

REVIEW

Social Safeguards in National and Sub-national REDD+ Initiatives: A comparison based on literature review

Seiji IWANAGA^{1,4*}, Yasuhiro YOKOTA² and Kimihiko HYAKUMURA³

¹ Faculty of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Tsukuba (Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8572, Japan)

² Kyushu Research Center, Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute (Kumamoto, Kumamoto 860-0862, Japan)

³ Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Kyushu University (Fukuoka, Fukuoka 812-8581, Japan)

Abstract

REDD+ is an approach to reduce deforestation and forest degradation, using economic incentives to influence behavior. The need for safeguards has emerged to avoid the negative social and environmental impacts caused by an overemphasis of such economic incentives. In the context of safeguards, in addition to the UNFCCC's official efforts, voluntary activities (initiatives) by many organizations have attempted to formulate principles, criteria, indicators and guidelines. In this article, we clarified the elements to enhance social safeguards and discussed how those elements are included in each initiative. We reviewed the literature on the SEPC, SESA and REDD+ SES initiatives, and clarified the focal points and problems relating to social safeguards. We found that benefit-sharing is an important aspect of social safeguards, and that more discussions are needed to enhance initiatives. The REDD+ SES initiative has received little criticism in literature to date and has the best-covered elements including "benefit-sharing" among the three initiatives. If more countries adopt REDD+ SES and more cases can be accumulated to identify problems and solutions, it could become a popular initiative in the international community to enhance the social safeguards in REDD+.

Discipline: Forestry and forest products

Additional key words: SEPC (Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria), SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment), REDD+ SES (Social & Environmental Standards)

Introduction

The concept of "Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries" (REDD) was proposed at the Eleventh Conference of the Parties (COP11) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 2005. It garnered recognition as a climate mitigation framework, and later gained the "+" (or "plus") denotation to signify expansion of the concept to encompass measures for forest conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks. It came to be called REDD+ after COP 13 in 2007 (UNFCCC 2007). REDD+ initiatives offer such economic incentives as carbon credits or funding

for activities toward reducing deforestation and forest degradation, and enhancing the removal of greenhouse gases (GHG) from the atmosphere (*ibid.*). It was pointed out, however, that if economic efficiency was the driving concern, REDD+ might lead to a preference for the removal of CO₂ from the atmosphere and a transition from natural to plantation forests of fast growing trees, and later to restrictions on the use of other forest resources and on access to forests by indigenous peoples and local communities (Hein & Van der Meer 2012, Mc Dermott et al. 2011, Rey et al. 2013). To avoid such social and environmental risks, and create measures and policies toward increasing the positive effects, there was a desire to formulate safeguards (Mc Dermott et al. 2012, REDD+ SES 2014, UN-REDD 2012).

This study was funded by the program "Project for Priority Preparation of Systems to Promote REDD" through the Forestry Agency of the Japanese government.

Present address:

⁴ Department of Forest Policy and Economics, Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute (Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8687, Japan)

*Corresponding author: e-mail iwanagasage@ffpri.affrc.go.jp

Received 24 March 2015; accepted 18 April 2016.

At COP 16 in 2010, a list known as the “Cancun Safeguards” was adopted with text mentioning “taking into account national legislation and sovereignty,” “conservation of natural forests and biological diversity,” “respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities,” and “effective participation of relevant stakeholders” (UNFCCC 2011a)¹. Adopted at COP 16 and a subsequent meeting, the Cancun Agreement (Decision 1/CP.16) and Durban Agreement (Decision 12/CP.17 and Decision 2/CP.17) include guidelines, procedures and policy instruments for the safeguards (UNFCCC 2011a, 2012a). The parties concerned requested the development of a Safeguard Information System (SIS) to provide information about how participant countries should promote and support activities in accordance with the safeguards, and how to address and recognize the safeguards. In this regard, 26 countries and groups handed in submissions at the meeting of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technical Advice (SBSTA) in June 2011 (Larsen et al. 2012, UNFCCC 2011b). COP 18 led to no modification of these documents (UNFCCC 2012b), but at COP 19 in 2013, agreement was reached on how to reference the safeguard information (UNFCCC 2013). And at COP 21 in 2015, guidance was adopted to note that information on how the safeguards are being addressed and respected should be provided in a way that ensures transparency, consistency, comprehensiveness and effectiveness (UNFCCC 2015).

In addition to the UNFCCC’s official activities, there are many voluntary activities (referred to below as “initiatives”) to formulate principles, criteria, indicators and guidelines by many organizations, such as UN-REDD managed by the UN Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). These initiatives have some variety in terms of implementation agencies (e.g. international organizations, state governments, private sector), work being done alone or in collaboration, and target area (national, sub-national or project level) (Roe et al. 2013). There are reportedly 14 initiatives in total, including nine national and sub-national initiatives (FCMC 2012). Many reports or journals have reviewed their merits and demerits after COP 16 in 2010.

The Cancun Safeguards could be categorized in terms of theme (natural environment, social aspects, forest

governance, or procedural), and are discussed in the context of avoiding the risks of negative impacts and enhancing the positive effects of each (Compese 2011, Roe et al. 2013, Stickler et al. 2012). The natural environment is not mainly discussed as the issue of safeguards, but as an extension of discussions on biodiversity and ecosystems in REDD+ (Alexander et al. 2011, Gardner et al. 2012, Phelps et al. 2012, Pistorius et al. 2011). Social aspects are discussed in terms of the importance of such issues as indigenous peoples, local communities, and land rights. Mention about indigenous peoples and local communities necessitates a focus on creating alternatives if livelihoods are to be reduced by limitations placed on access to forests due to REDD+ implementation; moreover, there is mention about enhancing their living standards, and respect for their rights, traditional knowledge, and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) (Anderson 2011, Schwart 2010, Silori et al. 2013, Thompson et al. 2011). There is also mention about land rights, such as the need to respect traditional customary land rights (Larson et al. 2013, Sunderlin et al. 2014, Wright 2011), the risk of conflicts due to forest tenure reforms (Brockhaus et al. 2012, Larson 2011, Westholm et al. 2011), and the risk of rising land prices (Cotula & Mayers 2009). There have also been discussions about forest governance targeting compliance with international laws, and good domestic governance, such as the importance of “nested” governance (decision-making at each level—international, national and local), and the necessity for governance that respects stakeholders’ rights (Corbera & Schroeder 2011, Kanowski et al. 2011, Sikor et al. 2010). In this article, we defined social safeguards as not only the social aspects (with many issues, such as the recognition of indigenous people and land rights) but also forest governance (which also relates to indigenous people and land rights).

With regard to initiatives, Ehara et al. (2013) proposed original criteria to compare initiatives, and articulated the view that it is necessary to ensure harmony among initiatives, in order to enhance and innovate environmental safeguards. On the other hand, much literature that reviewed social safeguards and forest governance did not include a high degree of diversity, as many authors were promoting their own organization’s initiative by emphasizing its merits or the authors only reviewed one aspect among many (Anderson 2011, Boyle & Murphy 2012, Forest & Landscape

¹ The Cancun Safeguards consist of seven safeguards: 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; e) That actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that the 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.

2012, IUCN 2010, Johl & Lador 2012, Krebichi et al. 2012, Pro Forest 2010, Sommerville 2011, Westholm et al. 2011). Therefore, we focused on social safeguards and not only targeted aspects one by one but also covered all of these issues to holistically check their focal points.

Based on these points, we clarified the elements to enhance social safeguards effectively, safely, equally and fairly. Then we discussed how these clarified elements are included in each initiative, and what kind of safeguard initiative is suitable to implement REDD+.

We reviewed literature written by third parties about initiatives that focus on many issues from several angles, and clarified important and problematic points about safeguards mentioned in the literature. We then focused on national- and sub-national-level safeguard initiatives under consideration by the UNFCCC, and collected and examined existing literature that reviews three initiatives: Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria (SEPC) by UN-REDD, Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) by the World Bank, and Social & Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES) by the Climate, Communities and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) and CARE international. These three initiatives are the main national and sub-national initiatives mentioned by Moss and Nussbaum (2011) and Roe et al. (2013). Finally, we reviewed the cited literature systematically to count and analyze what checkpoints were utilized for evaluation, and how to evaluate and propose initiatives. The literature reviewed was published before 31 October 2013 and is available on the Internet.

Results

1. Outline of safeguard initiatives

We began with outlines of the SEPC, SESA and REDD+ SES initiatives and a comparison of their content.

(1) SEPC by UN-REDD

Launched in 2008, the UN-REDD Programme is a partnership of the FAO, UNDP, and UNEP. In 2013, 16 national-level REDD+ programs and UN-REDD global programmes in certain countries were implemented (UN-REDD 2014). These programs aim to support developing countries in preparing for participation in REDD+ mechanisms, in order to develop guidance and standard approaches toward promoting REDD+, and ensure that activities promote social and environmental benefits and reduce risks from REDD+ (Compese 2011). As a consortium of UN programmes, UN-REDD is obligated to promote respect for, and seek the full realization of human rights and environmental instruments under the UN framework and international law, including the United Nations Declaration

on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN DRIP).

The SEPC initiative consists of seven principles and 24 criteria (Table 1). For activities that are financially supported by the UN-REDD Programme, the SEPC initiative contributes guidelines to address such social and environmental issues as support for developing a strategy to facilitate and implement REDD+. Under UN-REDD, there is no safeguard accompanied by legal binding conditions and/or a contract; however, all countries that adopt SEPC must attend to verification and admission, and also abide by a large variety of UN regulations (Roe et al. 2013).

(2) SESA by the FCPF

The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), established under the World Bank in 2007, is a partnership among developing countries, donor countries, and private sector participants². In 2013, 36 developing countries and 17 donor countries were participating (FCPF 2012). The FCPF aims to provide financial and technical assistance for REDD+ readiness preparation, and develop a carbon finance mechanism to support pilot REDD+ projects (Compese 2011). Activities under the FCPF must comply with safeguard policies of the World Bank, because the World Bank acts as the trustee for the Readiness Fund and the Carbon Fund, and is the delivery partner for the FCPF. Relevant World Bank Operational Policies (OPs) cover a range of environmental, social, governance and procedural issues, with varying degrees of specificity.

In the SESA initiative, there are five World Bank OPs (4.01 Environmental Assessment, 4.04 Natural Habitats, 4.10 Indigenous Peoples, 4.12 Involuntary Resettlement, and 4.36 Forests) correspond to the UNFCCC's safeguards (FCPF 2013), and only apply to countries receiving funding from the FCPF readiness fund (*ibid.*) (Table 2). The SESA initiative is in the process of developing a framework and continuing revisions (Roe et al. 2013). SESA is legally binding by contract, and noncompliance could result in an inspection panel process and suspension of the contract or funding (*ibid.*).

(3) REDD+ SES

REDD+ SES were developed between 2009 and 2012 through an inclusive process that engaged governments, NGOs, civil society organizations, indigenous people's organizations, international policy and research institutions, and the private sector in an effort to set out a comprehensive, clear and easy-to-follow set of recommendations that comply with official standards from the UNFCCC, and which serve as guidance for governments that implement REDD+ programs (Roe et al. 2013). REDD+ SES do not involve international organizations or implement financial grants (Greenpeace 2012), but provide available

² The FCPF has two funds: a readiness fund and a carbon fund. The readiness fund pays for capacity building, including initial planning. The carbon fund pays for practical activities toward reducing carbon emissions. The private sector only participates in the carbon fund.

Table 1. Seven principles and 24 criteria of SEPC

Principle	Criterion
1 Applying norms of democratic governance	1 Ensure transparency and accountability and fund management systems
	2 Ensure legitimacy and accountability
	3 Ensure transparency and accessibility of information
	4 Ensure the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders
	5 Promote coordination, efficiency and effectiveness
	6 Promote the rule of law, access to justice and effective remedies
2 Respect and protect stakeholder rights	7 Respect and promote the recognition and exercise of rights
	8 Promote gender equality, gender equity and women's empowerment
	9 Seek free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)
	10 Ensure there is no involuntary resettlement
3 Sustainable livelihoods and poverty reduction	11 Respect traditional knowledge, and cultural heritage and practices
	12 Ensure equitable, non-discriminatory and transparent benefit-sharing
4 Contribute to low-carbon, climate-resilient sustainable development policy	13 Protect and enhance economic and social well-being
	14 Consistency with and contribution to national climate policy objectives
	15 Address the risk of reversals of REDD+ achievements
	16 Poverty reduction and sustainable development
5 Protect natural forest from degradation and/or conversion	17 Contribution to national biodiversity conservation policies
	18 Do not cause the conversion of natural forest to planted forest
	19 Avoid or minimize degradation of natural forest
6 Maintain and enhance multiple functions of forest	20 Avoid or minimize indirect land-use change impacts
	21 Taking account of potential synergies and trade-offs for land-use planning
7 Avoid adverse impacts on ecosystem and biodiversity	22 Planted and natural forests management for ecosystem and biodiversity
	23 Avoid adverse impacts on carbon stocks, ecosystem and biodiversity
	24 Avoid adverse impacts on non-forest ecosystems

Source: UN-REDD (2012)

* These principles and criteria were summarized by the authors.

Table 2. Safeguards of SESA

OP No.	Content
4.01	Environmental Assessment
4.04	Natural Habitats
4.10	Indigenous Peoples
4.12	Involuntary Resettlement
4.36	Forests

Source: FCPF (2013)

frameworks and guidelines to governments that implement national or sub-national REDD+ programs, and to NGOs,

financing agencies and other stakeholders that support such programs. CCBA and CARE International serve as the secretariat. In 2014, REDD+ SES were applied in Ecuador, Nepal, the state of Acre in Brazil, and the province of Central Kalimantan in Indonesia (REDD+ SES 2014).

A second version of REDD+ SES resulted from a revision in September 2012 and consists of seven principles, 28 criteria, and 64 frameworks for indicators (Table 3). The principles and criteria are the same in all countries, and indicators are identified through meetings among several national level stakeholders, and created depending on the situation of each country. All countries participating in REDD+ SES are following a ten-step process organized around three core elements: governance, interpretation and assessment (REDD+ SES 2012). This process is a norm for

Table 3. Seven principles and 28 criteria of REDD+ SES

Principle	Criteria
1 Respects rights to lands, territories and resources	1.1 Identifies the rights holders and their rights to lands, territories and resources
	1.2 Recognizes and respects rights to lands, territories and resources
	1.3 Requires free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)
	1.4 Ownership of carbon rights are based on the rights
2 Equitable benefit-sharing	2.1 Transparent and participatory assessment of benefits, costs, and risks
	2.2 Equitable benefit-sharing
3 Livelihood security and well-being	3.1 Generating additional positive impacts on livelihood security and well-being
	3.2 Adaptation based on assessment of predicted and actual impacts
4 Contribution to good governance	4.1 Clearly defined, transparent, effective and accountable governance structures
	4.2 Coherent with relevant policies, strategies and effective coordination
	4.3 Publicly available adequate information
	4.4 Integrity, transparency and accountability managed finances
	4.5 Improvement in governance of the forest sector
	4.6 Contribution to sustainable development policies, strategies and plans
	4.7 Contribution to respect, protection and fulfilment of human rights
5 Enhance biodiversity and ecosystem	5.1 Identified, prioritized and mapped biodiversity and ecosystem services
	5.2 Maintain and enhance the identified biodiversity and ecosystem service
	5.3 Not leading to the conversion or degradation of natural forests.
	5.4 Transparent assessment of environmental impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem
	5.5 Adaptation based on assessment of environmental impacts
6 Stakeholder's full and effective participation	6.1 Identify rights holder and stakeholder groups
	6.2 Involve those concerned in design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation
	6.3 Protect tradition and knowledge, skills, institutions and management systems
	6.4 Use processes for effective resolution of grievances and disputes
	6.5 Ensure having the information that rights holder and stakeholder need
	6.6 Rights holder and stakeholder representatives disseminate all relevant information
7 Complying with laws and treaties	7.1 Complying with local law, national law and international treaties, conventions
	7.2 Undertaking to reconcile any inconsistencies

Source: REDD+ SES (2012)

* These principles and criteria were summarized by the authors.

how safeguards are defined, dealt with, and emphasized by each country.

(4) Comparison of initiatives

Below we compared the contents of the three initiatives (Table 4). To compare these contents, the principles, criteria and OPs for the safeguards in each initiative are corresponded to each other. And we checked which initiative is covered by what kind of issue. We found that REDD+ SES not only include more criteria and cover a wider range

than the others, but also noted the phrases “of indigenous peoples and local communities” and “with special attention to women and marginalized and/or vulnerable people” in most criteria. This observation leads to the conclusion that REDD+ SES focus on having no negative impacts on human rights and inequality from the implementation of REDD+ activities. We also noted that while some criteria in SEPC are not targeted in REDD+SES, they are indeed similar. On the other hand, some criteria targeted

Table 4. Correlation of social safeguards in three initiatives

No. of Principle and criteria in REDD+SES	No. of criteria in SEPC	No. operation policy in SESA
1.1	7	4.10
1.2	7	4.10
1.3	9	4.10
1.4	7	–
–	10	4.12
2.1	4	–
2.2	12	–
3.1	8, 13	4.10
3.2	21	4.10
4.1	1, 2	–
4.2	5	–
4.3	3	–
4.4	1	–
4.5	14, 17	4.04, 4.36
4.6	16	–
4.7	–	4.10
5.1	21	4.04, 4.36
5.2	22	4.04, 4.36
5.3	18, 19, 22	4.04, 4.36
5.4	–	4.01, 4.04, 4.36
5.5	15, 20, 23, 24	4.01, 4.04, 4.36
6.1	4	–
6.2	4 (not including monitoring)	4.10
6.3	11	4.10
6.4	6	–
6.5	–	–
6.6	3	–
7.1	14, 16	–
7.2	14, 16	–

Source: UN-REDD (2012), REDD+ SES (2012), FCPF (2013)

Note: “–” denotes no corresponding content.

in REDD+SES and SEPC, such as equal benefit-sharing among stakeholders, participation of stakeholders and good governance, cannot be seen in SESA. These criteria are mentioned in just one part of the contents in OP 4.01

“Environmental Assessment,” OP 4.04 “Natural Habitats,” OP 4.10 “Indigenous Peoples” and OP 4.36 “Forests.”

2. Review of literature about each initiative

(1) Four types of REDD+ literature reviewed

This article focuses on 21 items of published literature, which can be divided into four types:

- i) Reports introducing initiatives, written by organizations that created and/or are involved in them (Moss & Nussbaum 2011, Pro Forest 2010)
- ii) Reports or journal articles by organizations or authors with no direct interest in the initiatives (Baastel & NORDECO 2011, Dooley et al. 2011, FCMC 2012, Greenpeace 2012, McDermott et al. 2012, Murphy 2011, Rey et al. 2013, Roe et al. 2013)
- iii) Reports that discuss effectiveness or reasons for the selection of specific REDD+ initiatives in specific countries (Compese 2011, IGES 2013, Stickler et al. 2012)
- iv) Reports that review initiatives as a part of research about a specific topic, such as indigenous peoples or land rights (Anderson 2011, Boyle and Murphy 2012, Forest & Landscape 2012, IUCN 2010, Johl & Lador 2012, Krebichi et al. 2012, Sommerville 2011, Westholm et al. 2011)

REDD+ safeguard initiatives went through a process of meetings and revisions from the middle of 2010 to 2012: Type i) published from 2010 to the first half of 2011 when the initiatives began (Table 5); Type iv) published from 2010 to the middle of 2012 when the initiatives were actively planned and demonstration activities implemented; and Types ii) and iii) published from the first half of 2011 to the first half of 2013 when the initiatives were actively revised. The criteria of sorting were that they included the three initiatives targeted by this article, were written by a third party, and covered a checklist of items including indigenous peoples, land rights and related topics. As a result, seven items of literature were selected as the main literature for review and comparative analysis of SEPC, SESA and REDD+ SES: Compese (2011), Greenpeace (2012), FCMC (2012), Stickler et al. (2012), McDermott et al. (2012), Rey et al. (2013) and Roe et al. (2013). These items specifically discussed or analyzed the contents or descriptions of safeguards, but not the field conditions.

(2) Focal point of literature on each initiative

We identified the focal points of the seven items of literature selected in the previous section and classified contents into eight categories for discussion about social safeguards (Table 6). Of the seven principles of REDD+SES identified as being the most comprehensive and covering a wide range of criteria, six principles (excluding principle 5 about biodiversity) were included in the eight categories. The two other categories (category 7 “access to information

Table 7. Tally of references to eight categories of social safeguards by each selected publication

Literature	Category No.							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Roe et al. (2013)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2 Rey et al. (2012)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3 Mc Dermott et al. (2012)	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
4 Stickler et al. (2012)	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
5 FCMC (2012)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6 Greenpeace (2012)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7 Compese (2011)	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0
Total	7	6	7	7	5	6	7	4

Regarding the SEPC initiative, Stickler et al. (2012) found that it respects the land rights of indigenous peoples, local communities, and other vulnerable and marginalized groups, and aims to resolve direct land conflicts with indigenous peoples and local communities. However, the SEPC initiative remains very limited because while it aims to resolve conflicts, it shows little concern for the fundamental maintenance of law and/or regulation and demarcation for land rights and tenure.

SESA is criticized for having no projection for solving land conflicts and overlooking weaknesses in national legal frameworks, especially customary rights, FPIC, land demarcation, and processes for the acquisition of rights (FCMC 2012). The FCPF requires countries seeking financing for REDD+ readiness to assess their land-use legislation and to be responsible for addressing their land tenure issues. However, Stickler et al. (2012) expressed the opinion that the FCPF could be in a position of taking responsibility if countries decide to overturn the land rights of indigenous peoples and traditional communities. It is pointed out that the clarification of legal and customary rights for forest owners or users is encouraged, but not required (Roe et al. 2013), and that detailed guidelines or supports are not provided (Rey et al. 2013). It is also pointed out that the lack of clear standards for the recognition of rights and customs poses a great danger to rights holders, and ultimately, to investors (Greenpeace 2012).

It is pointed out that SEPC and SESA do not articulate any directives stating that REDD+ activities should not take place on land where ownership is contested (Stickler et al. 2012). That is to say, land tenure and resource rights for indigenous peoples and local communities are not specifically

secured in program implementation. Both SEPC and SESA also require that any security problems be identified, but do not require that such problems be solved (Greenpeace 2012). Furthermore, it is mentioned that the rules for land tenure security are not clear (*ibid.*).

McDermott et al. (2012) found that SEPC and SESA focus on carbon and non-carbon values, but both initiatives have been criticized by international NGOs for placing disproportionate attention that mainly focuses on carbon.

The REDD+ SES initiative explicitly requires the identification of rights to land, territory and resources for indigenous peoples, local communities and vulnerable groups, and is the only one of the three initiatives that requires demonstrable proof of the rights to use land (Stickler et al. 2012). It is worth noting that the word “rights” is mentioned 123 times in REDD+ SES, including footnotes, indicating a decisive adherence to a rights-based approach, whereas the word “rights” only appears five times in SEPC (Mc Dermott et al. 2012)⁴.

(2) Category 3: Recognition and respect for indigenous peoples and local communities

A report in 2010 pointed out a lack of versatility in SEPC due to inadequate explanation and examples of implementation cases (IUCN 2010). However, following the revisions in March, June and September 2011, and in March 2012, principle 7 (“Respect and promote the recognition and exercise of the rights of indigenous peoples, local communities and other vulnerable and marginalized groups to land, territories and resources, including carbon”) and principle 9 (“Seek free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples and respect and uphold the decision taken (whether consent is given or withheld)”) of SEPC became more comprehensive and advanced, and required participants to promote and enhance general gender equality and equity and women’s empowerment. However, there were questions about how SEPC could contribute to solving gender issues, even if the issues were identified (Rey et al. 2013). Further, FCMC (2012) criticizes the fact that the SEPC initiative emphasizes the equity and equality of indigenous peoples and local communities, without clarifying responsibility for the possibility of concomitant negative impacts on that equity and equality. It is also pointed out that particularly marginalized groups have many potential non-monetary benefits to share, including capacity building, social organization and the provision of environmental services, and these benefits tend to go unnoticed in discussions about compensation. (FCMC 2012).

Although not clearly defining local communities, SEPC did mention people who are not indigenous peoples but who depend on forests, and mentions “forest-dependent

⁴ Note that the authors found slightly different numbers, with the word “rights” mentioned 24 times in SESA, six times in SEPC, and 129 times in REDD+ SES.

communities” (Rey et al. 2013). Meanwhile, the SEPC initiative requires respect and protection of traditional knowledge in each country, but fails to define traditional knowledge (*ibid.*).

SESA applies World Bank OP 4.1, leading to broad community support in its readiness fund (FCMC 2012). In OP 4.1, FPIC regarding the rights for indigenous peoples is not required, but is required on what it calls Free, Prior, and Informed Consultation as defined by the World Bank (FCMC 2012, Greenpeace 2012, Stickler et al. 2012). The difference from the more common use of FPIC is in the word “consent” versus “consultation.” While FCPF guidance specifies that these are largely equivalent, it is pointed out that there are concerns among many civil society organizations that “consultation” does not provide the important right to say yes or no to activities with potentially harmful or insufficiently beneficial impacts for stakeholders (Compese 2011). At the same time, the SESA initiative plans to support compliance with FPIC for countries that have ratified International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention No.169⁵ and that apply or try to apply FPIC in national legislation (FCPF 2014). Under pressure from NGOs, the FCPF agreed to FPIC in the joint guidelines for stakeholder engagement with UN-REDD as of the middle of 2011 (FCPF & UN-REDD 2012). However, FCMC (2012) points out that SESA is still only in draft form, and that their power to ensure compliance and redress is unclear. The FCPF is also criticized for only acknowledging full FPIC in its joint UN-REDD guidelines for stakeholder engagement, but only in countries that are participating in UN-REDD and have adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) (FCMC 2012).

Regarding the definitions of indigenous peoples, there is criticism that OPs of the World Bank are applied, but only say that indigenous peoples are traditional knowledge holders and no more definition is provided (Rey et al. 2013). Rey et al. (2013) points out that SESA aims to respect indigenous knowledge, but provides no clear definition or requirement. Regarding local communities, it has been said that they are defined as groups of people living in or near a forest as a part of indigenous groups, and a local community’s rights may be limited by the adaptation of SESA (Rey et al. 2013).

There are comments that the REDD+ SES initiative does not specifically mention gender, but clearly identifies indigenous peoples and forest dependent communities, with particular attention given to the most vulnerable (FCMC 2012), and that for these stakeholders, the initiative aims not only at “doing no harm,” but also generating long-term,

equitable benefits and sharing them (Compese 2011).

(3) Category 4: Improvement of livelihood with equitable benefit-sharing

The SEPC initiative requires countries to “monitor” the impacts of REDD+ activities on livelihoods and promote sustainable livelihoods (Rey et al. 2013), and mentions enough about benefit-sharing, as with REDD+ SES (Roe et al. 2013); however, there is no guidance or requirement to implement measures to promote multiple benefits and the improvement of livelihoods (Rey et al. 2013).

The SESA initiative requires poverty alleviation as a mission of the World Bank and also equal benefit-sharing (Roe et al. 2013). There is no mention of the importance of involving indigenous peoples and local communities, even though it is presupposed to discuss benefit-sharing in a carbon fund through a participatory approach. Rey et al. (2013) pointed out that the ESMF should articulate equitable and accessible benefit-sharing mechanisms for indigenous peoples and local communities. Compese (2011) pointed out that there is only mention about recognizing the livelihood of indigenous peoples and other forest dependent peoples, but no mention about improving livelihood.

A common observation about the SEPC, SESA and REDD+ SES initiatives is that there are explicit principles and criteria about benefit-sharing, but no mention about labor rights (Stickler et al. 2012, Roe et al. 2013).

(4) Category 7: Access to information and grievance mechanisms

Regarding SEPC, it is pointed out that the initiative encourages participants to ensure access to information, but does not positively announce guidelines or clearly require or recommend that functions be set up for ensuring access to information (Roe et al. 2013). However, mechanisms and procedures to ensure access to information must be shown to donor countries (*ibid.*). Positive innovation of information is required, but no measures are provided to announce the granting of access rights for information and promote public awareness. On the other hand, it is said that regulations, access to justice and effective remedies are promoted and supported (*ibid.*).

In SESA, access rights for information are not mentioned (Rey et al. 2013), so there are no clear requirements or encouragement to set up functions ensuring access to information. Although mechanisms and procedures to ensure access to information must exist in order to show donor countries (*ibid.*), ways to inform and promote awareness for stakeholders other than donor countries are not indicated.

It is pointed out that the UNFCCC does not require the existence of a mechanism to solve conflicts and grievances,

⁵ Convention No.169 is a legally binding international instrument open to ratification, which deals specifically with the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples. Today, it has been ratified by 20 countries. Once it ratifies the Convention, a country has one year to align legislation, policies and programs to the Convention before it becomes legally binding. Countries that have ratified the Convention are subject to supervision with regards to its implementation (ILO 2014).

but all three initiatives (SEPC, SESA and REDD+ SES) require a mechanism to clearly and transparently solve conflicts and grievances (Roe et al. 2013, Stickler et al. 2012). In particular, SEPC and REDD+ SES encourage adapting such a mechanism that suits the local area or culture (Roe et al. 2013).

Discussion

1. Focal points and comments based on in-depth review of REDD+ initiatives

From the detailed aspects of the seven items of literature reviewed in this article, we found that all seven paid attention to four categories (categories 1, 3, 4 and 7), as summarized in Table 7.

Regarding category 1, literature discusses the potential for conflict due to REDD+ implementation in host countries that do not have clear land rights. It can be said that the clear security of land rights is a foundation and perhaps even a precondition for ensuring the permanence of long-term forest conservation and reducing carbon emissions. The absence of clear land rights, including carbon rights, as well as the absence of any requirement to clarify rights in initiatives, will adversely affect benefit-sharing and pose a serious obstacle to encouraging safeguards.

Regarding category 3, the literature points out that the definitions of indigenous peoples and local communities and their knowledge are ambiguous. The absence of definitions, or the use of bracketed definitions, for indigenous peoples and local communities who have different origins and life styles, mean that they are treated with the same level of forest dependency, even though it may be different. This results in a failure to secure equity in benefit-sharing, similar to the problems with category 1. Traditional structures of indigenous peoples may appear to give less recognition to gender and the young generation, from the viewpoint of outsiders, but the disorganization and restructuring of traditional structures may not always lead to the equity and equality of benefit-sharing for some groups, especially women and the young generation.

Regarding category 4, the literature points out that indigenous peoples and local communities are not included or clarified to be included as targets of benefit-sharing—a common point with categories 1 and 3.

With regard to category 7, the failure to secure or mention access to information is viewed with suspicion, and compared to the other three categories, this becomes a formal point of discussion about organizations of the United Nation. Agreements about the timing and frequency of presenting safeguards information for the development of Safeguard Information Systems (SIS) in COP 19 may have contributed to discussions and criticism, which have clarified a way forward regarding category 7.

The literature review clarified that three of the four selected categories mentioned benefit-sharing, and discussions about these three categories still continue. Moreover, this “benefit-sharing” is not only related to carbon credits but also to the system of governance regarding the use of forest resources and the distribution of land rights. The literature also discussed benefit-sharing not as result of REDD+ implementation but as a procedure or method of sharing the benefits stated prior to implementation.

Benefit-sharing had been focused on in the context of REDD+ or carbon credits, and discussed not only in terms of direct benefits but also indirect benefits, including that strengthening of tenure rights and enforcement, enhancing participation in decision making, and protecting the quality of soil, water and biodiversity (Costenbader 2011, Luttrell et al. 2012, Peskett 2011). On the other hand, in the context of safeguards, while the Cancun Safeguards did not directly mention benefit-sharing, SEPC, SESA and REDD+ SES focused on it. This paper clarified that benefit-sharing is currently one of the focal points of discussions about social safeguards, and more discussion is needed on this point to further enhance the initiatives.

2. Observations in literature for each initiative

Observations and discussion in the literature are mainly for SEPC and SESA. Regarding SEPC, it is pointed out that there is much mention of indigenous people but no clear way to respond, as well as the possible risk for people other than indigenous people to suffer inequality, due to the strong recognition of indigenous people and less recognition for those who are not indigenous people. The current focus of the principles and criteria is on mitigating harm, though the framework also aims to provide guidance on enhancing the many potential environmental and social benefits (Compese 2011).

In SESA, it is pointed out that there may be negative social impacts when implementing REDD+ programs, because there is no definition of indigenous peoples and their knowledge, and no regulations or procedure for solving land conflicts (Compese 2011). In addition, the host countries are required to ensure land rights, but donor countries are not required to do so. It has been mentioned that the responsibility for land rights is not with donor countries; consequently, the implementation of REDD+ programs could possibly lead to conflicts or negative impacts for stakeholders (Stickler et al. 2012). While the SEPC initiative seeks multiple income sources, the guidelines and procedures of SESA prioritize “do no harm” in REDD+ implementation, but are not a system for creating big positive impacts or benefits (Roe et al. 2013). Furthermore, as Compese (2011) and Stickler et al. (2012) pointed out, the situation surrounding SESA as described above has the potential to result in large negative impacts and throw

into doubt the continuation of the FCPF, and therefore the implementation of REDD+ programs in the adopting host countries as well.

The REDD+ SES initiative is not criticized in the four selected categories. However, if we take an overall view, some problems do exist, as are pointed out below. The observations are that there is less practical experience with REDD+ SES (FCMC 2012), and it is a completely voluntary initiative, so the initial motivation to utilize it may be weak at the country level and for efforts mainly seeking carbon credits (Compese 2011). Perhaps there has been less criticism on account of less practical experience thus far. Also, one reason for the difficulty of adopting and the less practical experience with REDD+ SES is that there is no direct linkage to a funding agency such as the World Bank and UN-REDD (Greenpeace 2012). Nonetheless, we find that the REDD+ SES initiative has the clearest mention of “recognition and respects for rights to lands, territories and resources” (category 1), “recognition and respects for indigenous people and local communities” (category 3), and “improvement of livelihood with equitable benefit-sharing” (category 4). As described above, among the four selected categories, only these three categories mention benefit-sharing. Therefore, it can be said that benefit-sharing is a focal point of discussion about social safeguards at this time. For that reason, we conclude that the REDD+ SES initiative has the best-covered elements among the three initiatives.

3. Issues for development of effective social safeguards

In this article, we examined the three main national and sub-national level initiatives. Some literature stated that there are nine national and sub-national initiatives in total, and that the number of initiatives, both public and private, is increasing. Despite the similarity of principles and criteria due to the existence of different initiatives, host countries require a huge amount of effort in order to adopt and consolidate multiple initiatives (Savaresi 2013). To avoid cumbersome procedures and rising costs, it is important to decide on initiatives that are based on a partnership with international forest certification systems or counter-measures against illegal logging, and coordinated in the international community, or select initiatives that formulate agreements in many countries (Greenpeace 2012, McDermott et al. 2012, Moss & Nussbaum 2011, Pro Forest 2010, Roe et al. 2013, Savaresi 2013, Silori et al. 2013). And to share the benefits and opportunities created by REDD+, it is also important to clearly design and coordinate national and international level projects, with strong but suitable compliance systems (FCMC 2012). In fact, some efforts are under way as a part of REDD+ for collaboration, such as coordination between the FCPF and UN-REDD, for enhancing the participation of indigenous peoples and other

forest-dependent communities, and sharing the guidelines on sustainable forest management among REDD+ SES, the Montreal Process, the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), FOREST EUROPE, and FAO (FCPF & UN-REDD 2012, REDD+ SES et al. 2012).

Conclusion

In this article, we concluded that “benefit-sharing” was the focal point in social safeguards for effective, safe, equal and fair implementation in REDD+, and that the REDD+ SES initiative was criticized only on a few aspects relating to social safeguards, especially in categories 1, 3 and 4 as related to benefit-sharing, and thus evaluated positively as a comprehensive initiative by the authors of certain items of reviewed literature (Compese 2011, Greenpeace 2012). Our findings are shown in the corresponding summary table (Table 4). We foresaw that if more countries adopt REDD+ SES and cases can be gained, plus the identification of problems and solutions, REDD+ SES could become a popular initiative as social safeguards and for the effective, safe, equal and fairly implementation of REDD+ in the international community.

Acknowledgments

This study was funded by the program “Project for Priority Preparation of Systems to Promote REDD” through the Forestry Agency of the Japanese government.

References

- Alexander, S. et al. (2011) Opportunities and challenges for ecological restoration within REDD+. *Restoration Ecology*, **19**(6), 683-689.
- Anderson, P. (2011) *Free, Prior, and Informed Consent in REDD+: Principles and approaches for policy and project development*. RECOFTC (The Center for People and Forests) and GIZ, Bangkok, pp.80.
- Baastel & NORDECO (Nordic Agency for Development and Ecology) (2011) *First program evaluation for the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)*. Baastel & NORDECO, pp.156.
- Boyle, J. and Murphy, D. (2012) *Designing effective REDD+ safeguard information systems: Building on existing systems and country experiences*. IISD (International Institute for Sustainable Development) report 8/2012, IISD, Manitoba, pp.50.
- Brockhaus, M. et al. (2012) An overview of forest and land allocation policies in Indonesia: Is the current framework sufficient to meet the needs of REDD+? *Forest Policy and Economics*, **18**, 30-37.
- Compese, J. (2011) *Integrating REDD+ social and environmen-*

- tal safeguards and standards in Tanzania*. TFCG Technical Report 32, Dar es Salaam, pp.66.
- Corbera, E. and Schroeder, H. (2011) Governing and implementing REDD+. *Environmental Science and Policy*, **14**, 89-99.
- Costenbader, J. (2011) *REDD+ benefit sharing: A comparative assessment of three national policy approaches*. FCPF & UN-REDD, pp.58.
- Cotula, L. and Mayers, J. (2009) *Tenure in REDD: Start-point or afterthought?* Natural Resource Issues No.15, International Institute for Environment and Development, London, pp.56.
- Dooley, K. et al. (2011) *Smoke and mirrors: A critical assessment of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility*. FERN & Forest People Programme, pp.44.
- Ehara, M. et al. (2013) REDD+ initiatives for safeguarding biodiversity and ecosystem services: Harmonizing sets of standards for national application. *Journal of Forest Research*, **19**(5), 427-436.
- FCMC (Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities Program) (2012) *REDD+ social safeguards and standards review*. FCMC, Vermont, pp.54.
- FCPF (2012) *Forest Carbon Partnership Facility: 2012 Annual report*. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., pp.57.
- FCPF (2013) *World Bank safeguard policies and the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards*. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., pp. 3.
- FCPF (2011) Global dialogue with indigenous peoples. Panama, September 27-29, 2011. <http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/global-dialogue-indigenous-peoples-panama-september-27-29-2011-0>
- FCPF and UN-REDD (2012) *Guidelines on stakeholder engagement in REDD+ readiness with focus on the participation of indigenous people and other forest-dependent communities*. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., pp.22.
- Forest & Landscape (2012) *An urgent need for social protections in REDD+*. Policy Briefs No. 20, University of Copenhagen, pp.4.
- Gardner, T. A. et al. (2012) A framework for integrating biodiversity concerns into national REDD+ programmes. *Biological Conservation*, **154**, 61-71.
- Greenpeace (2012) *Forests & people first: The need for universal REDD+ safeguards*. Greenpeace, Amsterdam, pp.23.
- Hein, L. and VanderMeer, P. J. (2012) REDD+ in the context of ecosystem management. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, **4**, 604-611.
- Hirata, Y. et al. (eds.) (2012) *REDD-plus Cookbook*, REDD Research and Development Center. Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute of Japan, pp.156.
- IGES (Institute for Global Environmental Strategies) (2013) *Quality-of-governance standards for carbon emissions trading: Developing REDD+ governance through a multi-stage, multi-level and multi-stakeholder approach*. IGES, Hayama, pp.31.
- ILO (International Labor Organization): Convention No. 169. <http://www.ilo.org/indigenous/Conventions/no169/lang-en/index.htm>
- IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Natural and Natural Resources) (2010) *Indigenous peoples and climate change / REDD: An overview of current discussions and main issues*. IUCN, pp.46.
- Johl, A. and Lador, Y. (2012) *A human rights-based approach to climate finance*. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Geneva, pp.20.
- Kanowski, P. J. et al. (2011) Implementing REDD+: Lessons from analysis of forest governance. *Environmental Science and Policy*, **14**, 111-117.
- Kreibich, N. et al. (2012) Ready for the Market? Assessing prerequisites for market-based REDD+ activities, Wuppertal Institute for Climate. *JIKO Policy Paper 3/2012*, Environment and Energy, Germany, pp.37.
- Larsen, G. et al. (2012) *Map of SBSTA submissions: REDD+ safeguard information system*. WRI Working Paper 1/2012, World Resources Institute, Washington D.C., pp.32.
- Larson, A. M. (2011) Forest tenure reform in the age of climate change: Lessons for REDD+. *Global Environmental Change*, **21**, 540-549.
- Larson, A. M. et al. (2013) Land tenure and REDD+: The good, the bad and the ugly. *Global Environmental Change*, **23**, 678-689.
- Luttrell, C. et al. (2012) Who should benefit and why? Discourses on REDD+ benefit sharing. In Angelsen, A. et al. (eds.) *Analysing REDD+: Challenging and choices*. CIFOR. Bogor, 129-151.
- McDermott, C. L. et al. (2011) Building the forest-climate bandwagon: REDD+ and the logic of problem amelioration. *Global Environmental Politics*, **11**(3), 85-103.
- McDermott, C. L. et al. (2012) Operationalizing social safeguards in REDD+: Actors, interests and ideas. *Environmental Science & Policy*, **21**, 63-72.
- Moss, N. and Nussbaum, R. (2011) *A review of three REDD+ safeguard initiatives*. FCPF & UN-REDD, pp.22.
- Murphy, D. (2011) *Safeguards and multiple benefits in a REDD+ mechanism*. IISD (International Institute for Sustainable Development), Canada, pp.29.
- Peskett, L. (2011) *Benefit sharing in REDD+: Exploring the implementations for poor and vulnerable people*. World Bank and REDD-net, pp.40.
- Phelps, J. et al. (2012) Win-win REDD+ approaches belie carbon-biodiversity trade-offs. *Biological Conservation*, **154**, 53-60.
- Pistorius, T. et al. (2011) Greening REDD+: Challenges and opportunities for integrating biodiversity safeguards at and across policy levels. *German Journal of Forest Research*, **182** (5/6), 82-98.
- Pro Forest (2010) *REDD+ SE standards: Briefing on complementarities with other REDD+ social and environmental safeguards mechanisms*. ProForest, Oxford, pp.12.
- REDD+ SES (2012) *REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards*

- Version 2. REDD+ SES, pp.27.
- REDD+ SES: REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards. <http://www.redd-standards.org/>.
- REDD+ SES et al. (2012) *Working together to get forest measurement right: A solution for REDD+*. REDD+ SES, pp.3.
- Rey, D. et al. (2013) *A Guide for consistent implementation of REDD+ safeguards*. ClientEarth, London, pp.390.
- Roe, S. et al. (2013) *Safeguards in REDD+ and forest carbon standards: A review of social, environmental and procedural concepts and application*. CLIMATEFOCUS, pp.86.
- Savaresi, A. (2013) REDD+ and human rights: Addressing synergies between international regimes. *Ecology and Society*, **18**(3), 5.
- Schwaret, C. (2010) Social safeguards in REDD: A review of possible mechanisms to protect rights and interests of indigenous and forest dependent communities in a future system for REDD. *Journal on Sustainable Development Law and Policy*, **6**(1), 55-80.
- Sikor, T. et al. (2010) REDD-plus, forest people's rights and nested climate governance. *Global Environmental Change*, **20**, 423-425.
- Silori, C. S. et al. (2013) Social safeguard in REDD+: A review of existing initiatives and challenges. *Journal of Forest and Livelihood*, **11**(2), 27-36.
- Sommerville, M. (2011) *International REDD+ institutions and the role of land tenure and property rights*. USAID, Vermont, pp.38.
- Stickler, C. et al. (2012) *Global rules for sustainable farming: A comparison of social and environmental safeguards for REDD+ and principles & criteria for commodity roundtables*. IPAM (Amazon Environmental Research Institute), San Francisco, pp.14.
- Sunderlin, W. D. et al. (2014) How are REDD+ proponents addressing tenure problems? Evidence from Brazil, Cameroon, Tanzania, Indonesia, and Vietnam. *World Development*, **55**, 37-52.
- Thompson, M. C. et al. (2011) Seeing REDD+ as a project of environmental governance. *Environmental Science and Policy*, **14**, 100-110.
- UNFCCC (2007) *Decision 2/CP.13 Reducing emissions from deforestation in developing countries: Approaches to stimulate action* (FCCC/CP/2007/6/Add.1), UNFCCC, pp.60.
- UNFCCC (2011a) *Decision 1/CP.16 The Cancun Agreements: Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention* (FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1), UNFCCC, pp.29.
- UNFCCC (2011b) *Report on the expert meeting on forest reference emission levels and forest reference levels for implementation of REDD-plus activities* (FCCC/SBSTA/2011/INF.18), UNFCCC, pp.14.
- UNFCCC (2012a) *Decision 12/CP.17 Guidance on systems for providing information on how safeguards are addressed and respected and modalities relating to forest reference emission levels and forest reference level as referred to in decision 1/CP.16* (FCCC/CP/2011/9/Add.2), UNFCCC, pp.63.
- UNFCCC (2012b) *Methodological guidance for activities relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries in Thirty-seventh session of Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA)* (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.31), UNFCCC, pp.2.
- UNFCCC (2013) *Decision 12/CP.19 The timing and the frequency of presentations of the summary of information on how all the safeguards referred to in decision 1/CP.16, appendix I, are being addressed and respected* (FCCC/CP/2013/10/Add.1), UNFCCC, pp.43.
- UNFCCC (2015) *Decision 17/CP.21 Further guidance on ensuring transparency, consistency, comprehensiveness and effectiveness when informing on how all the safeguards referred to in decision 1/CP.16, appendix I, are being addressed and respected* (FCCC/CP/2015/10/Add.3), UNFCCC, pp.13.
- UN-REDD (2012) *UN-REDD programme social and environmental principles and criteria*. UN-REDD Programme Eighth Policy Board Meeting. Asunción, pp.21.
- UN-REDD: The UN-REDD Programme Policy Board, UN-REDD. <http://www.un-redd.org/PolicyBoard/tabid/102628/Default.aspx>
- Westholm, L. et al. (2011) REDD+ and tenure: A review of the latest developments in research, implementation and debate. *Focali (Forest, Climate and Livelihood research network) Report 2011:02*, Gothenburg, pp.31.
- Wright, G. (2011) Indigenous people and customary land ownership under domestic REDD+ frameworks: A case study of Indonesia. *Law Environmental and Development Journal*, **7**(2), 117-131.

