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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWF</td>
<td>African Wildlife Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCB</td>
<td>Climate, Community &amp; Biodiversity Standards</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>JGI</td>
<td>Jane Goodall Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUMCIAZA</td>
<td>Association for the Conservation of Community Forests of Zanzibar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDI</td>
<td>Mpingo Conservation Development Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJUMITA</td>
<td>Community Forest Conservation Network of Tanzania</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>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>TATEDO</td>
<td>Tanzania Traditional Energy Development and Environment Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFCG</td>
<td>Tanzania Forest Conservation Group</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 Tanzania where the Initiative has been working.

The main focus of the report is an examination of progress in developing and using CSA in Tanzania 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 Tanzania.

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+:

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**

![Diagram showing potential processes and considerations for the development of a country safeguards approach.](image-url)
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.

---

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 institution².

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 results of the progress and outcomes in Tanzania 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, 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 and other stakeholders who had been involved in the safeguards process in Nepal at the annual REDD+ SES Exchange & Learning workshop in Nepal in April 2015. Further outcomes and clarifications were collected through additional interviews on skype undertaken by Phil Franks of the REDD+ SES Secretariat in November 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

Actor 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 Tanzania

REDD+ in Tanzania and the development of a country safeguards approach

Tanzania started to develop a National Framework for REDD+ in 2009 which is the basis of Tanzania’s REDD+ Strategy. The development and implementation of the REDD+ Strategy is led by the National REDD+ Task Force which published a second draft in June 2012. Various stakeholder groups from different sectors including civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples, local communities and government provided inputs to the development of the REDD+ strategy through five technical working groups on Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV), Energy, Agriculture, Financial Mechanisms and Legal, Governance and Safeguards.

Efforts to address and respect REDD+ safeguards started with their inclusion in the design and implementation of REDD+ pilot projects implemented by civil society organizations from 2010. The government started to develop a national safeguards process in 2012 with the support of the joint government and civil society Legal, Governance and Safeguards Technical Working Group. During 2012 and 2013, government and civil society developed principles, criteria and indicators to provide information on how REDD+ safeguards are addressed and respected.

Tanzania started participating in the REDD+ SES Initiative from 2009 when the Director of the Forests and Beekeeping Division participated in the first international meeting of the REDD+SES Initiative. Also in 2009, one of the country-level consultations on the first draft of the REDD+ SES principle, criteria and indicator framework was held in Dar es Salaam. This was followed by a series of capacity building workshops on safeguards organised by the REDD+ SES Initiative and the UN-REDD Programme, and participation of both government and civil society actors involved in REDD+ and safeguards in many of the REDD+ SES exchange and learning workshops. Tanzania has used the REDD+ SES guidance and tools as good practice guidance for development of a country safeguards approach. Progress in development of the country safeguards approach has been slow over the last two years due to changes in the institutional arrangements for REDD+ in Tanzania but will shortly resume.
Timeline and status of outcomes related to a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Tanzania

<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>2010</td>
<td>8 - CSOs demonstrate practical application of safeguards</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - CSOs engage strongly in Tanzania’s PCI development</td>
<td>civil society</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - Government and civil society agree on development of a grievance mechanism for REDD+</td>
<td>joint government and civil society</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1 - Government staff take a leading role in facilitating CSA/SIS development</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Government becomes increasingly willing to publically commit to CSA/SIS development</td>
<td>civil society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3 - Government commits to start developing CSA/SIS</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Government creates a working group on legal, governance and safeguards</td>
<td>civil society</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Government includes civil society in REDD+ Task Force</td>
<td>civil society</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Zanzibar Government delegates authority for key REDD+ activities to civil society</td>
<td>joint government and civil society</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7 - Key politicians engage in PCI development</td>
<td>civil society</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - Government and civil society agree on development of a grievance mechanism for REDD+</td>
<td>joint government and civil society</td>
<td>3</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

The first practical experience working on safeguards for REDD+ in Tanzania was from 2010 when six NGOs working on REDD+ pilot projects in Tanzania (JGI, TFCG/MJUMITA, CARE, AWF, MCDI, TATEDO) gave strong emphasis to safeguards in the design and implementation of their REDD+ projects. This was important in terms of civil society organizations demonstrating their commitment to safeguards and gaining experience on safeguards in general and key specific issues and thus more credibly engage in national level safeguards processes (outcome 8).

Civil society organizations have encouraged, engaged in and supported development of a country safeguards approach but real progress requires government leadership, which started from 2011 when some government staff started increasingly taking a leading role in facilitating safeguards discussions (1). At the same time, the government staff leading the development and implementation of the national REDD+ strategy started to publically commit to developing a country safeguards approach, for example by organizing side events at UNFCCC meetings publicizing Tanzania’s plans and progress on safeguards (2).

In 2012, the Government REDD+ Task Force decided to develop safeguards principles, criteria and indicators with participation from civil society, which signaled government ownership of the development of the country safeguards approach, and their willingness to work with civil society. This led to the Government REDD+ Task Force creating a Technical Working Group on legal, governance and safeguards that included members from government, non-governmental and private sector organizations (4). This was an important step in institutionalizing a multi-stakeholder governance structure for REDD+ when all previous governance entities had been comprised only of government. Around the same time in 2012, the government revised the membership of the REDD+ task force to include one member from civil society organizations (5), which was also a significant step in institutionalizing a more participatory approach to REDD+ in general, and not just for safeguards issues. The participatory process for development of the REDD+ safeguards indicators in 2012 created an opportunity and encouraged strong civil society participation and input to strengthen Tanzania’s approach to safeguards, and also served as a way to build capacity and understanding of REDD+ and safeguards among the participants (9). The indicator consultations also encouraged key politicians to engage in the safeguards indicator development in 2013, which led to increased awareness and buy-in of this group for REDD+ as well as providing input to strengthen the safeguards approach (7). A workshop to validate the indicator framework in 2013 also led to a discussion and agreement among government and civil society on development of a grievance mechanism for REDD+, based on stakeholder proposal that the existing grievance mechanism should be strengthened in terms of transparency, accessibility and gender sensitivity (10).

Separately, and consistent with the increasingly formal engagement of civil society in REDD+, the Zanzibar government decided to delegate authority for administration of carbon trading including monitoring REDD+ activities and safeguards a local NGO JUMCIAZA (Association for the Conservation of Community Forests of Zanzibar) (6).
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.

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

- The government commitment to start developing the safeguards process in 2012 (3) made an important contribution to several other outcomes (4, 7, 9, 10).

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

The following outcomes in Tanzania 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>
| 4 - Government creates a working group on legal, governance and safeguards | b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures  
d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders | Within REDD+     |
| 5 - Government includes civil society in REDD+ Task Force                     | b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures  
d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders | Within REDD+     |
| 6 - Zanzibar Government delegates authority for key REDD+ activities to civil society | b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures  
d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders | Within REDD+     |
| 8 - CSOs demonstrate practical application of safeguards                      | a - Consistency and complementarity with national forest programmes and international agreements  
b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures  
c - Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities  
d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders  
e - Conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, no conversion of natural forests, incentive for the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits | Within REDD+     |
| 10 - Government and civil society agree on development of a grievance mechanism for REDD+ | b - Transparent and effective forest governance structures  
d - The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders | Within REDD+     |
Findings on the factors contributing to the outcomes including the REDD+ SES Initiative

The early experiences of NGOs applying safeguards in REDD+ pilot projects in 2010 (8) were motivated by many factors including the NGOs’ interests in developing sound and fair projects, and also because the Norwegian Embassy funding the projects required strong safeguards. In addition, one of the first consultation workshops to develop the international REDD+ SES principle, criteria and indicator framework was held in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, in 2009 with civil society and government so many of NGO teams were aware of the elements of strong REDD+ safeguards and were influenced by the REDD+ SES indicator framework.

Government and civil society actors involved in REDD+ had been participating in the REDD+ SES exchange and learning workshops from 2010, and the increased expertise and confidence from these exchanges with other countries helped some of the government staff to start taking a leading role in development of a country safeguards approach from 2011 (1). In addition, the clear guidance provided by the REDD+ SES process guidelines and indicator framework, along with contributions from UN-REDD, helped to demystify and clarify the safeguards agenda and encourage greater government commitment to development of a country safeguards approach (2, 3).

The strong emphasis on a multi-stakeholder approach in the REDD+ SES guidelines contributed to six of the ten outcomes, encouraging adoption of a more participatory approach (e.g. 3,9,7) and multi-stakeholder governance structures (e.g. 5). Using the REDD+ SES principles, criteria and indicator framework contributed to four of the ten outcomes. Using a comprehensive framework as a starting point for development of country-specific indicators helped to encourage strong civil society participation (9) and also led to government and civil society agreement on the principles for a REDD+ grievance mechanism (10).
## Outcomes of a participatory, transparent and comprehensive approach to safeguards in Tanzania

<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>1 - Government support for strong and comprehensive safeguards</strong></td>
<td>From 2011 government staff (notably Tamrini Said Ali and Faustin Ninga) have increasingly taken a leading role in facilitating safeguards discussions in Tanzania</td>
<td>Important in demonstrating government leadership</td>
<td>The participation of Tamrini and Ninga in REDD+ SES International Steering Committee and/or annual learning events was the main factor giving them both increased expertise and confidence. (X)</td>
<td>Conversation and email with Rahima Njaidi of MJUMITA and Charles Meshack of TFCG and Task Force 5th October 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change that:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Enables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 - Government becomes increasingly willing to publically commit to CSA/SIS development</strong></td>
<td>From 2011, Government actors became generally more willing to commit to meeting their international commitments to REDD+ safeguards e.g. in organizing events at COPs publicizing Tanzania's work on CSA/SIS</td>
<td>CSA/SIS work at country level showed in practical terms how international commitments could be met and thereby made government staff more comfortable to publically commit to CSA/SIS development</td>
<td>SES guidance and PCI and contributions from UN-REDD both contributed in helping to demystify/clarify the safeguards agenda. (P, I)</td>
<td>Conversation and email with Rahima Njaidi of MJUMITA and Charles Meshack of TFCG and Task Force 5th October 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change that:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Enables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 - Government commits to start developing CSA/SIS</strong></td>
<td>In 2012, the Government REDD+ task force decided to develop safeguards principles, criteria and indicators for Tanzania based on REDD+ SES PCI with</td>
<td>This was important both in terms of signaling government ownership and leadership for CSA/SIS work and also increasing engagement of civil society</td>
<td>Tanzania was following the 10 step SES process and this was step 5 of the process. The SES PCI was also important in providing a clear</td>
<td>Tamrini Said Ally of Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources Zanzibar at Nepal workshop 16 April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Change that:
#### 2. Demonstrates
**How:**
- a) more participatory
- b) more comprehensive
  - i) leadership

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stakeholder participation</td>
<td>framework. <em>(P, I)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFCG and REDD+ Task Force on 5th October 2015 agreed with outcome and provided significance and contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 - Government creates a working group on legal, governance and safeguards

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2012, the Government REDD+ Task Force created a Technical Working Group on legal, governance and safeguards with members from government, NGOs and private institutions</td>
<td>This institutionalized safeguard considerations within the governance structures of REDD+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of this working group was not influenced by REDD+ SES. Government formed this committee largely in response to international requirements to address governance and safeguard issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamrini Said Ally of Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources Zanzibar at Nepal workshop 16 April 2015.</td>
<td>Conversation with Rahima Njaidi of MJUMITA and Charles Meshack of TFCG and REDD+ Task Force on 5th October 2015 agreed with outcome and provided significance and contribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Institutionalize

**How:**
- a) more participatory
- d) governance structures

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthens Cancun safeguards: b,d Dimension: within REDD+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 - Government includes civil society in REDD+ Task Force

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2012, government revised the membership of the REDD+ task force to include one member representing civil society organizations</td>
<td>This was important in institutionalizing the participation of civil society in CSA/SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The strong emphasis in REDD+ SES guidelines on civil society engagement made an important contribution. <em>(P)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamrini Said Ally of Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources Zanzibar at Nepal workshop 16 April 2015.</td>
<td>Conversation with Rahima Njaidi of MJUMITA and Charles Meshack of TFCG and REDD+ Task Force on 5th October 2015 agreed with outcome and provided significance and contribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Change that:
3. Institutionalizes
How:
- a) more participatory
d) governance structures
Strengthens Cancun safeguards: b,d
Dimension: within REDD+

| 6 - Zanzibar | In 2013, the Department of Forestry in the Ministry of Agriculture in Zanzibar designated a local NGO JUMIJAZA (Association for Conservation of Community Forests of Zanzibar) to have the role of Administering Carbon trading and related uses:
- Monitoring REDD+ activities
- Planning conservation
- Administration of carbon benefits | This applies to Zanzibar only. The action of government was important in increasing engagement of civil society in REDD+ in Zanzibar | REDD+ SES may have had some influence on the way this arrangement was set up but not very significant | 2015. | Tamrini Said Ally of Ministry Agriculture and Natural Resources Zanzibar at Nepal workshop 16 April 2015. | Conversation with Rahima Njaidi of MJUMITA and Charles Meshack of TFCG and REDD+ Task Force on 5th October 2015 agreed with outcome and provided significance and contribution |

<p>| 7 - Key politicians | In 2013, as part of the PCI | This consultation led to increased | This was part of step 6 | Tamrini Said Ally | Conversation |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change that:</th>
<th>How:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Demonstrates | a) more participatory  
   i) leadership |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change that:</th>
<th>How:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. Institutionalizes | a) more participatory  
   c) more comprehensive  
   i) leadership  
   Strengthens Cancun safeguards: a, b, c, d, e |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension: within</th>
<th>Validation process members of Standing Committee on Land, National Resources and Environment of the Tanzanian Parliament participated in a consultation on the PCI.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 - CSOs demonstrate practical application of safeguards</td>
<td>From 2010, 6 NGOs working on REDD+ pilot projects in Tanzania (JGI, TFCG, CARE, AWF, MCDI, TATEDO) gave strong emphasis to safeguards in the design and implementation of their REDD+ projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important in terms of civil society organizations demonstrating their commitment to safeguards, and gaining experience on safeguards in general and key specific issues (e.g. FPIC) and thus more credibly engage in national level CSA/SIS development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | Project proponents were encouraged to address safeguards by the donor, Norwegian Embassy,  
   CSOs were aware of REDD+ SES PCI after a consultation workshop for their development in Dar es Salaam in 2009.  
   To a greater or lesser extent all the NGOs based their project safeguards on the REDD+ SES PCI. *(I)* |
| | With Rahima Njaidi of MJUMITA and Charles Meshack of TFCG and REDD+ Task Force on 5th October 2015 agreed with outcome and provided significance and contribution |

**Civil society engagement for strong and comprehensive safeguards**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>REDD+</strong></th>
<th><strong>Change that:</strong></th>
<th><strong>How:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Change that:</strong></th>
<th><strong>How:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Government and civil society joint support for strong and comprehensive safeguards</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 - CSOs engage strongly in Tanzania’s PCI development</td>
<td>In 2012, members of various civil society organizations were strongly engaged in consultation meetings for inputs on REDD+ safeguards PCI including during the PCI validation workshop in 2013</td>
<td>This strong civil society input improved the quality of Tanzania’s PCI and the process greatly increased participants understanding of safeguards</td>
<td>This was part of step 6 of the REDD+ SES process and wouldn’t have happened otherwise. (P, I)</td>
<td>Tamrini Said Ally of Ministry Agriculture and Natural Resources Zanzibar at Nepal workshop 16 April 2015.</td>
<td>Conversation with Rahima Njaidi of MJUMITA and Charles Meshack of TFCG and REDD+ Task Force on 5th October 2015 agreed with outcome and provided significance and contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Government and civil society agree on development of a grievance mechanism for REDD+</td>
<td>In 2013, the stakeholders proposed and the government agreed that a grievance mechanism for REDD+ should use the existing grievance mechanism and that it should be transparent, accessible, and gender sensitive. This was discussed and agreed during the workshop to validate the PCI.</td>
<td>The discussion that led to this decision prompted stakeholders to review the different options for a REDD+ grievance mechanism and and their respective benefits and costs and generate consensus on the best approach for a REDD+ grievance mechanism in Tanzania</td>
<td>Tanzania was following the 10 step SES process and this was part of step 6 of the process, The SES PCI were also important highlighting this issue. (P, I)</td>
<td>Tamrini Said Ally of Ministry Agriculture and Natural Resources Zanzibar at Nepal workshop 16 April 2015.</td>
<td>Conversation with Rahima Njaidi of MJUMITA and Charles Meshack of TFCG and REDD+ Task Force on 5th October 2015 agreed with outcome and provided significance and contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transparent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safeguards:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b,d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>