Adoption of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to REDD+ safeguards in Peru and the Region of San Martin, 2012 to 2015

An outcomes evaluation
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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 Peru and the Region of San Martin where the Initiative has been working.

The main focus of the report is an examination of progress in developing and using CSA in in Peru and the Region of San Martin, 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 in Peru and the Region of San Martin.

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.
1.1 REDD+ safeguards: context and international policy

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+:

i. a National REDD+ Strategy or Action Plan;
ii. a National Forest Reference Emission Levels/National Forestry Reference Level;
iii. a National Forestry Monitoring System including Measurement, Reporting, and Verification Systems; and
iv. 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.

Figure 1. Potential elements of a Country Safeguards Approach

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 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.
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.

---

1.5 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+.

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 Peru and the Region of San Martin, including the full outcome descriptions, supporting information and analysis. The Spanish version of this report is available on www.redd-standards.org.

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

The outcome evaluation started during a participatory session with members of the safeguards facilitation team from San Martin and national level at the annual REDD+ SES Exchange & Learning workshop in Nepal in April 2015. Further outcomes and clarifications were collected through additional interviews in Peru undertaken by Aurélie Lhumeau of the REDD+ SES Secretariat in September 2015.
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

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

Contribution 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
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 Peru and the Region of San Martin

REDD+ in Peru and the Region of San Martin and the development of a country safeguards approach

From 2008, several REDD+ projects have been developed in the Region of San Martin to promote conservation of forests. Four projects are currently being implemented by civil society organizations, in protected areas, national parks and conservation concessions. In parallel, the Regional Government of San Martin (GORESAM) initiated a process to develop a coordinated approach to REDD+ in 2008 that was officialized through the Mesa REDD+ San Martin in 2009. This roundtable composed of public institutions and civil society stakeholders has developed tools to support the implementation of REDD+ activities. The Regional Environmental Authority (ARA) of GORESAM is the government authority responsible for the design and implementation of REDD+ activities in the region.

In 2012, the Region of San Martin in Peru started to develop its approach to safeguards for REDD+ and started to participate in the REDD+ SES Initiative, using the REDD+ SES tools and guidance as good practice guidance. Between 2012 and 2015, a facilitation team composed of the ARA and Conservation International (CI) Peru started to engage relevant stakeholders including regional government, civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples, small producers and chambers of commerce in the development of REDD+ safeguards through awareness raising and capacity building workshops.

In 2013, a Technical Advisory Group composed of civil society organizations, the Centre for Conservation, Research and Management of Natural Areas (CIMA), the Center for Indigenous Peoples Cultures of Peru (CHIRAPAQ) and the Peruvian Environmental Law Society (SPDA) was established to provide technical support and guidance to GORESAM in the development of San Martin’s safeguards approach and the involvement of relevant stakeholders. In December 2014, GORESAM established by regional decree a multi-stakeholder REDD+ safeguards committee composed of government, civil society and Indigenous Peoples to support the development of REDD+ safeguards in the region. In 2015, GORESAM with the support of the facilitation team and of the Advisory Group conducted a participatory consultation process on the regulations that will operationalize the decree and started to formally establish the safeguards committee through the approval of regulations for the operation of the committee in December 2015. The safeguards process of the region of San Martin is providing inputs into the national safeguards process.

At national level, the Ministry of Environment (MINAM) is the entity in charge of the development and implementation of REDD+ and for providing information on how safeguards are being addressed and respected, including the development of the safeguards information system (SIS). In 2013, MINAM with support from various sources (Betty & Gordon Moore Foundation, KfW, targeted support from the UN-REDD Programme, CI, USAID through FCMC, GIZ) developed a roadmap for developing the SIS and started to engage relevant stakeholders in awareness-raising activities. MINAM started to participate in the REDD+ SES Initiative from 2013.
### Timeline and status of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Peru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Key Actor</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1. GORESAM initiates a safeguards process with stakeholder participation</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>P I A X</td>
<td>process guidelines, principles, criteria, indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. CI Peru starts to promote participation of stakeholders in the safeguards process in San Martin</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>P I A X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2. MINAM creates a roadmap to involve stakeholders in the safeguards process</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>process guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. GORESAM starts to involve Indigenous Peoples in the REDD+ and safeguards process</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>P $</td>
<td>principles, criteria, indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. MINAM began to communicate their approach to safeguards in international fora</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1 X</td>
<td>technical advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. GORESAM starts to present regional safeguards process in national and international events</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1 X</td>
<td>exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. GORESAM creates a Technical Advisory Group</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3 $ A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. MINAM and GORESAM collaborate with CI Peru develop information materials</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1 $ A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. GORESAM starts to coordinate its actions on REDD+ and safeguards with the MINAM</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2 A X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8. MINAM starts to involve regional governments in the national safeguards process</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3 X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. GORESAM officially creates a safeguards committee</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3 P $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Regional NGOs participate in safeguards meetings</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3 P $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>10. GORESAM provides stronger facilitation of the safeguards process</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3 A X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Actor that changes behaviour:
- Government
- Civil society
- Joint government and civil society

#### What the change represents:
1 = enabling  
2 = demonstration  
3 = institutionalization  
4 = result from adoption of a more participatory, transparent or comprehensive approach to safeguards

#### Contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative:
P = process guidelines  
I = principles, criteria, indicators  
$ = funding  
A = technical advice  
X = exchange
Findings related to the significance of the outcomes

Fourteen outcomes were identified linked to the adoption of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards, of which 9 were in San Martin and 4 at national level in Peru plus one outcome that involved both levels. Twelve of the outcomes represented changes in behavior by government, with just 2 changes by civil society organizations, and no changes made by government and civil society working together.

Conservation International (CI) Peru has played a critical role in promoting a more participatory approach to safeguards, for example through the promotion of an inclusive, participatory and rights-based approach to safeguards for REDD+ in San Martin from 2012 (outcome 12). This helped to encourage GORESAM to initiate a participatory approach to safeguards for REDD+ in 2012 (1), which led to a series of other outcomes. For example, it led to the important step of including Indigenous Peoples in the safeguards process from 2013 (3). In part due to the participatory safeguards process adopted by GORESAM, Regional NGOs decided to participate more actively in the safeguards meetings from 2014 (14). This enhanced participation from important stakeholder groups related to REDD+ further strengthened the participatory process, not only for safeguards but more broadly for the development of the REDD+ process in San Martin.

To strengthen the progress made by GORESAM in relation to safeguards, a technical advisory group was created in 2013, composed of three NGOs to provide technical assistance on legal, environmental and Indigenous Peoples’ aspects (6). In December 2014, GORESAM took another major step institutionalizing a more participatory approach to safeguards by officially creating a multi-stakeholder regional safeguards committee that formally involves REDD+ stakeholders including Indigenous Peoples, academia and the private sector, as well as NGOs that had been participating in this process with the government to date (9). From August 2015, GORESAM started to provide stronger facilitation of the safeguards process and is the only region of Peru with a Regional Committee on Safeguards, and a government team that has among its responsibilities to promote the processes of climate change and REDD+ in the region, including safeguards. (10).

Meanwhile at national level, in part encouraged by the adoption of a participatory approach to safeguards in San Martin, MINAM also initiated a participatory process through the creation of a roadmap to involve stakeholders in the safeguards process in August 2013 (2). The exchange between regional and national level has been further strengthened through MINAM’s initiative to include regional governments in workshops and meetings to develop the national approach to REDD+ safeguards from 2014 (8). From 2013, GORESAM also started to coordinate more actively on safeguards approaches with MINAM including by sharing their experiences and progress with respect to REDD+ safeguards at national meetings (11).

From 2013, both GORESAM and MINAM started to present their progress on safeguards and demonstrate their commitment to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach in national and international meetings (4, 5).

Most of the progress and outcomes to date in San Martin and at national level in Peru have been in the establishment and institutionalization of participatory processes and governance structures for REDD+ safeguards. While it has taken several years for these changes to occur, it is important to emphasize that the safeguards process is linked to and should be articulated to the general REDD+ process in Peru that has been developing over the last year resulting in the publication of the draft Climate change and forests strategy in 2015. These efforts to build the basis for REDD+ institutional arrangements and governance, and in particular for safeguards, lay the foundations for an effective approach to REDD+ safeguards and a more inclusive approach to REDD+ by including important stakeholder groups that had doubts regarding the government-led REDD+ process and building trust for a more effective partnership.
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.

---

1. GORESAM initiates a participatory safeguards process 2012
2. MINAM creates a roadmap to involve stakeholders in safeguards 2013
3. GORESAM starts to involve Indigenous Peoples 2013
4. MINAM began to communicate their country approach to safeguards in international fora 2013
5. GORESAM starts to present regional process in national and international events 2013
6. GORESAM creates a technical advisory group 2013
7. MINAM and GORESAM collaborate with CI Peru to develop information materials 2013
8. MINAM starts to involve regional governments 2014
9. GORESAM officially creates a safeguards committee 2014
10. GORESAM provides stronger facilitation of the safeguards process 2015
11. GORESAM starts to coordinate its action on REDD+ and safeguards with MINAM 2015
12. CI Peru starts to promote participation of stakeholders in safeguards process in San Martin 2012
13. Regional NGOs participate in safeguards meetings 2014

---

Link an outcome that contributes to 3 or more outcomes
Link between two outcomes
No contribution of the REDD+ SES Initiative
Key outcomes that contributed to several other outcomes:

- GORESAM initiating a participatory safeguards process (1) led to 5 key outcomes (2, 3, 5, 6, 13) that were instrumental in leading to the majority of outcomes.
- Of these 5 key outcomes, GORESAM creating a technical advisory group (6) and involving Indigenous Peoples (3) as well as regional NGOs participating in the safeguards process (13) led to MINAM starting to involve regional governments in the national safeguards process (8).

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

The following outcomes in Peru 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>
</table>
| 3 - GORESAM involves Indigenous Peoples in the REDD+ and safeguards process | c - Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities  
|                                                                  | d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders                   | Within REDD+     |
| 8 - MINAM involves regional governments in the national safeguards process | b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures                           | Within REDD+     |
| 9 - GORESAM officially creates a safeguards committee          | c - Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities  
|                                                                  | d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders                   | Within REDD+     |
| 10 - GORESAM provides stronger facilitation of the safeguards process | b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures                           | Within REDD+     |
| 13 – Regional NGOs participate in safeguards meetings          | d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders                   | Within REDD+     |
Findings on the factors contributing to the outcomes including the REDD+ SES Initiative

GORESAM and MINAM have been open and willing to take progressive steps towards developing and institutionalizing a more participatory approach to safeguards as part of the development of the REDD+ process, and other key stakeholders have progressively started to participate more actively. This process has been encourage by several contributing factors including support from CI Peru to the Region of San Martin to develop REDD+ activities and by the participation of San Martin and Peru in the REDD+ SES Initiative (differently at regional and national level). The first changes by CI Peru and GORESAM in 2012 (1, 12) that initiated the process were influenced by all aspects of REDD+ SES, including the principles, criteria and indicators, the process guidelines promoting a participatory multi-stakeholder approach, technical support from the secretariat, participation in exchange and learning workshops with other countries, and funding for staff time and meetings to facilitate the process.

Informants in Peru identified participation in the REDD+ SES exchange and learning workshops, and thereby understanding progress and experiences in other countries, as a key factor influencing 9 out of the 14 outcomes, in particular for all 4 of the changes by MINAM. The REDD+ SES process guidelines partially encouraged several key procedural outcomes in San Martin such as including Indigenous Peoples (3), creation of the multi-stakeholder safeguards committee (9) and the inclusion of other key stakeholder such as regional NGOs (13). In other cases, the technical support from the REDD+ SES secretariat made a more significant contribution than the process guidelines. The provision of small grants from the REDD+ SES Initiative for staff time, meetings and production of materials also helped to support the changes, bearing in mind that all the identified outcomes are significant changes in behavior related to adoption of a more participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards and are not just outputs of the REDD+ SES initiative activities and funding.

In comparison with other countries, the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicators have not contributed to the outcomes San Martin and Peru since the initial changes in 2012, and the outcomes have been relatively less influenced by the REDD+ SES process guidelines, whereas the exchange and learning opportunities were particularly important for outcomes in Peru, along with technical support and small grants in some cases.
### Outcomes of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Peru

<p>| Short description                                                                 | Outcome                                                                 | Significance for                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Factors contributing to the outcome and contribution of REDD+ SES Initiative                                                                 | Sources                                                                                                                                  | Substantiation                                                                                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <strong>Government support for strong and comprehensive safeguards</strong>                   |                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                            |
| 1 - GORESAM initiates a safeguards process with stakeholder participation       | From March 2012, the Regional Government of San Martin (GORESAM) starts to lead the safeguards process in the region to address the &quot;social&quot; aspects of REDD+ that had not been addressed to date through hiring a person to support the regional government in this process, including organizing meetings to raise awareness and build capacity of the REDD+ round table on safeguards. | This demonstrates the commitment of GORESAM to ensure that social and environmental safeguards are addressed and respected in the implementation of REDD+ even before they had been considered at the national level and to involve relevant stakeholders in this process through the REDD + round table. | The REDD + SES Initiative provided funding that initially enabled hiring a person to support the regional government in the safeguards process and the regional government found additional funding to maintain this position. The regional government also use the REDD+ SES PCI and guidelines to guide the process and received technical support based on countries’ experiences and expertise from the REDD+ SES Secretariat to advise on the process. The participation of representatives of GORESAM in annual REDD + SES exchange workshops also | Lucas Dourojeanni, Milagros Sandoval, Patricia Porras, Workshop REDD + SES Nepal exchange, April 2015 | Patricia Porras, Moyobamba interview, September 30, 2015 Milagros Sandoval, interview in Lima, October 2, 2015 Progress in developing safeguards for REDD + in the region of San Martin P.47 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>allowed GORESAM strengthen capacities to lead this process. These workshops provided an exclusive space to strengthen capacities of representatives and to learn about safeguards experience from other countries since there are no other specific learning spaces on safeguards (P, I, $, A, X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - MINAM creates a roadmap to involve stakeholders in the safeguards process</td>
<td>In August 2013, the Ministry of Environment creates a roadmap to design and implement REDD+ safeguards for the first time and involve stakeholders from government, civil society and indigenous peoples at relevant times in the process.</td>
<td>This roadmap allows stakeholders from government, civil society and Indigenous Peoples to understand the stages of the process to design and implement REDD+ safeguards and opportunities for their participation to strengthen this process (G)</td>
<td>The REDD + SES experience sharing workshops (Indonesia 2013, Mexico 2014, Nepal 2015) initiative, in which a representative of MINAM participated contributed to MINAM identifying the need for a clear process for involving stakeholders. The idea of developing this roadmap came from countries that had already started their safeguards process (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucas Dourojeani, Milagros Sandoval, Patricia Porras, Workshop REDD + SES Nepal exchange, April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentati on PPT, Early Idea for the Carbon Fund, March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - GORESAM starts to involve Indigenous Peoples in the REDD+ and safeguards process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change that: 3. Institutionalizes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) more participatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthens Cancun safeguards: c, d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension: Within REDD+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 2013, GORESAM began to engage Indigenous Peoples in REDD+ processes, including safeguards, through invitations to workshops on REDD+ training, on safeguards design and implementation processes (e.g., meetings for the creation of the Safeguards Committee).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This has helped to build trust between the government and representatives of Indigenous Peoples to develop public policies and ensure good governance for REDD+. It also enabled involvement of a marginalized group that had not been involved and that depend on forests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORESAM use REDD + SES guidelines to emphasize the importance of involving Indigenous Peoples in the safeguards process. Additionally, the REDD+ SES Initiative provided some funds to assist in the organization of capacity building workshops and other meetings that were complemented and catalyzed other sources of funding (Norad, USAID) (P, $)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Porras, Moyobamba interview, September 30, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4 - MINAM begins to communicate their approach to safeguards in international fora |
| Change that: 1. Enables |
| From 2013, the MINAM began to communicate its approach and progress of the safeguards process of Peru in international forums (REDD + SES exchange workshops Indonesia, Mexico, Nepal, workshops Latin American exchange in Peru and Mexico, events COP20). |
| This showed the commitment of Peru to promote a transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards (G) |
| The REDD + SES Initiative contributed partially to support the participation of a representative of MINAM at REDD + SES exchange and learning workshops on and Latin American exchange workshops on safeguards. (X) |
| Milagros Sandoval, interview in Lima, October 2, 2015 |

| 5 - GORESAM starts to present regional safeguards process in national and |
| From 2013, GORESAM began to present the participatory process that it adopted as the first region that has addressed the issue of safeguards, both nationally and |
| This demonstrates the pioneering position and commitment of San Martin to promote a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards and |
| The REDD + SES Initiative partially contributed to support the participation of a representative of |
| Milagros Sandoval, interview in Lima, October 2, 2015 |

<p>| Advances in the development of REDD + safeguards |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change that:</th>
<th>Enables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>international events</strong></td>
<td>internationally (REDD+ SES exchange workshops, COP20, national workshops organized by the MINAM, Interregional Amazon Council meetings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Enables</strong></td>
<td>contribute to the national process and promoting a similar process in other regions of Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 - GORESAM creates a Technical Advisory Group</strong></td>
<td>In April 2013, GORESAM established a technical advisory group composed of NGOs SPDA, CIMA and CHIRAPAQ to provide technical support GORESAM by making sure that decisions are grounded in a solid technical foundation and facilitating the safeguards design and implementation process that is socially, legally and environmentally coherent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change that: 3. Institutionalizes</strong></td>
<td>Ensures that the safeguards process and approach of the San Martin region is technically robust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How:</strong></td>
<td>CI PERU provided support and the REDD+ SES Initiative contributed with technical advice based on countries experiences and safeguards expertise, capacity building and some funding that enabled to organize the first meetings of the Technical Advisory Group ($, A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) more participatory</strong></td>
<td>Advances in the development of REDD + safeguards in San Martin Region P.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d) governance structures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dimension: Within REDD+</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthens Cancun safeguards: b, d</strong></td>
<td>From 2013, MINAM and GORESAM start to collaborate with CI Peru to develop different information and training materials as posters, videos, brochures, etc. suitable for different groups of actors building on the lessons learned from the process of information dissemination (workshops, briefings) about REDD+ and safeguards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change that: 1. Enables</strong></td>
<td>This has ensured the dissemination of information through a more systematic approach to capacity building in an appropriate format and approach for the different actors so that they understand about REDD+ and safeguards can participate effectively in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The REDD + SES Initiative provided technical support for the development of materials and financial support that partially helped fund their development of them and that were complemented and catalyzed additional funding (Norad, USAID). ($, A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milagros Sandoval, interview in Lima, October 2, 2015 REDD + Safeguards brochure (<a href="http://www.redd-standards.org/images/Leaflet_REDD_safeguards.pdf">http://www.redd-standards.org/images/Leaflet_REDD_safeguards.pdf</a>) Video REDD + safeguards,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**in San Martin Region P.47 & 48**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 - MINAM starts to involve regional governments in the national safeguards process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change that:</strong> 3. Institutionalizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How:</strong> a) more participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthens Cancun safeguards:</strong> b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension:</strong> Within REDD+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 2014, the Ministry of Environment (MINAM) started to strengthen regional governments’ participation (San Martin, Madre de Dios, Ucayali, Loreto) in the national safeguards development and implementation process through invitations to government representatives to participate in workshops to provide information on safeguards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 - GORESAM officially creates a safeguards committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change that:</strong> 3. Institutionalizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How:</strong> a) more participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On December 9, 2014, GORESAM published an ordinance to create a regional safeguards committee, which recognizes and formally involves REDD+ stakeholders including indigenous communities, academia and the private sector for the first time, since up to this time mainly NGOs were involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) more participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) governance structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension: Within REDD+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Since August 2015, the technical advisory group composed of SPDA, CIMA and CHIRAPAQ decided to dissolve the facilitation team for safeguards composed of CI Peru and GORESAM because GORESAM provides stronger facilitation of the safeguards process at regional level. GORESAM with the support of a climate change team composed of 5 people in government, that among other responsibilities, organize the safeguards process including the definition of the work plan for safeguards and involvement of stakeholders, and providing a secretariat for the Safeguards Committee.**

This demonstrates GORESAM commitment to implement effective safeguards for REDD+ through its institutionalization of a work program for safeguards within GORESAM and allocation of adequate human resources.

This resulted from a long process of progressive empowerment of GORESAM supported by CI Peru. The REDD+ SES Initiative partially contributed through the participation of representatives of GORESAM in exchange and learning workshops that provided an exclusive space to strengthen capacities of representatives and to learn about safeguards experience from other countries since there are no other specific learning spaces on safeguards. In addition, technical support and capacity building provided by the REDD+ SES

Patricia Porras, Moyobamba interview, September 30, 2015
11 - GORESAM starts to coordinate its actions on REDD+ and safeguards with MINAM

*Change that:*
2. *Demonstrates How:*
   a) more participatory

From 2013, GORESAM has strengthened the articulation of their REDD+ activities, including safeguards, with MINAM and the SERFOR (Ministry of Agriculture) through greater involvement of GORESAM at meetings convened by MINAM on climate change and forests (e.g. meetings of PNBCC), the Amazon region (Amazon interregional Council) and international (GCF REDD + SES workshops etc. exchange).

This demonstrates the willingness of GORESAM to be informed and linked with the national process and to develop a coherent and aligned REDD+ process, including for safeguards, at the regional level. This also demonstrates GORESAM empowerment and commitment to promote the position and progress of the region of San Martin in REDD+, including the implementation of safeguards in an effective, participatory and transparent manner.

This resulted from a long process of progressive empowerment of GORESAM supported by CI Peru. The REDD + SES Initiative partially contributed through the participation of representatives of GORESAM in exchange and learning workshops that provided an exclusive space to strengthen capacities of representatives and to learn about safeguards experience from other countries since there are no other specific learning spaces on safeguards. In addition, technical support and capacity building provided by the REDD+ SES.
### Civil Society Engagement for Strong and Comprehensive Safeguards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change that: 2. Demonstrates How:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) more participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - CI Peru starts to promote the participation of stakeholders in the safeguards process in San Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 2012, CI Peru started to promote the participation of relevant stakeholders for REDD+ in the safeguards processes at regional and national level (e.g. in San Martin) through the dissemination of information in the national government, the civil society spaces (e.g. REDD+ round tables). This resulted in the empowerment and leadership of the national government and GORESAM processes safeguards and regular participation of civil society in meetings on safeguards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI Peru played a critical role in promoting the participation of all stakeholders in the safeguards processes, and a rights-based approach, and empowering relevant government institutions to lead safeguards processes at national and regional levels because other NGOs haven’t been so involved in the safeguards processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI Peru used REDD + SES Guidelines and the PCI and used some funds from the REDD + SES Initiative that were complemented and catalyzed additional funding (Norad, USAID) to promote and disseminate information about the importance and experience of participatory processes for safeguards in the different government and civil society fora, with the technical support of the REDD + SES Secretariat. Additionally, CI Peru's participation in the REDD+ SES exchange and learning workshops since 2010 has enabled sharing of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milagros Sandoval, interview in Lima, October 2, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

secretariat based on country experiences and expertise helped to strengthen the capacities of the government. (A, X)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change that:</th>
<th>3. Institutionalizes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How:</td>
<td>a) more participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthens Cancun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>safeguards: d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension:</td>
<td>Within REDD+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>