



April 2023

Examining support for the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the context of REDD+ in the DRC, Indonesia and Peru

A comparative analysis with recommendations for further progress

Tamara Lasheras, Juan Pablo Sarmiento Barletti, Anne M. Larson, Ade Tamara, Nining Liswanti, Sandra Rodriguez and Marie-Bernard Dhedya Lonu

Key messages

- Cancun safeguards were established to – at a minimum – prevent the most harmful impacts (“do no harm”) on the territories, livelihoods and sociocultural lives of the Indigenous Peoples and local communities (IPs and LCs) that steward forests where REDD+ interventions are implemented. However, these safeguards are to be interpreted by each country based on their own legal frameworks and policy priorities.
- Comparative analysis of the rights of IPs and LCs in the legal frameworks and policies of the DRC, Indonesia, and Peru – three of the four countries with highest tropical forest cover – reveals different levels of recognition and respect for the rights of IPs and LCs in the context of REDD+.
- These different engagements with the rights of IPs and LCs, and divergence from rights recognized under international agreements (e.g., UNDRIP), reveal that progress from safeguards that ‘do no harm’ to ones that aim to ‘do better’ will be challenging and uneven.
- ‘Doing better’ requires greater effort, starting with a reconsideration of REDD+ proponents as duty bearers and communities as rights holders with the capacities and mechanisms to hold the former accountable (e.g., monitoring of rights obligations including access to participation and benefits).
- Further reflection at the level of the UNFCCC is needed to decide whether safeguards should ‘do better’. This would require laying out levels of ambition more clearly and transparently, providing clearer guidelines and more stringent requirements for REDD+ countries, and a more robust monitoring of their compliance.
- The evidence of the impact of IPs and LCs as stewards of forest landscapes of high biodiversity suggests that safeguards that ‘do better’ by supporting their self-determination and access and control of their ancestral territories, will not only be transformative in terms of equity but also will support REDD+’s wider goals.

This flyer is part of a series on REDD+ safeguards, focusing on the rights and social inclusion concerns of the women and men of the Indigenous Peoples and local communities (IPs and LCs) that steward the forests where climate solutions are implemented. Flyers provide lessons for application in different national contexts, present evidence for decision makers and practitioners to consider the implications and benefits of supporting the rights of IPs and LCs, and contribute to the participation of IPs and LCs representatives in discussions on and monitoring of safeguards.

Introduction

As the framework for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and enhancing forest carbon stocks (REDD+) moves to results-based payments, there is a need to re-examine safeguards. At the 2010 Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Cancun, seven safeguard principles for the implementation of REDD+ were adopted, including two that address Indigenous Peoples and local communities (IPs and LCs). The Cancun safeguards mandate that countries interpret these principles, deferring to national law in deciding what counts as 'respect' or 'participation' for IPs and LCs.

Scholars and practitioners have been concerned about REDD+'s potential impact on the rights of IPs and LCs from early on (see Sarmiento Barletti and Larson 2017 for a review). Without proper guidelines, the application and operationalization of REDD+ safeguards vary greatly, with different impacts on IPs and LCs (Jodoïn 2017). Indeed, the national interpretation and rollout of safeguards is framed by country-specific legal interpretations of relevant rights, adherence to international agreements on the rights of IPs and LCs, and different political and economic priorities. Concerns over safeguards focus on the need to expand rights recognition and to bridge gaps in access to recognized rights, including to land and resources, as well as to participation (Savaresi 2013; Wallbott 2014). In general, these are far from the wide range of rights, including self-determination, that are recognized in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). This is relevant because UNFCCC decisions refer to UNDRIP, yet national legal frameworks tend to be much more limited.

Given the specificity of national safeguards interpretation processes and the recognized importance of the women and men of IPs and LCs in achieving REDD+ (and global climate and biodiversity) goals, this flyer presents the results of a comparative analysis of the support for IP and LC rights in law and policy in the context of REDD+ in the DRC, Indonesia and Peru (Table 1). These are key countries in the development and implementation of REDD+, and are among the four tropical countries with highest forest cover. The flyer is based on publications by the authors, which built on reviews of legal documents and interviews with legal specialists in each country.

Methods

This flyer is part of a series on REDD+ safeguards focusing on the rights and social inclusion concerns of the women and men of the IPs and LCs that steward the forests where climate solutions are implemented. It provides a comparative analysis based on three country cases: the DRC (Dhedya et al. 2022), Indonesia (Tamara et al. 2022) and Peru (Rodriguez et al. 2022). The comparative analysis considers ten criteria regarding the support for the rights of IPs and LCs in the legal systems of the three countries. The criteria are: (1) recognizes historically under-represented groups; (2) aligns with the Cancun safeguards; (3) recognizes gender inequalities and/or women's exclusion; (4) recognizes the rights of IPs and LCs under international law; (5) recognizes land and resource rights for IPs and LCs; (6) recognizes community carbon rights; (7) recognizes the right of IPs and LCs to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC); (8) requires formal benefit sharing mechanisms; (9) requires formal grievance mechanisms; and (10) includes provisions for monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) on rights and social inclusion. We rated each criterion based on whether it aligned with the laws fully, partially, or not at all.

Table 1. At a glance: IP and LC rights in the context of REDD+

Criteria	Ratings		
	DRC	Indonesia	Peru
(1) Groups recognized by law	Partial (Indigenous Peoples and local communities)	Partial (customary, local, and traditional communities)	Yes (Indigenous Peoples)
(2) Cancun safeguards/SIS	Partial	Yes	Yes
(3) Gender equity/women's inclusion	Partial	Yes	Partial
(4) Indigenous Peoples' rights under international law	Yes	Partial	Yes
(5) Land and resource rights	Partial	Yes	Partial
(6) Community carbon rights	Partial	Partial	Partial
(7) Free, prior, and informed consent	Partial	Partial	Yes
(8) Formal benefit sharing mechanism	Partial	Partial	No
(9) Formal grievance mechanism	Partial	Yes	Partial
(10) MRV of social/rights concerns	Partial	Partial	No

Comparative analysis: The state of support for IP and LC rights in the context of REDD+

Groups recognized by law (1), and Indigenous Peoples' rights under international law (4)

All three countries met the criteria, at least partially. Peru's legal system recognizes IPs in its 1993 Constitution; of the three countries it is the only one that is signatory to ILO Convention 169, and specific national laws also operationalize this recognition (e.g., the Law of Prior Consultation). However, despite formal recognition and progress, there is de facto disrespect for Indigenous Peoples' rights, particularly in the expansion of extractive industries and restricted access to the right to prior consultation (Guevara and Cabanillas 2019). The DRC has recently recognized IPs with the passing of the Law on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Indigenous Pygmy Peoples, which was signed in November 2022. IPs were previously considered under laws for local communities. It remains to be seen how the recognition of rights to land and resources that is central to the law will support the equitable participation of IPs and their territories in the DRC's REDD+ efforts. Indonesia recognizes customary, local and traditional communities, but does not legally recognize Indigenous Peoples as per international conventions, as it recognizes all Indonesians (except for those of Chinese ethnicity) as indigenous (IWGIA 2021; Simamarta and Sasmita 2021).

Cancun safeguards/SIS (2)

All three countries have progressed in their national interpretations of the Cancun safeguards. Indonesia has been a leader in the development of its REDD+ framework (Novyanza et al. 2020), including the completion of its Safeguards Information System (SIS), which was legalized in 2017, ahead of most other REDD+ countries. Furthermore, REDD+ implementation in Indonesia has followed other voluntary safeguards standards and guidelines introduced by multilateral funding institutions (e.g., the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility). In contrast, Peru completed its SIS in December 2021, but it remains to be piloted. Specialists considered that the completion of Peru's SIS had been delayed by weak institutional and organizational capacities (Rodríguez et al. 2022). The DRC is still working towards its SIS to fulfil conditions for results-based payments. A draft document was presented in April 2022 that still needs to be disseminated among key stakeholders across levels before submission to the UNFCCC.

Gender equity/women's inclusion (3)

Regarding gender equity and women's inclusion, Indonesia has shown major developments (fully met the criteria) in comparison with Peru and the DRC (partial). The three countries have ratified relevant treaties and conventions, leading to the adoption of general standards for the promotion and protection of women's rights, including

the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). Although Indonesia has no specific law regarding women's rights, gender is mainstreamed in the national long-term development plan for 2005–2025. As a result, the Ministry of Forestry issued guidelines for gender-responsive planning and budgeting in 2011 (Siscawati 2020). Challenges remain regarding how to operationalize gender equality regulations, how to address cultural norms blocking women from participating in decision making on climate change mitigation and adaptation, and the need to rethink programmes and capacity development activities that only target men as heads of households (Arwida et al. 2016; Liswanti et al. 2020). In the DRC's natural resources context, to date, only the national REDD+ strategy requires gender cross-cutting integration in policies, planning, and implementation of REDD+ projects. Furthermore, the new Law on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Indigenous Pygmy Peoples mentions women's rights in a general way, failing to recognize that they are often marginalized in land and resource access. Finally, Peru's Law of Forestry and Wildlife establishes that through the design and implementation of forest policies, the state must guarantee equal access to resources, development opportunities and benefit-sharing mechanisms with a gendered approach. Gender was also a cross-cutting theme in the national process of safeguards interpretation. Nevertheless, challenges remain regarding implementation and operationalization as its mention in key policy documents remains to be translated into concrete actions.

Land and resource rights (5)

The criterion for land and resource access rights is met in Indonesia, and partially in the DRC and Peru. Indonesia's Constitutional Court Decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012 of May 2013 recognized customary tenure rights to land and forests. Rights have also been transferred to forest-dependent communities under the Social Forestry programme. However, our research revealed that progress in the issuance of district regulations to gain customary forest recognition has not been uniform. Peru's legal framework also recognizes Indigenous Peoples' land and resource access rights, but partially. While different laws grant communities collective titles, with rights that are imprescriptible and guaranteed against seizure, the Law of Forestry and Wildlife establishes that forestlands fall under the state's mandate, and forest resources can only be accessed through a contract system. In line with this, communal rights in the Amazon are only granted to lands classified for agricultural use but not to forest land, for which they can only claim usufruct rights (Monterroso et al. 2017). In practice, Indigenous communities access and manage both types of land indistinctly. In the DRC, collective ownership of land acquired under law or custom is recognized by the Constitution (Article 34). However, land ownership is exclusively vested in the state and, in practice, communities and individuals can only hold rights of enjoyment, use, usufruct, passage and concessions on state land. Besides, as stated in the Land Law, collective ownership rights must be detailed by a presidential



Ramadian Bachtiar/CIFOR

ordinance, which has not been issued to date. LCs can obtain forest concessions with perpetual and imprescriptible titles, as well as conservation concessions, but the procedural costs and the required technical skills to run them are often prohibitive.

Community carbon rights (6)

The three countries have not regulated community rights to carbon. However, interpretations can be made based on national laws. In the DRC the state owns forest carbon stocks but recognizes that emissions reduction units are the property of those who invest in REDD+, including local communities. Indonesia's tenure rights also determine carbon rights. As a result, communities that hold permits for social forestry may benefit directly from REDD+ as has been the case in Plan Vivo initiatives in Indonesia (Ditjen PPI 2016). Similarly, carbon rights in Peru can be tied to land ownership and tenure (RRI 2020). Under the Law of Forestry and Wildlife and the Law of Compensation Mechanisms for Ecosystem Services (No. 30215), ecosystem services such as carbon storage are inherent components of tenure rights over forests, intending that whoever holds tenure rights over land also holds carbon rights.

Free, prior and informed consent (7)

Peru meets the criteria related to Free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), with the Prior Consultation Law and its bylaws. The national safeguard interpretation process did not involve a formal consultation process, but a Safeguards Technical Sub-Committee included indigenous organizations. However, although participation and involvement of national indigenous organizations based in Lima was actively promoted, that was not the case for subnational and local

organizations (DAR 2019). Indonesia and the DRC partially meet the criterion. The DRC has few references to FPIC in the Ministerial Order of 2018 on the approval of REDD+ investment projects, or in the recent Law on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Indigenous Pygmy Peoples. However, the latter only requires the prior consent of IPs for the creation of protected areas on their land whenever this may directly or indirectly affect their way of life. In Indonesia, FPIC has been implemented as part of certification standards but there is no specific legal framework for FPIC, and legal components are addressed separately in different regulations.

Formal benefit sharing mechanism (8)

There are also differences across countries regarding benefit sharing mechanisms. Indonesia has a formal mechanism that was developed for the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) programme in East Kalimantan Province, and for the BioCarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes in Jambi Province. Indonesia has also established the Environmental Fund Management Agency to manage climate funding, including the Emission Reductions Payment Agreement (ERPA) with the FCPF. The DRC has set up a mechanism defining the distribution of the state's share of benefits derived from REDD+, and requires REDD+ investors to develop benefit sharing plans in negotiation with stakeholders. The mechanism will not come into effect until it is published in the official gazette. Finally, although Peru has not completed its benefit sharing mechanism, the Law of Forestry and Wildlife establishes that forest rights holders are entitled to receive the benefits derived from payment for ecosystem services schemes. It remains to be seen how this will be included in the formal mechanism.

Formal grievance mechanism (9) and MRV of social/rights concerns (10)

Indonesia has implemented its grievance and redress mechanism for REDD+; Peru's is completed but untested; and the DRC has not formally included it in its REDD+ framework. A formal feedback grievance and redress mechanism for REDD+ in Indonesia has been set up based on existing national systems at the village, provincial and national levels. This mechanism is connected to the measurement, reporting and evaluation (MRV) component for REDD+ through Indonesia's Safeguards Information System. The DRC included a conflict and dispute resolution mechanism in the national REDD+ framework, and some initiatives to resolve disputes were observed in early REDD+ initiatives. Finally, Peru designed its grievance mechanism as part of its Safeguards Information Module; it has gone through a participatory process to receive feedback to improve performance.

Conclusions

The Cancun safeguards were introduced as the primary mechanism to prevent the most harmful impacts on the territories, livelihoods and sociocultural lives of the IPs and LCs that steward the forests where REDD+ is implemented. Our analysis shows that despite the references to international agreements regarding the rights of IPs and LCs in REDD+ documents at the UNFCCC level, national progress varies regarding support and respect for such rights; variation rests on country-specific interpretations of relevant rights.

Our research in the DRC, Indonesia and Peru reveals that for safeguards to reach a minimum 'do no harm' standard, several reforms remain to be undertaken for alignment with international REDD+ principles.

In Indonesia, rights to land and forest tenure for recognized communities are comprehensive (e.g., through schemes under the Social Forestry programme), but the bundle of rights is divided among different implementing regulations in piecemeal fashion. Despite progress in the development of tools to support REDD+ implementation, including the completion of its SIS, it remains to be seen how the legal framework on community rights will be translated into practice, and how it will address political challenges and development interests in forests and land use.

In Peru, although legal recognition of IPs is grounded in various international legal norms, the Constitution and different special laws, there is still disregard for community rights in some institutions and in some contexts. Indigenous Peoples' land and resource rights in Peru are legally recognized but only partially, which fosters insecurity in a context of strong external pressure on their collective lands. Peru's recently launched SIS still needs a roadmap to integrate the contributions and feedback of Indigenous Peoples if it is to build and monitor a fair and transparent benefit sharing system.

In the DRC significant progress on land rights is expected with the recent adoption of the Law on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of the Indigenous Pygmy Peoples, and the ongoing land reform process. Ongoing reforms need to be completed, and the gains made need to be established in law rather than being left as regulations that can be vulnerable to different interests and policy shifts. The implementation and monitoring of REDD+ safeguards must involve the women and men of IPs and LCs, recognizing and respecting their rights, knowledge and participation, as outlined in the DRC's NDC.

The findings in this comparative flyer and our publications examining the support for the rights of IPs and LCs in voluntary standards for REDD+ (see Sarmiento Barletti et al. 2021) emphasize the need for clearer guidelines for the interpretation and implementation of the Cancun safeguards. The self-declaration of compliance with safeguards by REDD+ countries must be supported by independent monitoring to ensure that safeguards are not just a formality, but rather are implemented – at the very least – to protect and respect the rights of IPs and LCs. Progress towards 'doing better' will require greater effort, starting with a reconsideration of REDD+ proponents as duty bearers and communities as rights holders with the capacities and mechanisms to hold the former accountable. Given the recognized role of the men and women of IPs and LCs as stewards of forest landscapes of high biodiversity, safeguards that 'do better' by supporting the recognition and respect of their rights, including self-determination, will be transformative in terms of equity, and will support REDD+'s climate change mitigation goals.

Further discussion at the level of the UNFCCC is needed to define whether safeguards should comply with a minimum of 'doing no harm' – extending a status quo with a poor record regarding IP and LC rights – or support transformative pathways by 'doing better'. This would require laying out levels of ambition more clearly and transparently, and providing clearer guidelines and more stringent requirements to guide REDD+ countries to do better. The demand side of carbon markets must recognise their role in supporting these transformative pathways by demanding the same ambition.

We will continue to update our analysis as part of GCS REDD+'s engagement with safeguards, providing evidence-based recommendations towards a rights-responsive REDD+ that benefits forests and the men and women that steward them.

Table 2. Summary: The state of IP and LC rights in the DRC, Indonesia and Peru (Dhedya Lonu et al. 2022; Rodríguez et al. 2022; Tamara et al. 2022)

Criteria	DRC
(1) Historically under-represented groups recognized by law	No law formally enshrines the notion of 'Indigenous Peoples'; they are generally considered by other categories, in particular as local communities, to which they are often assimilated. Progress is expected with the recent Law on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Indigenous Pygmy Peoples.
(2) Cancun safeguards/SIS	Validated its SIS in April 2022 to strengthen its eligibility for results-based payments. It still needs to be disseminated to stakeholders at the national level and then submitted to the UNFCCC.
(3) Gender/ women's concerns	Ratified international conventions and treaties (CEDAW, etc.) and has adopted general standards for promoting and protecting women's rights. Although laws relevant to natural resources do not clearly or specifically enshrine women's rights, the National REDD+ Framework Strategy imposes the integration of a gender dimension in all policies, planning and implementation of REDD+ projects.
(4) IP and LC rights under international law	Signatory to, and ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, UNDRIP, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol, all of which enshrine the right to self-determination and the promotion and protection of minorities, including IPs and LCs.
(5) Land and resource rights	Recognizes collective ownership of land acquired in accordance with the law or custom. However, as land ownership is exclusively vested in the state, communities and individuals can only hold rights of enjoyment, use, usufruct and concessions on state land. The Forestry Code and the decrees related to community forestry allow local communities to obtain forest concessions with imprescriptible titles in perpetuity. Local communities can obtain conservation concessions through which the government entrusts (totally or partially) the exploitation and management of forest and wildlife resources. However, these concessions are not easily implemented by communities given the costs, procedures and skills required.
(6) Community carbon rights	Although community carbon rights are not legally enshrined, it could be interpreted from different norms that holders of land rights may (at least partially) also hold carbon rights.
(7) Free, prior and informed consent	There are a few references to FPIC in the Ministerial Order of 2018 on the homologation of REDD+ investment projects, or in the law on the protection and promotion of the rights of Indigenous Pygmy Peoples.
(8) Formal benefit sharing mechanism	A Ministerial Order sets a mechanism defining the distribution of the DRC state's share of REDD+ products, and requires REDD+ investment holders to negotiate an agreement with stakeholders to develop a benefit sharing plan. To date, the DRC's Official Gazette has not published the decree. Furthermore, relevant environmental legislation and related legislation have been undergoing reform for several years.
(9) Formal grievance mechanism	There are conflict and dispute resolution mechanisms in the National REDD+ Framework Strategy, but no law formally enshrines them. A ministerial order that sets the approval procedure for REDD+ investments specifies a feedback and appeal mechanism, with definitions in the manual annexed to the order. Notably, some initiatives to resolve disputes can be observed in some early REDD+ initiatives.
(10) MRV of social/ rights concerns	Finalized its SIS in 2022, but it remains untested.

Indonesia	Peru
<p>The 1945 Constitution recognizes and respects the customary rights of customary, local and traditional communities. Recent regulations define customary communities (e.g., the Environmental Law and Forestry Law). Indigenous Peoples are not recognized as per international conventions; all Indonesians – except those of Chinese ethnicity – are recognized as indigenous.</p>	<p>The 1993 Constitution protects ethnic and cultural plurality and recognizes the right to communal property over lands; the legal personhood of Peasant and Native Communities (in the Andes and Amazon, respectively); autonomy in their organization; and communities’ jurisdiction over activities conducted within their territories. Different laws implement these provisions (e.g., the Law of Prior Consultation).</p>
<p>SIS consists of 7 principles, 17 criteria and 32 indicators, which are intended to guide REDD+ implementers in conducting self-assessments and reporting their safeguard implementation. SIS REDD+ has been tested in Jambi and East Kalimantan provinces.</p>	<p>SIS (presented in December 2021) has three core components: 1) a safeguards portal; 2) an MIS application where users can register how REDD+ initiatives are respecting safeguards; and 3) a grievance mechanism. Its development included a stakeholder consultation process, including with Indigenous Peoples’ organizations.</p>
<p>The 1945 Constitution stresses that all citizens have equal status before the law, and gender issues have been mainstreamed in the national long-term development plan for 2005–2025. In 2010, gender responsive budget tagging was piloted in seven ministries. In 2011, the Ministry of Forestry issued Ministerial Regulation P. 65/2011 on Guidelines for Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting, which was then amended by Ministerial Regulation P.31/2017 on Guidance for the Implementation of Gender Mainstreaming in the Environment and Forestry Sectors.</p>	<p>The Law of Forestry and Wildlife establishes that the state must guarantee equal access conditions to resources, development opportunities and benefit sharing mechanisms, with a gendered approach. The Ministry of Environment developed an Action Plan of Gender and Climate Change to incorporate a gender-based approach within policy and management tools on climate change adaptation and mitigation. Gender is a cross-cutting theme within the process of implementing the NDC and the national process of safeguards interpretation, yet it remains to be translated into concrete and relevant actions.</p>
<p>Indonesia is a signatory to UNDRIP, but has not ratified ILO Convention No. 169 as the government deems the convention’s definition of Indigenous Peoples inappropriate to the Indonesian context.</p>	<p>Signatory of ILO 169 (ratified in 1994), UNDRIP, the OAS’ American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.</p>
<p>Customary forests, previously categorized as state forest, are now recognized as being collectively owned by customary communities. Local community and customary groups can apply for social forestry permits. To be eligible, a community must have a subnational level regulation recognizing its existence as a customary community. Progress in recognition has not been uniform across the country.</p>	<p>Communal rights over land are recognized, with rights that are imprescriptible and guaranteed against seizure. However, communal rights can only be granted to lands classified as appropriate for agriculture or pastures, whereas Indigenous Peoples can only claim usufruct rights over land classified as forests. The process to access such contracts is complex and overregulated, leading communities to extract timber informally for which they receive fines. Furthermore, rights over the resources in the subsoil of titled communities are held by the state.</p>
<p>Carbon rights held by the state, but communities will access the benefits from carbon emission reductions. Further regulations related to community participation are still to be introduced.</p>	<p>It can be interpreted from existing laws that whoever holds tenure rights over land – private or communal property, or forestry concessions – also holds carbon rights. However, as communities only hold usufruct rights over forest lands, they may be entitled to benefits, but not to decide or directly negotiate the terms of carbon credit commercialization.</p>
<p>There is no legal framework for FPIC as per international principles. However, different aspects of FPIC (e.g., participation, transparency or access to information) can be found in human rights law and several laws and regulations. FPIC has been implemented voluntarily in Indonesia following sustainable certification standards.</p>	<p>Legislated under the Law of Prior Consultation and its bylaws, following Peru’s responsibilities under ILO C169.</p>
<p>Designed, but not yet in operation. The Environmental Fund Management Agency was established in 2019 to manage funding for environmental and emissions reduction programmes. In the context of the ERPA with the FCPF, benefits will be allocated to incentivize governments and other beneficiaries for their efforts in reducing emissions, and to reward customary communities for their historical forest protection.</p>	<p>Although the benefit sharing mechanism was expected to be concluded in 2019, it is yet to be presented. Under the Law of Forestry and Wildlife, forest rights holders are entitled to receive the benefits derived from payment for ecosystem services schemes. It remains to be seen how this will be included in the formal benefit sharing mechanism for REDD+.</p>
<p>Developed based on existing systems of grievance redress that exist at village, provincial and national levels. Different mechanisms apply depending on the type of grievance, which can be received by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry and other enforcement agencies, as well as by village and provincial institutions. The reporting of grievances will be linked to the national SIS.</p>	<p>The Mecanismo de Atención al Ciudadano (MAC-REDD+) was designed as part of Peru’s SIS, and has already gone through a participatory process to receive feedback to improve its performance.</p>
<p>The monitoring, reporting and verification component of REDD+ also covers implementation of safeguards. For this purpose, the government has developed tools to measure safeguard implementation. However, the reporting of safeguards does not require much specificity or a qualitative assessment.</p>	<p>Given the recent launch of the Safeguards Information Module, it is too early to assess whether there are robust provisions for measurement, monitoring, reporting and verification with respect to REDD+ safeguards.</p>

References

- Arwida S, Maharani CD, Basnett BS, Yang AL, Resosudarmo DP, Wong GY, Brockhaus M, Madhavan P. 2016. Gender in forestry and REDD+ in Indonesia. CIFOR Factsheet. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.
- Dhedya Lonu M-B, Sarmiento Barletti JP, Larson AM. 2022. Examining support for the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the context of REDD+ in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.
- [Ditjen PPI] Directorate General of Climate Change Control. 2016. Mewujudkan 29% Penurunan Emisi Karbon Indonesia melalui REDD+ Komunitas. Accessed 16 August 2022. <http://ditjenppi.menlhk.go.id/kcpi/index.php/aksi/redd/implementasi/305-mewujudkan-29-penurunan-emisi-karbon-indonesia-melalui-redd-komunitas-konsorsium-pendukung-sistem-hutan-kerakyatan>
- Guevara Gil A and Cabanillas C. 2019. Mineralizing the right to prior consultation: From recognition to disregard of indigenous peasant rights in Peru. *Global Jurist* 20(1).
- Jodoin S. 2017. Forest preservation in a changing climate: REDD+ and Indigenous and community rights in Indonesia and Tanzania. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- IWGIA. 2021. The Indigenous World 2021: Indonesia. Accessed 3 January 2022. <https://www.iwgia.org/en/indonesia/4224-iw-2021-indonesia.html>
- Liswanti N, Tamara A, Djoudi H. 2020. Climate finance and gender on the ground: Insights from mitigation and adaptation interventions in Indonesia. CIFOR Infobrief 306. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.
- Lofts K, Sarmiento Barletti JP, Larson AM. 2021. Lessons towards rights-responsive REDD+ safeguards from a literature review. CIFOR-ICRAF Working Paper. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR-ICRAF.
- Monterroso I, Cronkleton P, Pinedo D, Larson AM. 2017. Reclaiming collective rights. Land and forest tenure reforms in Peru (1960–2016). Working Paper 224, CIFOR, CGIAR.
- Nofyanza S, Moeliono M, Selviana V, Dwisatrio B, Liswanti N, Tamara A, Komalasari M. 2020. Revisiting the REDD+ experience in Indonesia: Lessons from national, subnational and local implementation. CIFOR Infobrief 314. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.
- Rights and Resources Initiative. 2021. Status of Legal Recognition of Indigenous Peoples', Local Communities' and Afro-descendant Peoples' Rights to Carbon Stored in Tropical Lands and Forests. Technical Report. Accessed 13 December 2021. <https://rightsandresources.org/publication/carbon-rights-technical-report/>
- Rodríguez S, Sarmiento Barletti JP, Larson AM. 2022. Examining support for the rights of Indigenous Peoples in the context of REDD+ in Peru. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR-ICRAF.
- Sarmiento Barletti JP and Larson AM. 2017. Rights abuse allegations in the context of REDD+ readiness and implementation: A preliminary review and proposal for moving forward. CIFOR Infobrief 190. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.
- Sarmiento Barletti JP, Larson AM, Lofts K, Frechette A. 2021. Safeguards at a glance: Supporting the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in REDD+ and other forest-based initiatives. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR-ICRAF.
- Savarese A. 2013. REDD+ and human rights: Addressing synergies between international regimes. *Ecology and Society* 18(3).
- Simamarta R and Sasmita T. 2021. Self-determined land rights in Indonesia: A review on various tenure recognition options. Accessed 3 January 2022. https://www.forestpeoples.org/sites/default/files/documents/Tenure%20options%20-%20Final%20Report_English.pdf
- Siscawati M. 2020. Gender and forest tenure reform in Indonesia. CIFOR Working Paper 258. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.
- Tamara AR, Liswanti N, Sarmiento Barletti JP, Larson AM. 2022. Examining support for the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the context of REDD+ in Indonesia. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.
- [UNDP] United Nations Development Programme. 2021. Gender responsive climate budgeting in Indonesia. Accessed 3 January 2022. <https://www.id.undp.org/content/indonesia/en/home/library/others/12292021.html>
- Vásquez R, Pérez R, Olivera I, Zúñiga C, Villena D. 2019. Independent Assessment of Peru's Readiness Package. Executive Summary. Climate Change and Forest Program, DAR.
- Wallbott L. 2014. Indigenous Peoples in UN REDD+ negotiations: 'Importing power' and lobbying for rights through discursive interplay management. *Ecology and Society* 19(1).



cifor-icraf.org

Series on social safeguards standards #6

See the full series here:

<https://www.cifor-icraf.org/research/topic/multi-stakeholder-platforms/>

Photo by Juan Carlos Huayllapuma/CIFOR

CIFOR-ICRAF

The Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) and the International Center for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF) envision a more equitable world where trees in all landscapes, from drylands to the humid tropics, contribute to improving the environment and well-being of everyone. CIFOR-ICRAF are research centers of the CGIAR.

