workshop's objectives to:

1. Build common understanding, drawing on multiple perspectives, on key rights and governance issues relevant to REDD+
2. Share, learn about and document emerging best practices and challenges from NGO/CSO experience on how to address key rights issues in the context of REDD+
3. Generate lessons and recommendations to strengthen ongoing NGO/CSO activities and inform broader policy and donor processes
4. Identify opportunities for collective efforts to promote rights-based approaches to REDD+

Participants' expectations ranged from broad interests to learn more about the themes tackled by the workshop, to more specific aims of gaining knowledge on lessons learned from local experiences, better addressing challenges of working with a human rights-based approach, consolidating conservation and human rights networks, and achieving a better understanding of indigenous peoples' human rights law.

Context of social safeguards and benefits

This session provided information on the main safeguards systems for REDD+ developed through the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), donor initiatives and other international processes. The following presentations were given and are available on the [CIHR website](#).

Social and Environmental Safeguards in UNFCCC – Johnson Cerda, CI Indigenous and Traditional Peoples Program

REDD+ SES Voluntary Principles – Montserrat Alban, CI & Elvira Raffo, CARE

Integration of rights-based approaches in UN-REDD and the Common Approach on Environmental and Social Safeguards for Multiple Delivery Partners - James Leslie, UNDP

Presentations and discussions highlighted a number of key developments and issues. Under the UNFCCC, the December 2010 COP-16 meeting produced the Cancun Agreement, including a set of social and environmental safeguards for climate mitigation and sustainable forest management activities. While recognized as an important step, many indigenous peoples' organizations have also stressed that there is space for improvement to adequately address their concerns and interests in a final legal framework. Indigenous peoples ask for the recognition of key rights: right to lands, territories and resources; recognition of traditional knowledge and traditional practices; and respect to indigenous peoples' own governance structure and equitable benefit sharing. It was noted that the Cancun Agreement only takes into account the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, though this is considered a crucial and comprehensive instrument by indigenous peoples.

At the UNFCCC Durban Conference (COP-17) Member States agreed to establish a Social and Environmental Safeguards information system; however, no agreement was reached regarding the specific content and criteria of the reporting system. Indigenous organizations sought a rights-based monitoring system but such a standard was not reached.

Among donor initiatives, the UN-REDD Programme has developed a set of [Social and Environmental Principle and Criteria](#) (still in draft version), to guide the design of UN-REDD national programs. A [Benefit and Risk Tool](#) has also been developed to support countries' implementation of the UN-REDD SES Principles and Criteria. To promote a common approach to safeguards between UN-REDD and the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, the two initiatives have jointly developed [Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement](#) – with a focus on indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities. UN-REDD+ has also developed [Guidelines on Free, Prior and Informed Consent \(FPIC\)](#), expected to be finalized and approved by the UN-REDD Policy Board in March 2012.

The [REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards \(REDD+ SES\)](#), are a set of voluntary principles, criteria and indicators for government-led REDD+ (national and sub-national) initiatives, designed to promote both safeguards and high levels of social and environmental performance. Developed through a multi-stakeholder process, the REDD+ SES are being piloted by several national and state governments.

While valuable, participants raised questions about the complexity and potential for inconsistency presented by these multiple safeguards systems, and feasibility of greater standardization. Also, one lesson from REDD+ SES implementation has been that large numbers of indicators with multiple qualifiers (adjectives) has made it difficult to translate indicators into national contexts and collect information in the field. The indicators are being revised to address this.

COICA representatives highlighted the alternative approach presented by Indigenous REDD – a set of principles and policies developed by COICA in 2010, then further developed and presented in Durban. (See *Land and Resource Rights* section below for more on Indigenous REDD.) Participants also noted that it is important to avoid “reinventing the wheel” with REDD+, as it is simply a new name and line of financing for forest conservation and sustainable local development. As such, REDD+ will not be the solution, but can be added as one element to this more integrated vision.

Thematic sessions

Thematic sessions addressed the four main workshop themes of participation in REDD+ national and sub-national programs; free, prior and informed consent; land and resource tenure; and equitable sharing of benefits), with panels presenting on each of the four themes. The following presentations are available on the [CIHR website](#).

Participation in REDD+ national/sub-national programs

- *Participation and REDD+: Importance, challenges and main lessons learned* – Consuelo Espinosa, IUCN
- Comparative experiences – case studies
 - *Participation of Indigenous Peoples in REDD+ Processes in Guatemala* - Mario Escobedo, IUCN
 - *Promoting participation in REDD+ in Colombia* – Camilo Ortega, WWF-Colombia
 - *Capacity-building and stakeholders' engagement in REDD+*, Luis Barquín, CI

Free, Prior, Informed Consent

- *The importance of FPIC in the context of Readiness and major challenges* - Johnson Cerda, CI - Indigenous and Traditional Peoples Program
- Comparative experiences – case studies
 - *The right of consultation, challenges and progress in Peru and its implications in the REDD+ context*- Ivan Langer, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Culture, Peru
 - *The participation of Civil Society in the context of REDD+* - Milagros Sandoval, CI-Peru
 - *Local challenges and the concept of FPIC for local communities in Suriname* - Annette Tjongsiefat, CI-Suriname

Land Tenure, Resource Rights and REDD+

- *Tenure issues in REDD+: Challenges and relevant experience* – Jenny Springer, WWF
- Comparative experience – case studies
 - *Indigenous Territorial Management and Avoided Deforestation in the Greater Madidi-Tambopata Landscape* – Robert Wallace, Wildlife Conservation Society - Bolivia
 - *Indigenous REDD is Vida Plena territories* - Henderson Rengifo & Roberto Espinoza, AIDSEP (with Forest Peoples' Programme)
 - *Lessons from a forest carbon + coffee initiative and R-PP for Chiapas, Mexico*, Mónica Morales, CI-Mexico

Equitable Sharing of Benefits

- *Review of benefit-sharing programs* - Jill Blockhus, The Nature Conservancy
- Comparative experiences – case studies
 - *Experiences from Brazil PES schemes* - Andre Silva Dias, WWF Brazil
 - *Ecuador: Experiences from Socio Bosque on benefit sharing* - Montserrat Alban, Conservation International

Key discussion areas - themes

The following main points are distilled from thematic session presentations and discussions, and from theme-specific break-out groups.

Participation in REDD+ decision-making

Concerns to ensure full and effective participation in REDD+ are based both on international rights frameworks (such as Rio Principle 10, and the Aarhus Convention) and on recognition that participation contributes to the practical effectiveness of REDD+. The emphasis on participation in UNFCCC safeguards and donor standards provides a foundation for engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities in REDD+. However, participants expressed concern that REDD+ processes have generally not been very effective in involving stakeholders – particularly from vulnerable groups. The absence of a government role has sometimes been filled by other stakeholders, with mixed results.

4 key elements for effective community participation in REDD+ decision-making include:

- Capacity and awareness - training is a starting point for a good process; communities need tools to understand, engage in discussions and make decisions about REDD+
- Definition of the community's own agenda on REDD+ - interest from communities themselves, based on connections to their own priorities, is the basis for active participation (e.g., see box below for an example from SocioBosque of links to Life Plans)
- Strong local organizational and governance structures, including to articulate and negotiate agendas
- Links from local to national levels (communities to representative organizations)

Practical approaches to promote informed participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in REDD+ decision-making include capacity-building workshops for indigenous communities and organizations (as in Colombia) and establishment of roundtables – either specifically for indigenous communities and/or to enable communities to voice their interests in relation to other stakeholders (as in Peru). CI has also developed tools for Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ analysis, planning and monitoring.

While some participants identified the need to communicate REDD+ issues in simple terms to local communities as a challenge, others took issue with this, noting that indigenous communities have used their own knowledge and resources for many years to accomplish avoided deforestation. The problem, they noted, is that we are going in with our own concepts and language, whereas we need to start with and complement their vision.

Other challenges identified by the group include that participation can require that indigenous and local communities invest significant time in “process” with few concrete benefits, at least in the short-term. Meanwhile, communities are looking to realize some benefits from the forests – this is one of the factors behind the signing of (unfair) contracts with “carbon cowboys.” Costs of participation processes themselves, especially for ongoing participation in REDD+ decision-making and monitoring, are another challenge, along with the fact that participation does not guarantee that views are taken into account.

Participants felt that expectations of benefits stemming from REDD+ also need to be tempered; participation processes should communicate clearly about reasonable expectations of benefits.

Participation in the SocioBosque Program based on a *Plan de Vida* (Life Plan) - Ecuador Environment Ministry & Shuar Federation

Emerging good practice

- The community considered the SocioBosque Program as an opportunity to implement their Life Plan and, on the other hand, the SocioBosque Program identified the community's Life Plan as the basis for its work with the community. This reliance on a Life Plan already developed by the community is an emerging good practice – however, taking this up systematically within the SocioBosque Program remains a challenge.

Lessons learned

- Along with the Life Plan it is important to define investment priorities –and to monitor the implementation of such investment plan.

Free, Prior, Informed Consent

Workshop participants identified a number of issues related to the implementation of FPIC in relation to REDD+, including:

- Challenges associated with different definitions and understanding of FPIC (consultation vs. consent)
- Primary role and obligation of governments to obtain FPIC
- Lack of clarity in responsibilities of third-party actors towards indigenous communities
- Issues of representation in indigenous communities, and extent of broad community participation in traditional decision-making processes
- Conflicts within or between indigenous communities
- Challenges of juggling community timelines with donor demands
- Time required for FPIC processes can appear long even to community members themselves.
- Questions of who has rights to FPIC – while primarily identified as a right of indigenous peoples, discussions of FPIC also refer increasingly to “local communities.” However, the concept of local communities is very wide, and even in indigenous lands others are now moving in.
- Questions of how to move forward with REDD+ in the absence of national legislation regarding FPIC.

Several emerging good practices for an FPIC cycle in REDD+ initiatives were identified, such as:

- Begin consultation from the outset of any plans (“It is a mistake to say ‘we won’t discuss with communities from the outset, because we don’t want to raise expectations.’”)
- Respecting communities’ protocols and structures, and identifying or developing an FPIC protocol jointly with the community
- Establishing proactive, culturally pertinent and continuous communication
- Working with flexible timelines, following community timeframes
- Supporting the enabling environment for FPIC implementation, including capacity-building for government on FPIC processes and responsibilities

- Identifying community trainers and traditional authorities who can develop the FPIC cycle –the external and/or third parties should only support the process but not assume leadership
- Clarifying the roles/responsibilities of all stakeholders

Participants also noted that there is an opportunity to consolidate the experience that many communities and organizations already have with FPIC.

Highlights of the presentation ‘*The right of consultation, challenges and progress in Peru and its implications in the REDD+ context*’ - Ivan Lanegra, Vice-Minister of Interculturality of Peru

Consultation and consent are different; however they are frequently used indistinctly in Latin American countries and law courses. This confusion has generated controversy. It is therefore important to clarify the different responsibilities of the State on consultation-related issues.

The term *consent* should be used when there are rights the State cannot affect by any means, such as formal or customary indigenous peoples’ rights to lands. If an indigenous community does not want to reach an agreement with a private party regarding their lands, the State cannot interfere. There are nonetheless exceptions for situations like this in the Peruvian legislation.

Peru passed the *Consultation with Indigenous Peoples Law*, based in ILO Convention 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries. The Consultation Law addresses situations where the State issues laws that can affect indigenous peoples’ collective rights. However, for its implementation the State has to also consider previously recognized individual and collective rights.

Moreover, ILO Convention 169 applies only to indigenous peoples. Therefore, the Consultation with Indigenous Peoples Law and its Regulation –currently under development, will also only apply to indigenous peoples.

Due to the prevailing asymmetry between indigenous peoples and private parties, in some cases the State has the duty to support indigenous peoples to ensure a certain level of equilibrium in negotiations is reached. This would be the case in transfer of a rights agreement to indigenous lands. In Peru indigenous peoples can sell their lands provided that a strong majority of the community agrees.

However, this would not be the case in REDD+ since forests belong to the State and the State grants an administration right to exploit them –a concession. At present a forest carbon market is not possible since such rights belong to the State. A specific regulation should be therefore issued regarding forest-derived rights if a change in this situation is intended. The decision to issue such a regulation could be subject of a consultation. Nonetheless, until now there is nothing formally decided. The Ministries of Agriculture and the Environment also hold important responsibilities on this regard.

Land Tenure, Resource Rights and REDD+

Participants noted that most forest tenure issues relevant to REDD+ are not new, but rather are longstanding issues common to other forest conservation and sustainable use initiatives. From a tenure perspective, REDD+ does introduce some new elements – such as rights to the carbon values of forests – as well as specific challenges and opportunities. Challenges include the problem of “carbon cowboys” – private speculators interested in profiting from potential carbon markets, who negotiate unfair contracts with local communities. At the same time, opportunities include that REDD+ is drawing greater attention – and potentially resources – to resolving long-standing tenure issues/conflicts, which are possible to resolve. For example, it was noted that the WB is now working on tenure in Peru, as a result of consultations on Forest Carbon Partnership Facility investments.

Indigenous participants stressed that, currently, the lack of formal recognition of settlement of land claims makes REDD “dangerous” to indigenous peoples. For example, where lands claimed by indigenous communities are not yet titled, they could be allocated to private concessions to work on REDD+. Lack of land rights also limits potential for communities to participate in REDD+ initiatives, and thus limits the effectiveness of REDD+. Still, they noted, that there is potential to transform REDD+ into an opportunity. Conditions for “Indigenous REDD+” - as articulated by COICA for the Amazon basin – include territorial security (fundamental to indigenous life), consultation and consent (including flexibility to adjust carbon contracts entered into without full prior information), self-governance, a holistic approach to forest values (not only carbon), respect for customary knowledge, no selling of carbon contracts, and participatory monitoring of forests.

Presentations and discussions highlighted that national legal frameworks for recognition of indigenous and community lands can take stronger or weaker forms, with implications for the full realization of rights and effective forest stewardship. Titling processes may also weaken traditional systems. At the same time, indigenous participants stressed that it is preferable to hold the land title even where there are risks of not being able to fully exercise their land-property rights.

Titling is just a first step towards effective realization of property and the benefits that can be generated from it. Capacity also needs to be in place for management and protection – both at the local community level and among government agencies responsible for helping communities defend their rights. It was noted that, in addition to technical capacities, realization of tenure rights requires political will and sharing of power from governments who have historically claimed ownership and management authority over forests.

Finally, participants emphasized the importance of taking a holistic approach to management of lands, rather than looking narrowly at carbon values. Indigenous participants in particular stressed that it is not possible to compartmentalize indigenous territorial management – this integrated approach to ecosystems is also a key element of Indigenous REDD+.

Equitable sharing of benefits

Several challenges were identified regarding REDD+-related equitable sharing of benefits:

- There are still not –or very few- examples of benefit-sharing in REDD+
- Legal frameworks facilitating effective benefit sharing are seldom in place
- How to ensure resources actually reach beneficiaries and are not kept by bureaucracy – there is frequently no transparency in funds distribution
- There is not a lot of dialogue between communities and external stakeholders (governments and private sector -corporations) on benefit-sharing issues
- Internal communication and decision-making within communities can be a challenge
- Land tenure is frequently not clear and this uncertainty stands in the way of equitable benefit-sharing

The presentations, discussions and the report out from the breakout group brought out the following conclusions and recommendations:

- Benefit sharing framework must be responsive to the prevailing context: stakeholders' needs, deforestation dynamics and institutional capacities
- Benefit sharing legal framework must ensure benefits reach the beneficiaries
- Benefit-sharing schemes can be developed in a parallel way to REDD+ mechanisms
- There must be a monitoring organ and beneficiaries must participate in it
- Non-monetary benefits must be visible
- Strengthening community organizational structure is crucial for benefits to be effective – good governance is needed to address issues such as elite capture

Geographical Group Reports

On Day 3 of the workshop, participants worked in geographical groups (Peru, Latin America regional and Global) to discuss the following questions:

1. How will you incorporate what you have learned in the workshop in your daily work?
2. How can we work together to promote rights-based approaches to REDD+? What form will the work take? What is the timeline? Do we need financial resources?

The **Peru Group** proposed to develop a pilot Indigenous REDD+ project, supported by a group of organizations, which could serve as a replicable model for other communities and help establish an enabling policy environment. Criteria for selecting an appropriate site include: 1) community interests and representation, 2) secure tenure, 3) regional political will, 4) resources, 5) potential for alternatives to compete with other forest land uses. As a next step – within 3-6 months – interested organizations should organize a meeting to use these criteria to select a place.

The **Latin American Group** proposed three lines of action:

1. Regional REDD+ policy: Prepare a regional dialogue for high-level policy-makers on sharing experiences on rights-based approaches to REDD+ (land tenure, FPIC, benefit-sharing, participation, etc.)
 - Regional summits were identified as relevant scenarios for the dialogue
 - Alliances with governments and regional organizations would be pursued in order to support preparation of such a dialogue
2. Identify where REDD+ and PES schemes have been applied and the resulting lessons learned in order to jointly develop a toolkit to inform decision-making –linked to SES information systems
 - WWF is working on a proposal to conduct this analysis and develop tools to inform decision-making, which could help generate funds for this activity
3. Making and sharing assessments of ecosystem service and conservation contributions of indigenous lands, incorporating both traditional and scientific knowledge
 - Share the results; two synergies/opportunities might be
 - Bio-cultural protocols currently being developed by CBD Secretariat
 - ‘Indigenous territories for conservation’ paradigm to be presented at the IUCN World Conservation Congress
 - Funds are required to develop this initiative

The **Global Group** also identified three lines of action:

1. Policy and Donor Engagement – at international levels and by linking international and national processes. At the international level, opportunities include:
 - Workshop on Community Engagement and Benefit Sharing - currently being organized by TNC in conjunction with the World Bank FCPF. The workshop would emphasize links from practice to policy. Some resources are in hand with TNC. (*Timing*: Late 2012)
 - UNFCCC – highlighting Rights-based Approaches to REDD+ (workshop outcomes) through a side event and/or policy piece. (*Timing*: May, September and/or December)
 - UN Convention on Biodiversity – highlighting Rights-based Approaches to REDD+ (workshop outcomes) through a side event and/or policy piece. (*Timing*: October 2012)

The group also discussed opportunities to facilitate better two-way links between international discussions of social/rights issues (especially by donor initiatives), and national processes to develop and implement REDD+ programs consonant with internationally-recognized rights.

2. Documentation and Communication: several opportunities were identified to document and communicate key issues and outcomes beyond the workshop participants, including:
 - Producing a workshop report, posting on CIHR website with links (*Timing*: March)
 - Producing an RBA to REDD+ Publication with case studies (*Timeline*: Target is JeJu World Conservation Congress)
 - Conducting a Brownbag series by theme in Washington, DC, hosted by CIHR members and with additional virtual participation (*Timing*: Spring 2012)

- Producing a CIHR Newsletter: April
3. Training: in light of the high priority placed on informed participation, and several concurrent training initiatives including development of materials, the group proposed to discuss with indigenous organizations the possibility of developing joint materials on RBAs to REDD+. An initial meeting could be held at the UNPFII May 2012.

Conclusions

To conclude participants reflected on how to strengthen their work on rights-based approaches to REDD+ and follow-up on the main proposals and recommendations discussed during the workshop. Several recommendations focused on ways to share experience and learning more broadly, including:

- Compiling and sharing relevant case studies on rights-based approaches to REDD+
- Building networks with NGOs working on human rights
- Strengthening networks to enable exchanges and learning across and at all levels
- Facilitating direct exchanges between communities
- Using the Internet (CIHR website) to share experience from the region
- Systematizing information – there is so much material that people get lost
- Ensuring that information-sharing is two-way (not only communicating to people but understanding what they know)
- Participating in discussion spaces already hosted by governments
- Reaching out through the CIHR consortium to governments and national REDD+ readiness processes
- Supporting country and regional offices' engagement on social issues

Looking ahead, some participants recommended broadening the participation of future workshops to include other stakeholders, including those who may not support rights-based approaches. Other take-away points highlighted by participants were to:

- Facilitate joint work with communities and governments on sensitive issues such as benefit-sharing and FPIC
- Address more systematically how to work with local communities who live near indigenous peoples and how we will incorporate them in our dialogue
- Support COICA's Indigenous REDD+ paradigm
- Address indigenous communities' concerns with legal certainty regarding land titles
- Develop capacity-building activities in communities in order to better understand their daily experience and vision of the world

Participants commended the workshop for focusing attention on human rights dimensions that have received too little focus in REDD+ discussions to date, including among government agencies leading national processes. They expressed appreciation for the opportunity to learn from the presentations of experience and discussions, and interest to continue working together on rights-based approaches to REDD+.

Several **noteworthy insights** were consistently expressed throughout the workshop discussions, including:

- The concept of development itself might have different connotations for indigenous peoples. Therefore, the incorporation of indigenous peoples' views of the world, cultural identity and relationships with nature and Life Plans (*Planes de Vida*) emerged as an essential requirement in a REDD+ context.
- The development of standards addressing social and environmental safeguards (SES) is an important development. However, there is a need to standardize safeguards in order to enhance their operational capacity.
- A set of indigenous peoples' concerns was recurrently dealt with:
 - Respect for autonomy and indigenous peoples' rights
 - Recognition of traditional practices
 - Respect for lands and territories
- For third parties and even government authorities it is difficult to identify who is a legitimate representative of an indigenous community.
- Attention was drawn to the fact that the contribution of traditional knowledge to REDD+ has not been sufficiently addressed in national and sub-national programs.
- Costs of including rights-based approaches in REDD+ need to be taken into account.
- REDD+ along with many financial and economic mechanisms is a means to reach conservation and sustainable development goals but not an end in itself.
- Deforestation is frequently linked to indigenous communities' activities. However, major drivers of deforestation are actually bigger scale activities as open pit mining and extensive agriculture.
- Appropriate sharing of information and communities' capacity-strengthening were identified as essential components of a rights-based approach to REDD+.
- Participants highlighted the importance of documenting and sharing lessons learned.

Annex I - Workshop Agenda

Time	Session
Day 1	Tuesday, January 24, 2012
8:15-9:00am	Registration
9:00-10:30 am	<p>Welcome & Introduction to the Conservation Initiative on Human Rights (CIHR)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jenny Springer, WWF (Coordinator, CIHR) <p>Opening Remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daniel Arancibia, WWF-Peru Luis Espinel, Conservation International-Peru <p>Workshop objectives and agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kristen Walker Painemilla, CI Consuelo Espinosa, IUCN
10:30-10:45am	Break
10:45am-12:30pm	<p>Session 1: International context of social safeguards and benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Presentation of speakers and context of session</i> – Vanessa Retana, WWF <i>Social and Environmental Safeguards in UNFCCC</i> – Johnson Cerda, CI - Indigenous and Traditional Peoples Program <i>REDD+ SES Voluntary Principles</i> – Montserrat Alban, CI & Elvira Raffo, CARE <i>Integration of rights-based approaches in UN-REDD and the Common Approach on Environmental and Social Safeguards for Multiple Delivery Partners</i> - James Leslie, UNDP
12:30-1:30pm	Lunch
1:30-3:15pm	<p>Session 2: Participation in REDD+ national/sub-national programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Participation and REDD+: Importance, challenges and main lessons learned</i> – Consuelo Espinosa, IUCN Comparative experiences – case studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Participation of Indigenous Peoples in REDD+ Processes in Guatemala</i> - Mario Escobedo, IUCN <i>Promoting participation in REDD+ in Colombia</i> – Camilo Ortega, WWF-Colombia <i>Capacity-building and stakeholders' engagement in REDD+</i>, Luis Barquín, CI Q&A/Discussion
3:15-3:30	Break
3:30-5:15pm	<p>Session 3: Free, Prior, Informed Consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The importance of FPIC in the context of Readiness and major challenges</i> - Johnson Cerda, CI - Indigenous and Traditional Peoples Program Comparative experiences – case studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The right of consultation, challenges and progress in Peru and its implications in the REDD+ context</i>- Ivan Langer, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Culture, Peru <i>The participation of Civil Society in the context of REDD+</i> - Milagros Sandoval, CI-Peru <i>Local challenges and the concept of FPIC for local communities in Suriname</i> - Annette Tjongsiefat, CI-Suriname Q&A/Discussion
5:15-5:30	Wrap-up and close of day
7:30pm	Dinner

Day 2	Wednesday, January 25, 2012
9-9:05am	Review of Day 2 agenda
9:05am-10:50am	<p>Session 4: Land Tenure, Resource Rights and REDD+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Tenure issues in REDD+: Challenges and relevant experience</i> – Jenny Springer, WWF • Comparative experience – case studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Indigenous Territorial Management and Avoided Deforestation in the Greater Madidi-Tambopata Landscape</i> – Robert Wallace, Wildlife Conservation Society - Bolivia ○ <i>Indigenous REDD is Vida Plena territories</i> - Henderson Rengifo & Roberto Espinoza, AIDSEP (with Forest Peoples' Programme) ○ <i>Lessons from a forest carbon + coffee initiative and R-PP for Chiapas, Mexico</i>, Mónica Morales, CI-Mexico • Q&A/discussion
10:50-11:10am	Break
11:10am-1pm	<p>Session 5: Equitable Sharing of Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Review of benefit-sharing programs</i> - Jill Blockhus, The Nature Conservancy • Comparative experiences – case studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Experiences from Brazil PES schemes</i> - Andre Silva Dias, WWF Brazil ○ <i>Ecuador: Experiences from Socio Bosque on benefit sharing</i> - Montserrat Alban, Conservation International • Q&A/Discussion
1-2pm	Lunch
2:00-3:00pm	<p>Session 6: Challenges and emerging best practice</p> <p>Four breakout groups discuss main opportunities and challenges, lessons and emerging best practice on i) Participation, ii) FPIC, iii) Tenure and iv) Benefit-sharing in the context of REDD+.</p>
3:00-3:30	Group reports
3:30-3:45	Break
3:45-4:15	Group reports, cont.
4:15-5:15	Plenary discussion on key cross-cutting opportunities, challenges and lessons
5:15-5:30	Wrap-up and close of day
7:30pm	Dinner
Day 3	Thursday, January 26
9-10:15am	<p>Session 7: Strengthening policy and practice</p> <p>Breakout groups discuss recommendations to strengthen ongoing NGO/CSO activities and influence policy, as well as opportunities for collective efforts to promote rights-based approaches to REDD+.</p>
10:15-10:30am	Break
10:30am-12pm	<p>Session 8: Opportunities for the future</p> <p>Group reports, and discussion on workshop follow-up and future work</p>
12-12:30pm	Workshop closing
12:30pm	Lunch

Annex II - Participants' List

Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana (AIDSESP)

1 Roberto Espinoza ayamtai08@gmail.org

CARE-Peru

2 Elvira Raffo eraffo@care.org.pe

Central Asháninka del Río Ene

3 Rommy Villanueva Zúñiga ashaninkarioene@yahoo.es

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

4 Peter Cronkelton P.Cronkleton@CGIAR.ORG

Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica (COICA)

5 Arlen Ribeira arlenribeira@gmail.com

6 Juan Reátegui jrs2406@yahoo.es

Conservation International (CI)

7 Luis Barquin l.barquin@conservation.org

8 Johnson Cerda j.cerda@conservation.org

9 Eva Garen e.garen@conservation.org

10 Kristen Walker k.walker@conservation.org

Conservation International (CI)-Ecuador

11 Monserrat Alban m.alban@conservation.org

Conservation International (CI) -Mexico

12 Mónica Morales m.morales@conservation.org

Conservation International (CI) -Peru

13 Luis Espinel l.espinel@conservation.org

14 Milagros Sandoval m.sandoval@conservation.org

Conservation International (CI) -Suriname

15 Annette L. Tjon Sie Fat a.tjonsiefat@conservation.org

Inter-American Development Bank (IADB)-Peru

16 Juan Carlos Páez JUANCARLOSP@iadb.org

International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

17 Connie Espinosa consuelo.espinosa@iucn.org

International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)-Guatemala

18 Mario Escobedo mario.escobedo@iucn.org

Ministry of the Environment-Peru

19 Elvira Gómez egomez@minam.gob.pe

Ministry of Culture-Peru

20 Iván Lanegra,
Vice-Minister of Interculturality ilanegra@mcultura.gob.pe

The Nature Conservancy (TNC)

21 Jill Blockhus jblockhus@TNC.ORG

The Nature Conservancy (TNC)-Ecuador

22 Marcelo Guevara mguevara@TNC.ORG

The Nature Conservancy (TNC)-Peru

23 Marisel Allende mariselallende@gmail.com

24 Alfredo Salinas asalinas@TNC.ORG

The Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation

25 Paulina Arroyo Paulina.Arroyo@moore.org

U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)

26 Connie Campbell cocampbell@usaid.gov

27 Mónica Romo mromo@usaid.gov

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)-Peru

28 James Leslie james.leslie@undp.org

Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)-Bolivia

29 Robert Wallace rwallace@wcs.org

World Wildlife Fund (WWF)- Amazon Regional Program

31 André Da Silva Dias AndreDias@wwf.org.br

World Wildlife Fund (WWF)- Forest & Climate Initiative

31 María Pacha mpacha@wwfint.org

World Wildlife Fund (WWF)-Colombia

32 Camilo Ortega scortega@wwf.org.co

World Wildlife Fund (WWF)- Peru

33 Daniel Arancibia daniel.arancibia@wwfperu.org

34 Maria Eugenia Arroyo me.arroyo@wwfperu.org.pe

35 Liliana Lozano liliana.lozano@wwfperu.org

36 Gustavo Solano Garro gustavo.solano.garro@gmail.com

World Wildlife Fund (WWF)-United States

37 Vanessa Retana vanessa.retana@wwfus.org

38 Jenny Springer jenny.springer@wwfus.org

