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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOMA</td>
<td>Yayasan Biosfer Manusia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>Clinton Climate Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Conference of Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Country Safeguards Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCPF</td>
<td>Forest Carbon Partnership Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIP</td>
<td>Forest Investment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JATAM</td>
<td>Mining Advocacy Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>Indonesia Ecolabelling Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRV</td>
<td>Monitoring, Report and Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>Principles, Criteria and Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISAI</td>
<td>Indonesian Principles, Criteria and Indicators for REDD+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD+</td>
<td>Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD+ SES</td>
<td>REDD+ Social &amp; Environmental Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESA</td>
<td>Strategic Social and Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>Safeguards Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>United Nations Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-REDD Programme</td>
<td>United National Programme to Reduce Emissions for Deforestation and Degradation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

Since the UNFCCC Conference of Parties agreed five years ago in Cancun in December 2010 that seven safeguards should be applied to all REDD+ activities (see REDD+ safeguards: context and international policy section below), countries have been developing approaches to ensure these safeguards are addressed and respected. There has been significant progress and already some results from the development and implementation of country safeguards approaches (CSA) in many countries/jurisdictions. This report aims to take stock of progress and results of adopting a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards through an outcomes evaluation conducted by the REDD+ SES Initiative in the Province of East Kalimantan, Indonesia, where the Initiative has been working.

The main focus of the report is an examination of progress in developing and using CSA in the Province of East Kalimantan, and results flowing from this process, irrespective of whether there was a link between progress and support from the REDD+ SES Initiative. This approach recognized that the Initiative was one among various national and international actors and factors contributing to CSA development and use. Identifying outcomes of the process regardless of whether the Initiative contributed or not, or contributed directly or indirectly, allowed us to describe and gain an understanding of the wider system involving multiple national, international, government and civil society actors that has contributed to the development of CSAs. In addition to this system-wide picture, the report also looks at where, when and how the Initiative contributed to a CSA in the Province of East Kalimantan.

This evaluation report aims to help stakeholders recognize the value of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards for REDD+ and low emissions, sustainable land use more broadly by providing evidence-based, constructive feedback to:

i. government and civil society organizations in the participating countries/jurisdictions to help them to communicate about and to improve their country safeguards approach;

ii. agencies supporting the development of REDD+ safeguards to help them to improve their strategies and guidance materials; and,

iii. the funder of the REDD+ SES Initiative (Norad) to help them to understand the outcomes of their investment in this REDD+ safeguards initiative.
It is eight years since the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) 13th Conference of Parties (COP 13) in 2007 in Bali, Indonesia, initiated a program of work on reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries, conservation of forests, sustainable management of forests and enhancing forest carbon stocks (REDD+). REDD+ strategies and activities seek to change the way that land is used against a ‘business as usual’ reference scenario. There has always been strong interest in the potential negative and positive social and environmental impacts of such land use interventions under REDD+ and associated governance issues. Particular attention has been focused on the impacts on forest-dependent peoples including Indigenous Peoples and local communities, women and groups that are vulnerable and/or marginalized.

To address some of these concerns, COP 16 in Cancun, Mexico, in 2010, defined seven safeguards to be applied when undertaking all REDD+ activities (referred to as the ‘Cancun safeguards’ - see Box 1), and requested countries to develop a system for providing information on how these safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of REDD+ activities. The safeguards information systems (SIS) is one of the four key elements that a country must have in place for REDD+:

1. a National REDD+ Strategy or Action Plan;
2. a National Forest Reference Emission Levels/National Forestry Reference Level;
3. a National Forestry Monitoring System including Measurement, Reporting, and Verification Systems; and
4. a Safeguards Information System.

In 2011, COP 17 in Durban, South Africa, provided guidance on the SIS, defining that it should be country-driven, transparent, build upon existing systems and provide information that is accessible by all relevant stakeholders (see Box 2). Countries were also requested to submit a summary of information on how all the safeguards have been addressed and respected. In 2013, COP 19 in Warsaw, Poland, reaffirmed that countries should have all four elements of REDD+ including the SIS in place, and should have submitted a summary of information on safeguards before obtaining and receiving results-based finance. The summary of information on safeguards should be included in national communications to the COP every four years after the start of implementation of REDD+ activities, and could be provided on a voluntary basis on the UNFCCC web platform. The Warsaw decisions concluded negotiations on REDD+ and all the relevant decisions on REDD+ are referred to as the ‘Warsaw framework for REDD+’.
Box 1. Cancun safeguards – Decision 1/CP.16. Appendix 1 of UNFCCC

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

(a) That actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements;

(b) Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty;

(c) Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities, by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws, and noting that the United Nations General Assembly has adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;

(d) The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular, indigenous peoples and local communities in the actions referred to in paragraphs 70 and 72 of this decision;

(e) That actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that actions referred to in paragraph 70 of this decision are not used for the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits;

(f) Actions to address the risks of reversals;

(g) Actions to reduce displacement of emissions.

Box 2. UNFCCC guidance on safeguards information systems - Decision 12/CP.17

2. Agrees that systems for providing information on how the safeguards ... are addressed and respected should, taking into account national circumstances and respective capabilities, and recognizing national sovereignty and legislation, and relevant international obligations and agreements, and respecting gender considerations:

(a) Be consistent with the guidance identified in decision 1/CP.16.;

(b) Provide transparent and consistent information that is accessible by all relevant stakeholders and updated on a regular basis;

(c) Be transparent and flexible to allow for improvements over time;

(d) Provide information on how all of the safeguards referred to in appendix I to decision 1/CP.16 are being addressed and respected;

(e) Be country-driven and implemented at the national level;

(f) Build upon existing systems, as appropriate;
1.2 Development of country safeguards approaches

Over the last five years since the Cancun safeguards were agreed in December 2010, countries have been developing their approach to safeguards. Several initiatives have developed guidance and provided technical advice to support these efforts, including the REDD+ SES Initiative, the UN-REDD Programme, World Resources Institute, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), Climate Law & Policy and the Netherlands Development Organization (SNV). These groups collaborated in 2012 to develop a conceptual framework for CSA that has been further developed and used in slightly different formats by each initiative. In general, the country safeguards approach involves, among other elements (see Figure 1):

- the country’s legal framework of policies, laws and regulations (PLR);
- an institutional framework defining the roles, responsibilities and procedures of the different entities;
- feedback and grievance redress mechanisms to enable stakeholders to make complaints and seek redress related to safeguards; and
- a safeguards information system (SIS) to provide information on how safeguards are addressed and respected.

In this context, safeguards in general are understood to be policies and measures to protect from harm, and also to ‘do good’ in the case of the Cancun safeguards. The UNFCCC Cancun Agreement defines safeguards at international level and for operationalization they need to be clarified at country level to reflect the country’s context and the specific risks and opportunities of the country’s REDD+ strategy. The actual safeguards at country level are the country’s policies, laws and regulations which ensure that the Cancun safeguards are ‘addressed’. These policies, laws and regulations are implemented through institutions, processes and procedures which ensure that the Cancun safeguards are ‘respected’.

The ‘Country Safeguards Approach’ ensures that relevant policies, laws and regulations, implemented and reinforced through effective institutions processes and procedures, informed by a safeguards information system and strengthened by a feedback and grievance redress mechanism, together, effectively address the risks and opportunities of the REDD+ strategy and activities in compliance with UNFCCC decisions related to the Cancun safeguards.
In summary, the CSA identifies and implements the country’s own safeguards that address the specific risks and opportunities of the country’s REDD+ strategy and the country context, through a country-led and -owned approach. The CSA builds on and strengthens the country’s existing legal and institutional frameworks and information systems.

Based on the experience of the REDD+ SES Initiative, the following processes are likely to be useful for the development of a CSA:

- **Define the goals of the CSA** – Considering the risks and opportunities of the REDD+ strategy, and the country context, what are safeguards expected to achieve? A participatory process to develop a country-specific interpretation or clarification of the Cancun safeguards can be useful at this stage.

- **Identify/strengthen policies, laws and regulations** – How do existing PLRs address the goals of the CSA and the country-specific interpretation or clarification of the Cancun safeguards? How do existing institutions, processes and procedures ensure effective implementation of the PLRs? What new PLRs are needed and what is the process to develop them? Is there a need to develop ‘other safeguards’ to support existing PLRs, such as procedures, norms and standards for REDD+ activities, particularly in the short to medium term before PLRs can be revised? How do institutional capacities need to be strengthened?

- **Identify/develop the safeguards information system** – What are the objectives of the SIS to provide information for what purposes? What existing systems provide relevant information related to the country-specific interpretation/clarification of safeguards? What are the gaps and how can they be filled? What are appropriate institutional arrangements? A participatory process to collecting and reviewing safeguards information can strengthen credibility and accuracy of the information and promote effective use of the safeguards information to strengthen the REDD+ strategy and safeguards.

- **Identify/develop a feedback and grievance redress mechanism** – What PLRs can grievances be raised against? What existing grievance mechanisms could be used for REDD+? Do they need to be strengthened or new ones developed, ensuring a transparent, accessible, fair and efficient response to stakeholders?

Different pathways may be taken to define and strengthen the CSA. A potential process is depicted in Figure 2 below. The proposed processes may be undertaken in parallel or at different speeds, and may be combined or organized differently. The processes will be more interconnected than depicted in this simplified diagram.

**Figure 2. Potential processes and considerations for the development of a country safeguards approach**
1.3 Evolution of the REDD+ SES Initiative

The REDD+ SES Initiative was started in 2009 to develop voluntary best-practice standards to support effective implementation and credible reporting on safeguards for government-led REDD+ programs. REDD+ SES guidance and tools were developed through a transparent and inclusive multi-stakeholder process from 2009. The aim was to create a framework that countries/jurisdictions could use on a voluntary basis to demonstrate high social and environmental performance of a government-led REDD+ program. The initial focus was on development of principles, criteria and a framework for indicators that could be adapted to the country context through a country-led, multi-stakeholder process. As international policy for REDD+ safeguards developed to emphasize a country-led approach, the Initiative evolved considerably from the initial promotion of voluntary standards for REDD+ to become ones of leaders in providing support for a country-led approach to REDD+ safeguards (see country support section below). Greater emphasis was placed on adoption of good practices for a transparent, multi-stakeholder process at country-level as defined in the Guidelines for the Use of REDD+ SES at Country Level. The Initiative has provided a dynamic exchange and learning platform to support South-South exchanges among government and civil society organizations for the identification and dissemination of good practices for safeguards, for multi-stakeholder approaches and for development and implementation for CSA.

Up to 2015, seventeen countries/jurisdictions \(^1\) have participated in the Initiative, using the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicator framework and the multi-stakeholder process guidelines of the REDD+ SES in different ways, either as good practice guidance, as the basis for their SIS, or as a quality assurance standard. Although countries/jurisdictions have been using the principle, criteria and indicator framework and the multi-stakeholder process guidelines in different ways, the common denominator has been strong commitment to a high level of participation and transparency, and to a comprehensive approach to REDD+ safeguards.

---

\(^1\) State of Acre, State of Mato Grosso, State of Amazonas in Brazil; Ecuador; Chile; Costa Rica; Democratic Republic of Congo; Guatemala; Honduras; Province of Central Kalimantan and Province of East Kalimantan in Indonesia; Liberia; States of the Yucatan Peninsula and State of Jalisco in Mexico; Nepal; Region of San Martin in Peru; Tanzania.

Goal of the REDD+ SES Initiative

To support the development and implementation of effective social and environmental safeguards for government-led strategies and action plans for REDD+ and related low-emissions land use to make a substantial contribution to human rights, poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation goals while avoiding social or environmental harm.

The REDD+ SES is an initiative of the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA), a partnership of NGOs (CARE, Conservation International, Rainforest Alliance, The Nature Conservancy and Wildlife Conservation Society). The Initiative has been hosted by CARE and managed by the CCBA secretariat based at Conservation International with technical support from the Proforest Initiative. The Initiative is overseen by an International Steering Committee of representatives from governments, multilateral organizations, Indigenous and Community organizations, social and environmental NGOs and private sector organizations, mostly from countries where REDD+ activities will be implemented. The main funding for the initiative has been provided by the David and Lucile Packard Foundation (2009), the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation (2010-2011) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad, 2012-2015).
1.4 Why conduct an outcome evaluation?

Outcome evaluation focuses on identifying and understanding changes in behavior of key actors that constitute an important step towards achieving desired impacts. In a linear results chain, inputs enable activities that produce outputs which lead to outcomes and then impacts. In complex systems, such as changing land use under REDD+ and simultaneously meeting development goals through the development and application of safeguards, behavior changes are a key step to lasting impacts, but are usually influenced by many factors and not just by the activities of a single project.

The outcome harvesting approach used for this evaluation collects evidence of what has been achieved, and works backwards to determine what factors contributed to the change. This approach helps to understand the process of change and how each outcome contributes to this change, and is especially suited for complex situations where relations of cause and effect are not fully understood. It can provide evidence of achievements and also help to understand the significance of the changes, and the contribution of various factors, including, in this case, the REDD+ SES Initiative.

Box 3. Definition of Outcomes

Outcomes are a change in the behavior, relationships, action, activities, policies or practices of an individual, group, community, organization or institution.

Box 4. Definitions of participatory, transparent and comprehensive

The following definitions are used in relation to a country safeguards approach in the context of this report

- **Participatory** – enabling inclusive participation of civil society with government and other relevant stakeholders in developing and using the CSA, including all relevant types of civil society and government stakeholders. This interpretation of participatory is sometimes referred to as multi-stakeholder.

- **Transparent** – making relevant safeguards information accessible to all relevant stakeholders.

- **Comprehensive** – covering all relevant safeguards issues, considering the existence of safeguards in policies, laws and regulations and the extent of their implementation.

---

The outcome evaluation did not only collect outcomes that were influenced by the REDD+ SES Initiative, although whether that influence existed and the nature of the influence was explored in each case.

1.6 Structure of the report

This report first lays out the methods used to harvest and analyze outcomes in ten countries and then presents the results of the progress and outcomes in the Province of East Kalimantan, Indonesia, including the full outcome descriptions, supporting information and analysis.

2. Methods

2.1 Approach used to ‘harvest’ the outcomes

The evaluation was conducted in a participatory manner through interviews and document review using the Outcome Harvesting method\(^2\), adapted for this evaluation with the assistance of Richard Smith of the Proforest Initiative. Informants were asked to provide:

1. **An outcome description** – A specific change in behavior related to adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards, i.e. who changed what, when and where?

2. **The significance** – What was the importance or significance of the change described in the outcome?

3. **The contribution** – What were the main factors contributing to the change described in the outcome? Has the REDD+ SES Initiative contributed to the outcome? In what ways?

The outcomes were mostly developed through an iterative process where written outcome descriptions, significance and contribution statements were developed from informant interviews or knowledge of Initiative personnel and shared with the informants for validation. The outcomes were classified by the REDD+ SES team (see section 2.4) and the classifications were reviewed and approved by the informants. The detailed outcomes table in this report provides the sources and evidence for each outcome description, and also for the significance and the contribution where these were collected from different sources.

---

1. **Objectives of the outcome evaluation**

- To provide evidence of progress and early results related to adopting a participatory, transparent and comprehensive country safeguards approach in ten countries/jurisdictions that are:
  - strengthening safeguards for REDD+ and related low emissions land use;
  - strengthening REDD+ strategies and activities to deliver greater emissions reductions and non-carbon benefits; and
  - scaling up finance for REDD+.

- To encourage wider adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards for REDD+ and related low-emissions land use.

- To understand the contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative and other factors to the progress and early results related to adopting a participatory, transparent and comprehensive country safeguards approach in ten countries/jurisdictions.

The evaluation focused on identifying the changes in key actors in three domains of change:

- government support for strong and comprehensive safeguards,
- civil society engagement for strong and comprehensive safeguards,
- government and civil society joint support for strong and comprehensive safeguards.

This included changes in behavior that facilitated the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards, and also changes that resulted in the definition of stronger and more comprehensive safeguards (policies, laws, regulations and procedures) and their more effective implementation, as well as changes beyond the country safeguards approach resulting from adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

The evaluation does not, however, look for evidence of improvements in the social and environmental performance of the REDD+ strategies and actions (i.e. impacts) that might be attributed to adopting a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to REDD+ safeguards since it is premature to expect a pattern of impacts during this relatively early stage in the development and implementation of REDD+.

---

1. Structure of the report

This report first lays out the methods used to harvest and analyze outcomes in ten countries and then presents the results of the progress and outcomes in the Province of East Kalimantan, Indonesia, including the full outcome descriptions, supporting information and analysis.

2. Methods

2.1 Approach used to ‘harvest’ the outcomes

The evaluation was conducted in a participatory manner through interviews and document review using the Outcome Harvesting method\(^2\), adapted for this evaluation with the assistance of Richard Smith of the Proforest Initiative. Informants were asked to provide:

1. **An outcome description** – A specific change in behavior related to adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards, i.e. who changed what, when and where?

2. **The significance** – What was the importance or significance of the change described in the outcome?

3. **The contribution** – What were the main factors contributing to the change described in the outcome? Has the REDD+ SES Initiative contributed to the outcome? In what ways?

The outcomes were mostly developed through an iterative process where written outcome descriptions, significance and contribution statements were developed from informant interviews or knowledge of Initiative personnel and shared with the informants for validation. The outcomes were classified by the REDD+ SES team (see section 2.4) and the classifications were reviewed and approved by the informants. The detailed outcomes table in this report provides the sources and evidence for each outcome description, and also for the significance and the contribution where these were collected from different sources.
2.2 Substantiation
As far as possible, outcomes generated by different actors were shared with other relevant actors who were asked to give their comments about the accuracy of the outcome description, and their views on the significance and the contribution. This formed a process of substantiation.

2.3 Timeline and process for collection of outcomes
Joanna Durbin of the REDD+ SES Secretariat led the data collection in East Kalimantan. The outcomes were initially collected at a meeting with the safeguards team of the REDD+ Working Group in East Kalimantan in 8-12 June 2015 and were complemented by document review and email exchange with the same informants from July to October 2015. It has not been possible to substantiate the outcomes with any other informants beyond the safeguards team from East Kalimantan.
2.4 Classification of outcomes

Adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach

The outcomes were classified into four levels related to adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach:

1. **Enable** – Outcomes that create favorable conditions for a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach but do not contribute explicitly and directly to enhancing participation, transparency and/or comprehensiveness in the development or implementation of the country safeguards approach.

2. **Demonstrate** – Outcomes that contribute explicitly and directly to the development of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach but not to its implementation.

3. **Institutionalize** – Outcomes that are expected to be sustained in the longer term and contribute to the implementation of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach. These changes are considered to be sustainable. Since the country safeguards approach is necessarily government-led, a change in civil society governance structures or participation could only be classified as institutionalize if there is some official government endorsement of the change, recognizing the civil society role in implementation of the safeguards approach.

4. **Result from** - Outcomes that have resulted from the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive country safeguards approach, that may contribute to REDD+ strategies, actions and impacts or also beyond REDD+. These go beyond a change in adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

It is important to note that:

- Outcomes classified as Enable have not been further classified a-i since they only indirectly affect the country safeguards approach.
- To be classified as Demonstrate or Institutionalize the outcome must have contributed to a) a more participatory, and/or b) a more transparent and/or c) a more comprehensive approach to safeguards.

Contribution to a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach

a) **more participatory** - Outcomes that correspond to a more inclusive participation of civil society with government, or changes that include more different types of civil society actors or changes that include more different levels (e.g. local and national) or types of government department. This interpretation of participatory is sometimes referred to as multi-stakeholder.

b) **more transparent** - Outcomes that make more safeguards information more accessible to more different kinds of stakeholders.

c) **more comprehensive** - Outcomes that lead to the country safeguards approach and/or the safeguards information system i) being broader in scope of issue covered or ii) extending performance monitoring beyond existence of safeguards in policies to implementation.

d) **change in governance structures** - Outcomes that constitute a change in formal or informal arrangements that define which people and organizations influence the process of development and/or implementation of the country safeguards approach.

e) **change in policies, laws and regulations** - Outcomes that correspond to a change in the drafting, adoption and/or revision of policies, laws and regulations linked to the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

f) **change in strategies and action plans** - Outcomes that correspond to a change in government-led strategies and action plans linked to the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

**g) increased funding** - Outcomes that correspond to an increase in funding.

h) **advocacy to bring about further change** - Outcomes that relate to civil society promoting the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

i) **stronger commitment/leadership** - Outcomes that strengthen government and/or civil society endorsement and taking initiative towards adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.
Contribution to Cancun safeguards

Outcomes were classified according to their contribution to a change in the development, policy or implementation of any specific UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards in the country:

a. Actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programs and relevant international conventions and agreements;

b. Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty;

c. Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities, by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws, and noting that the United Nations General Assembly has adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;

d. The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities;

e. Actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that the REDD+ actions are not used for the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits;

f. Actions to address the risks of reversals;

g. Actions to reduce displacement of emissions

Contributions of the REDD+ SES Initiative

When the REDD+ SES Initiative contributed to the outcome, the type of contribution was classified as follows:

- P Following guidelines of the REDD+ SES Initiative that promote a participatory, transparent process to ensure safeguards are addressed and respected and to provide information on safeguards
- I Using the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicators as a framework for comprehensive treatment of safeguards
- $ Funding from the REDD+ SES Initiative
- A Technical assistance from the REDD+ SES Secretariat
- X Exchange with and learning from actors in other countries facilitated by REDD+ SES Initiative

Actors that change behaviour

Outcomes were classified according to the importance or significance of the change described in the outcome for

i. Building support from government for strong, comprehensive safeguards

ii. Engaging civil society for strong, comprehensive safeguards

iii. Strengthening government and civil society joint support strong and comprehensive safeguards
2.5 Limitations in the collection of outcomes and their interpretation

The outcome harvesting approach adopted for this evaluation was conducted in a participatory manner. The outcomes were identified by informants in each country who have been involved in REDD+ strategies and activities and, in most cases, also in the country safeguards approach. They identified outcomes that they consider to have been significant related to the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach. They also provided their views on the significance of the outcomes and on what factors had contributed. This approach enabled the identification of an important set of outcomes in each country that can provide evidence and illustrate pathways of the progress and results of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards, without necessarily providing a complete and comprehensive picture.

The different context in each country/jurisdiction means that outcomes considered important in one country may not have been identified as outcomes in another country. For example, in Acre and Tanzania the government decision to develop a country safeguards approach was identified as an outcome, but not in other countries/jurisdictions despite there probably having been such as decision. The outcomes are not outputs and their mapping does not track all the milestones in development of a country safeguards approach, but only changes of behavior of key stakeholders that were considered important by those identifying the outcomes.

For a particular country/jurisdiction, differences in the number of outcomes found in each category are not a robust guide to the importance or otherwise of a particular category of outcome. Equally, the number of outcomes in different categories cannot be easily compared across countries/jurisdictions. For instance, in some countries/jurisdictions, the participation of a particular stakeholder group is a separate outcome, such as Indigenous Peoples in Peru or in Acre, but in others such as Nepal, participation of several different marginalized civil society groups are included in one outcome. The outcomes illustrate changes and help to understand the ways that changes have occurred in different countries/jurisdictions but cannot be compared quantitatively across countries/jurisdictions.

Due to constraints of time and resources, many of the outcomes were collected through email exchanges and skype or telephone discussions. It was not possible to engage physically with all potential informants. This means that the collection of outcomes was not exhaustive and some may have been missed. In most cases, the collection of outcomes was facilitated by the REDD+ SES secretariat which may have led to greater reporting of the outcomes to which the REDD+ SES Initiative contributed and fewer outcomes supported by other processes. There may also have been some variations in the ways outcomes were described due to slight variations in the approach used by the different members of the REDD+ SES secretariat in different countries/jurisdictions.

The credibility of outcomes was enhanced firstly through verification of outcome descriptions with outcome sources and, secondly, through substantiation i.e. checking outcome descriptions with written sources and/or independent actors. In all cases, the informants have reviewed and approved the final formulation of the outcome descriptions, their significance and the contributions. Lastly, informants went on record with their outcome description, thereby enhancing its credibility by association.

There was limited substantiation in several countries/jurisdictions, such as in East Kalimantan and in Nepal. Wherever possible, evidence was documented and a link is provided to support the outcome in the detailed outcomes tables, but this was not always possible and in many cases the outcomes represent opinions of the people interviewed.

The evaluation did not, as would be the case with an evaluation focused only on the effectiveness of the Initiative, seek views or to make a judgement on the merits of the Initiative and the relative significance of its contributions to observed changes. The evaluation did seek to identify which outcomes the Initiative contributed to and how, allowing some conclusions to be drawn about the relevance of the Initiative and how its relevance was sustained despite the significant changes in context.

 Despite these caveats, we conclude that the outcomes represent an important and sufficiently credible collection of results, identified as significant by key actors within the countries/jurisdictions, and can provide clear evidence of the progress and results of adopting a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.
3. Progress and results in the Province of East Kalimantan, Indonesia

REDD+ in East Kalimantan and development of a country safeguards approach

The Government of East Kalimantan and civil society groups active in forestry and land use in the province started to work together on preparing for REDD+ following the UNFCCC COP in Bali in 2007 where the concept of REDD+ was first agreed. A multi-stakeholder REDD+ Working Group was created in 2008 and the Provincial REDD+ Strategy and Action Plan was published in 2012.

East Kalimantan started to use REDD+ SES guidance and tools in 2012 to develop a set of principles, criteria and indicators that would be used to assess the social and environmental performance of the Provincial REDD+ Strategy as a means to strengthen this performance and to support the implementation of REDD+ activities in East Kalimantan. In January 2015, the REDD+ Working Group finalized the first assessment of performance against the province-specific REDD+ SES indicators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Key Actor</th>
<th>What the change represents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1 - Provincial Government creates multi-stakeholder REDD+ Working Group</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>enabling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Government starts to request technical support from NGOs on safeguards</td>
<td>civil society</td>
<td>demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3 - Government publishes a provincial REDD+ Strategy that includes SIS</td>
<td>joint government and civil society</td>
<td>institutionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Government start to seek NGO input for REDD+ planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>result from adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Provincial Forestry Agency creates information system section including for SIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6 - REDD+ Working Group starts safeguards work and creates a safeguards team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - Anti-REDD civil society organisations start to participate more in REDD+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8 - Safeguards are being expanded in revision of Provincial REDD+ strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9 - Anti-REDD civil society organisations start to participate more in REDD+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - Government decides to provide budget for REDD+ safeguards activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - Government strengthens safeguards and land rights in new permit process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>12 - Safeguards are being expanded in revision of Provincial REDD+ strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 - Anti-REDD civil society organisations start to participate more in REDD+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 - Government decides to provide budget for REDD+ safeguards activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 - Government strengthens safeguards and land rights in new permit process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>16 - Safeguards are being expanded in revision of Provincial REDD+ strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 - Anti-REDD civil society organisations start to participate more in REDD+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 - Government decides to provide budget for REDD+ safeguards activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 - Government strengthens safeguards and land rights in new permit process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20 - Safeguards are being expanded in revision of Provincial REDD+ strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings related to the significance of the outcomes

Ten outcomes were identified related to the adoption of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in East Kalimantan. Eight correspond to changes made by government, one was a change in civil society behavior and one was a change in joint government and civil society support for strong and comprehensive safeguards.

These outcomes provide evidence of a progressive change in the government’s approach towards embracing greater civil society participation as a result of the REDD+ and safeguards processes in the province. The changes started with the creation of a multi-stakeholder REDD+ working group in 2008 (outcome 1). This was a key step that created a multi-stakeholder governance structure to oversee the development of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards. It is likely that the social and environmental risks and opportunities of REDD+ that safeguards would address contributed to the adoption of a multi-stakeholder approach at this early stage. The government recognized that academics and other non-government actors typically have better capacity, understanding and experience than government actors in issues related to safeguards. From 2009, the government started to show increasing respect for the technical knowledge and advice of civil society, and requested technical advice, particularly on safeguards issues for REDD+ (2). The REDD+ Working Group engaged both government and civil society in the development of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach through the creation of a safeguards team in 2012 (10). This team included civil society members from a range of backgrounds as well as a member from the Provincial Forestry Agency. This process resulted in increased trust and willingness to include civil society in government planning for REDD+ from 2013 (4).

The increased openness from government to engage with civil society was accompanied by an increased willingness on the part of civil society to participate in REDD+ meetings from 2012 (9). In particular, some organizations that had been less informed and suspicious about REDD+ such as BIOMA and JATAM (Mining Advocacy Network) decided that they would engage because there were indications that key safeguards issues that were important to them would be taken seriously by government.

In addition, the government demonstrated increased recognition for the importance of safeguards for REDD+ and took steps to institutionalize the participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards. The Provincial REDD+ Strategy published in 2012 included development of a safeguards information system (3). The Forestry Agency created a new Forestry Information System section in 2013 that will manage the REDD+ safeguards information system in the long term (5) and the government approved, for the first time, a budget for the REDD+ Working Group of 340,000 USD to use in 2016 including 23,000 USD for safeguards activities (6). The increased recognition of the importance of safeguards is also reflected in the decision to expand the information about safeguards and increased their prominence in the current revision of Provincial REDD+ Strategy and Action Plan in 2015 (8).

A particularly significant outcome that results from adopting a participatory and transparent approach to safeguards for REDD+ is the prioritization of respect for land rights and requirements for a transparency and participatory process in the decree for the new land use permit process issued in April 2015 (7). This covers forestry, mining and oil palm so goes way beyond REDD+ and creates new rules to help manage and address the main drivers of deforestation. The new rules will effectively strengthen safeguards for key aspects of land use, will help to avoid further land use conflicts caused by overlapping permits and will help to strengthen respect for land tenure and rights of local communities and indigenous peoples. The new transparency and participatory processes will strengthen the voice of these local stakeholders that have often been marginalized, and will help them to defend their rights.
Outcome mapping

The outcome mapping shows the linkages between the identified outcomes related to the adoption of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

Outcome classification

1. **Enable** – Outcomes that create favorable conditions for a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach.

2. **Demonstrate** – Outcomes that contribute explicitly and directly to the development of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach.

3. **Institutionalize** – Outcomes that are expected to be sustained in the longer term and contribute to the implementation of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach.

4. **Result from** – Outcomes that have resulted from the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive country safeguards approach.

---

7 – Government strengthens safeguards and land rights in new permit process 2015

8 – Safeguards are being expanded in revision of Provincial REDD+ strategy 2015

6 – Government decides to provide budget for REDD+ safeguards 2015

5 – Provincial Forestry Agency creates information system section including SIS 2013

4 – Government starts to seek NGO input for REDD+ planning 2013

3 – Government publishes a provincial REDD+ Strategy including SIS 2012

9 – Anti-REDD+ civil society organisations start to participate in REDD+ 2012

10 – REDD+ Working Group creates a safeguards team 2012

2 – Government starts to request technical support from NGOs on safeguards 2009

1 – Provincial government creates multi-stakeholder REDD+ Working Group 2008

---

Link an outcome that contributes to 3 or more outcomes

Link between two outcomes

No contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative
Outcome mapping

The outcome mapping shows the linkages between the identified outcomes related to the adoption of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards.

Outcome classification

1. **Enable** - Outcomes that create favorable conditions for a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach.

2. **Demonstrate** - Outcomes that contribute explicitly and directly to the development of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach.

3. **Institutionalize** - Outcomes that are expected to be sustained in the longer term and contribute to the implementation of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive country safeguards approach.

4. **Result from** - Outcomes that have resulted from the adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive country safeguards approach.

---

**Outcome classification diagram**

- **1. Enable**: CONAF starts conducting capacity building on safeguards with regional staff 2013
- **2. Demonstrate**: CONAF organizes workshops with stakeholders for inputs on social and environmental aspects of the ENCCRV 2013
- **3. Institutionalize**: CONAF establishes a National Expert team on Social & Environmental Safeguards 2015
- **4. Result from**: CONAF establishes a civil society expert group to advise on the development of the ENCCRV 2015
- **5. Result from**: The Expert Committee on Social & Environmental safeguards begins developing safeguards indicators 2015
- **6. Result from**: Civil society and regional representatives of CONAF begin to participate in developing ENCCRV 2013

---

**Legend**

- Link an outcome that contributes to 3 or more outcomes
- Link between two outcomes
- No contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative
Mapeo de resultado
El mapeo de resultados muestra el vínculo entre resultados relacionados a la adopción de un enfoque de salvaguardas participativo, transparente e integral.

**Clasificación de resultados**

1. **Habilita** - Resultados que crean condiciones favorables para un enfoque país de salvaguardas más participativo, transparente o integral.

2. **Demostrar** - Los resultados que contribuyen de forma explícita y directamente al desarrollo de un enfoque país de salvaguardas más participativo, transparente e integral.

3. **Institucionalizar** - Los resultados que deberían ser sostenidos en el largo plazo y contribuyen a la aplicación de un enfoque país de salvaguardas más participativo, transparente e integral.

4. **Resultar de** - Los resultados que han resultado de la adopción de un enfoque país de salvaguardas más participativo, transparente e integral.

---

![Diagrama de resultados](image-url)
Key outcomes that contributed to several other outcomes:

- The creation of a multi-stakeholder safeguards team in 2012 (10) contributed to several other outcomes raising the profile of safeguards and strengthening collaboration between government and civil society for safeguards and REDD+ more broadly (3, 4, 9).

Outcomes that strengthen development, policy change and implementation of the Cancun safeguards

The following outcomes in East Kalimantan helped to strengthen development, policy change and implementation of the UNFCCC Cancun safeguards through changes expected to endure (classified as 3. Institutionalize or 4. Results from).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short outcome description</th>
<th>Cancun safeguard(s)</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Provincial Government creates multi-stakeholder REDD+ Working Group</td>
<td>d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>Within REDD+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Government starts to request technical support from NGOs on safeguards</td>
<td>d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>Within REDD+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 - Government publishes a Provincial REDD+ Strategy that includes SIS        | a - Consistency and complementarity with national forest programmes and international agreements  
                                      | b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures                          | Within REDD+            |
| 5 - Provincial Forestry Agency creates information system section including for SIS | b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures                          | REDD+ and beyond        |
| 6 - Government decides to provide a budget for safeguards activities         | b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures                          | Within REDD+            |
| 7 - Government strengthens safeguards including respect for land rights in new permit process | a - Consistency and complementarity with national forest programmes and international agreements  
                                      | b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures                          | REDD+ and beyond        |
| 10 – REDD+ Working Group starts safeguards work and creates a safeguards team | b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures                          | Within REDD+            |
Findings on the factors contributing to the outcomes including the REDD+ SES Initiative

The East Kalimantan REDD+ Working Group started to address safeguards in 2012 (10). This resulted from a number of factors including the safeguards processes at national level such as the development of the Ministry of Forestry safeguards information system (SIS) and the development of principles, criteria and indicators (PRISAI) led by the REDD+ Task Force, both of which had initiated in 2011. In addition, a neighboring province, Central Kalimantan, had been using the REDD+ SES guidelines from 2010, facilitated by Clinton Climate Initiative (CCI) and Indonesian Ecolabelling Institute (LEI). LEI and CCI organized a workshop in East Kalimantan to share the Central Kalimantan experiences and to raise awareness about the REDD+ SES approach and guidelines in 2012. This led directly to the REDD+ working group’s creation of a safeguards team, composed of government and civil society, to facilitate the safeguards process (10) and contributed significantly to the adoption of the participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards that influenced most of the subsequent outcomes. Indeed, the REDD+ SES process guidelines that lay out steps and good practices for the approach to safeguards influenced all the outcomes from 2012 onwards, except the inclusion of development of a safeguards information system in the Provincial REDD+ Strategy which happened prior to the REDD+ SES safeguards workshop.

The East Kalimantan safeguards team used the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicator framework to guide their work. This comprehensive treatment of safeguards issues helped to encourage the civil society organizations that had been suspicious about REDD+ to engage in the REDD+ design process (9) and also helped to build the capacity of NGOs which increased government respect and requests for their support. The broad coverage of safeguards also helped to convince the Provincial Forestry Agency to create the information system section in 2013 (5), including for safeguards information, and also contributed to the inclusion of more information about safeguards in the current revision of the Provincial REDD+ Strategy and Action Plan (8).

As mentioned in the significance section above, the prioritization of respect for land rights and requirements for transparency and participatory process in the decree for the new land use permit process issued in April 2015 is a particularly significant outcome (7), since it has led to a legal change that it likely to be sustainable and have an impact in the longer term.

This outcome was influenced by many factors, including the identification of key safeguards issues and increased awareness of the importance of these safeguards issues, as a result of the participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards. This was influenced by the REDD+ SES guidelines, the REDD+ SES indicator framework and the funding from the REDD+ SES Initiative (initially from CARE via CCI and LEI, and then from CARE via Conservation International from late 2014) that enabled the development and publication of the analysis of safeguards issues in 2013 and the subsequent publication of the safeguards assessment against the province-specific indicators in January 2015.
Outcomes of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in East Kalimantan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Significance for</th>
<th>Factors contributing to the outcome and contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Substantiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government support for strong and comprehensive safeguards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Provincial Government creates multi-stakeholder REDD+ Working Group</td>
<td>In February 2008, the East Kalimantan Provincial Government officially created a multi-stakeholder REDD+ Working Group through a Governor’s decree, with a mandate to work on REDD+ information, monitoring and evaluation, and consultations with stakeholders, among other aspects. The REDD+ Working Group includes representatives from government, universities, private sector and NGOs and is responsible for coordination and communication related to REDD+. The composition of the REDD+ Working Group was revised in April 2010 to include more civil society members through a new Governor’s decree.</td>
<td>This established a formal role for civil society in facilitating and overseeing REDD+ alongside government and enabled the development of a multi-stakeholder approach to safeguards for REDD+. Note that the Provincial Climate Change Council established in 2011 only includes Government and academics, but the REDD+ Working Group enables civil society to remain actively engaged in REDD+ issues, including safeguards.</td>
<td>The REDD+ SES Initiative did not contribute to this outcome.</td>
<td>Governor’s decrees Keputusan Gubernor Kalimantan Timur 522/k.51/2008, 522/K.215/2010 Safeguards team members 10 June 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Government starts to request technical support from NGOs on safeguards</td>
<td>From 2009, the government started to recognize safeguards experts from NGOs and to request their technical support on safeguards issues. This increased after the safeguards team was created and some of the REDD+ safeguards writing team have been given consultancy contracts by government for on policy and regulation research on REDD+ and safeguards and other related issues. For example, in 2013, the East Kalimantan Forestry Service conducted research on the drivers of deforestation and degradation factors with BIOMA and developed the MRV Database with Yayasan BUMI.</td>
<td>This enabled civil society organizations to influence government policy on REDD+ and approaches to safeguards.</td>
<td>REDD+ SES Initiative was not the initial influence that started this trend in 2009 but the REDD+ Working Group following REDD+ SES guidelines from 2012 led to the creation of the safeguards team and helped to raise the profile and technical expertise of its members. (P, I)</td>
<td>Safeguards team members 10 June 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change that:</td>
<td>2.Demonstrates How:</td>
<td>a) more participatory</td>
<td>Strengthens Cancun safeguards: d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension: Within REDD+</td>
<td>3 – Government publishes a Provincial REDD+ Strategy that includes SIS</td>
<td>The development of a safeguards information system was included as a component of the Provincial REDD+ Strategy and Action Plan published in November 2012.</td>
<td>The inclusion of safeguards and a SIS in the Provincial REDD+ Strategy is important to ensure that they are given importance and addressed effectively.</td>
<td>REDD+ SES Initiative did not contribute to the inclusion of the safeguards component in the Provincial REDD+ Strategy in 2012.</td>
<td>Provincial REDD+ Strategy and Action Plan 2012, Safeguards team members 10 June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change that:</td>
<td>3.Institutionalizes How:</td>
<td>b) more transparent</td>
<td>f) strategies and action plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthens Cancun safeguards: a,b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension: Within REDD+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 – Government starts to seek NGO input for REDD+ planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change that: 1. Enables How: a) more participatory, b) more transparent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Government started to trust and be more open to criticism from NGOs, for example the forestry and planning agencies started to invite local NGOs to government planning meetings for REDD+ from 2013.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved government and civil society relations help to promote greater understanding and support for safeguards and improved collaboration to address safeguards issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The REDD+ Working Group following the multi-stakeholder process of the REDD+ SES guidelines from 2012 fostered more collaboration between government and NGOs, and helped government to see how this collaboration could be constructive. (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguards team members 10 June 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>5 – Provincial Forestry Agency creates information system section including for SIS</strong> |
| Change that: 3. Institutionalizes How: b) more transparent d) governance structures |
| Initiated in 2013, and active in 2014, the Forestry Agency of East Kalimantan created a Forestry Information System section within the Provincial Forestry Agency to collect, manage and publish information on REDD+ including MRV of carbon and a safeguards information system as well as other forestry information. |
| The creation of this section in the Forestry Agency facilitates the institutionalization of the safeguards information system based on REDD+ SES, and helps to ensure that the safeguards monitoring will be continued in the future. It will ensure consistency with the National Act for public information and transparency and regulation at province level for public information and helps to ensure that the safeguards information system will be managed transparently to provide publicly accessible information. |
| Following the REDD+ SES guidelines and using the indicator framework helped the safeguards team under the REDD+ Working Group to demonstrate the importance of providing information on safeguards and adopting participatory and transparent operating procedures for the SIS. The REDD+ SES process also helped to build |
| Organigramme of the East Kalimantan Forestry Agency, Safeguards team members 10 June 2015 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Strengthens Cancun safeguards: b</th>
<th>Dimension: REDD+ and beyond</th>
<th>Support within government for the SIS. (P, I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 – Government decides to provide a budget for safeguards activities</td>
<td>From 2016 (secured in Forestry Agency budget in January 2015), the Provincial Government agreed to provide 4.5 billion IDR (approx. 340,000 USD) financial support for the program of the REDD+ Working Group out of which 300 million IDR (23,000 USD) are for work on safeguards. This is the first time that the government has provided funding for safeguards activities.</td>
<td>This budget allocation is very significant as it demonstrates that REDD+ and the safeguards activities are including in the official Provincial government program and that the safeguards activities will be sustained.</td>
<td>Following the REDD+ SES guidelines helped the REDD+ Working Group to raise awareness of the importance of safeguards and to build support for REDD+ and for safeguards across different stakeholder groups, including government. (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change that: 3. Institutionalizes How: a) more participatory g) funding</td>
<td>Land tenure and land rights have become a primary consideration for the Provincial Government because of the identification of key safeguards issues for REDD+. In April 2015, the Provincial Government issued a decree changing the process for issuing land use permits (eg. For oil palm, plantations, mining, etc.) that</td>
<td>This change in government processes for land use decisions is very important as it greatly strengthens safeguards for all land use. In 2012, the government found that there are 748 cases of overlapping tenure and this new moratorium and permitting process will help to avoid further conflicts. It will also help to protect local community and indigenous</td>
<td>The guidelines, framework and funding from REDD+ SES Initiative led to the identification of key safeguards issues developed and validated through a participatory process by the REDD+ working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – Government strengthens safeguards including respect for land rights in new permit process</td>
<td>Land tenure and land rights have become a primary consideration for the Provincial Government because of the identification of key safeguards issues for REDD+. In April 2015, the Provincial Government issued a decree changing the process for issuing land use permits (eg. For oil palm, plantations, mining, etc.) that</td>
<td>This change in government processes for land use decisions is very important as it greatly strengthens safeguards for all land use. In 2012, the government found that there are 748 cases of overlapping tenure and this new moratorium and permitting process will help to avoid further conflicts. It will also help to protect local community and indigenous</td>
<td>The guidelines, framework and funding from REDD+ SES Initiative led to the identification of key safeguards issues developed and validated through a participatory process by the REDD+ working</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

East Kalimantan Forestry Agency draft budget to be published in regional budget regulation in December 2015 (Perda APBD - Regional Regulation on Regional Budget Plan). Safeguards team members 10 June 2015
### 4. Results from How:

- a) more participatory
- b) more transparent
- c) more comprehensive
- e) policies, laws and regulations

**Strengthens Cancun safeguards:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension: REDD and beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ensures that land tenure, high conservation value forests, transparency, and participation of stakeholders are effectively addressed.

peoples land rights, since they will be considered through more transparent and participatory process.

group in 2013, and then further awareness raising and development of safeguards indicators, monitoring plan and assessment report also published by the REDD+ working group in 2015, has been instrumental in raising awareness in the Provincial government of the importance of these safeguards issues not just for REDD+ but for all land use. (P, I, $)

### 8 - Safeguards are being expanded in revision of Provincial REDD+ Strategy

**Change that:**

- **2. Demonstrates How:**
  - b) more transparent
  - f) strategies and action plans

The Government has decided to strengthen the importance of safeguards in a revised Provincial REDD+ strategy and will provide more information about them and the safeguards information system in a new version currently under preparation with input from members of the safeguards team.

The strengthening of safeguards in the Provincial REDD+ Strategy is important to ensure that they are given importance and addressed effectively.

The use of REDD+ SES guidelines and indicator framework by the REDD+ Working Group since 2012 has helped to raise awareness of the importance of safeguards so that they will be addressed more comprehensively in the revised strategy. (P, I)

**Civil society engagement for strong and comprehensive safeguards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 - Anti-REDD civil society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

From 2012, civil society groups suspicious about REDD+ started to

This has been important to ensure that issues of concern to these NGOs

The REDD+ SES process encouraged
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations start to participate more in REDD+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) more participatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Demonstrates How:                            |
| a) more participatory                            |
| and other local stakeholders are addressed by safeguards, making them and the REDD+ activities more effective. |
| consultations with all groups, and the principles criteria and indicators framework ensured that a full range of issues are addressed by safeguards. This has helped to build confidence of the anti-REDD groups and encourage their participation. (P, I) |
| June 2015                                         |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government and civil society joint support for strong and comprehensive safeguards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 – REDD+ Working Group starts safeguards work and creates a safeguards team</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutionalizes How:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) more participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) governance structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthens Cancun safeguards: b, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension: Within REDD+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| In December 2012, the REDD+ Working Group decided to work on safeguards and created a multi-stakeholder safeguards team to facilitate the safeguards work, including one from government, two from universities and three from NGOs (6 total). In 2013, a consultant was added to the team (7 total), and in 2014 another NGO member was added to the team (8 total). |
| This small group took the leadership in developing drafts of province-specific indicators and an assessment report, and organized consultations with stakeholders prior to finalization. They were highly motivated and became the ‘facilitation team’ for the safeguards process. |
| The REDD+ Working Group members decided to create the safeguards team based on the good practices in the REDD+ SES guidelines explained at a workshop organized by Indonesian Ecolabelling Institute (LEI) and Clinton Climate Initiative with funding from the REDD+ SES Initiative. (P, $) |
| CCI December 2012 report to CARE. Contracts from the REDD+ Working Group with each of the writing group team members in 2013/2014 Safeguards team members 10 June 2015 |