

Learning Initiative on Social Impact of REDD+ (LISA-REDD)

Workshop Report

Experts' Meeting on Social Impact Assessment Methodologies for National or Sub-National REDD+

May 8-10, 2012

World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)

Nairobi, Kenya

With support from the U.S. Agency for International Development's
Forest Carbon, Markets, and Communities (FCMC) Program



Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations	iii
Executive Summary	v
Overview	1
Day 1 - May 8	
Introduction	3
<i>Tony Simons, ICRAF; Phil Franks, CARE International</i>	
The Assessment Guidance Framework	5
<i>Diane Russell, USAID</i>	
Elements of Social Impact Analysis and their Relevance to National Level REDD+	6
<i>Paul Francis, Independent Consultant</i>	
Some Learning from Large Scale Assessments of Livelihood Change	9
<i>Frank Place, ICRAF</i>	
Social Impact Assessment for VPAs - The Relevance for REDD+	11
<i>Mary Hobley, Independent Consultant</i>	
Participatory Social Impact Assessment for National/Subnational REDD+ Programs ...	14
<i>Michael Richards, Forest Trends; Oscar Maldonado, Independent Consultant</i>	
Day 2 - May 9	
Social Impacts of REDD+	17
<i>Pam Jagger, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, CIFOR</i>	
How can more rigorous research designs better inform the design and more appropriate targeting of evidence-based policies for improved rural livelihoods and improved forests?	19
<i>Lauren Persha, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</i>	
Strategic Social and Environmental Assessment (SESA) and the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) as developed by the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	21
<i>Tom Blomley, Independent Consultant, Workshop Facilitator</i>	
Social Assessment of Protected Areas Initiative (SAPA)	23
<i>Phil Franks, CARE International</i>	
Group Work - Part 1: Applying the Assessment Guidance Framework to Three Pilot Countries: Ghana, Kenya and Cameroon	25
<i>Facilitated by Tom Blomley</i>	
Day 3 - May 10	
Group Work - Part 2: Enabling Conditions and Methodological Guidance	29
<i>Facilitated by Tom Blomley and Phil Franks</i>	
Country Selection for Piloting	31
<i>Eva Garen, Conservation International, the FCMC Program</i>	

Conclusions and Next Steps	33
<i>Facilitated by Tom Blomley and Phil Franks</i>	
Appendix 1: Workshop Agenda	36
Appendix 2: Participant List	39
Appendix 3: Compilation of Participant Questions and Comments	40
Appendix 4: The Assessment Guidance Framework (AGF)	44
Appendix 5: The Seven Stages of the SBIA Process	45
Appendix 6: Group Work Part 1 - Assessment Guidance Framework - Ghana	46
Appendix 7: Group Work Part 1 - Assessment Guidance Framework - Kenya	47
Appendix 8: Group Work Part 1 - Assessment Guidance Framework - Cameroon ...	48
Appendix 9: Country Selection Scenarios for Piloting	49

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AGF	Assessment Guidance Framework
BIA	Biodiversity Impact Assessment
CCBA	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CI	Conservation International
CIFOR	Center for International Forest Research
COP	Conference of the Parties
DHS	Demographic Health Surveys
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
ESMF	Environmental and Social Management Framework
EU	European Union
FCMC	Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FFI	Fauna and Flora International
FIP	Forest Investment Program
FLEGT	Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
GCS	Global Comparative Study
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IP	Indigenous Peoples
IUCN-TILCEPA	International Union for Conservation of Nature - Theme on Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas
LISA-REDD	Learning Initiative on Social Assessment of REDD+
LSMS	Living Standards Measurement Study
MINEP	Ministry of Environment and Protection of Nature
Norad	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
PA	Protected Area
RA	Rainforest Alliance
PIA	Poverty Impact Assessment
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PSIA	Poverty and Social Impact Analysis
RCT	Randomized Control Trials
R-PP	REDD Readiness Preparation Proposal

REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation, plus the Role of Conservation, Sustainable Management of Forests and Enhancement of Forest Carbon Stocks in Developing Countries
REDD+ SES	REDD+ Social and Environmental Safeguards
SAPA	Social Assessment of Protected Areas Initiative
SBIA	Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment
SESA	Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment
SIA	Social Impact Assessment
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
TOC	Theory of Change
UNEP-WCMC	United Nations Environment Programme - World Conservation Monitoring Center
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VPA	Voluntary Partnership Agreement

Executive Summary

Social Impact Assessment is Crucial to the Success of REDD+ Programs

The successful implementation of programs to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) depends upon the ability of national governments to effectively measure, monitor and report on the social impacts of REDD+ programs in practice. The Learning Initiative for Social Assessment of REDD+ (LISA-REDD) was formed in 2011 by a consortium of international organizations to develop new methodologies, tools and guidance on assessing and monitoring the social impacts of national REDD+ programs. With technical and financial support from USAID's Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities (FCMC) Program, LISA-REDD convened an Experts' Meeting in Nairobi, Kenya in May 2012 to: (1) characterize different methods and tools for social impact assessment (SIA) of national REDD+ programs; (2) develop an approach to select the most appropriate methods and tools for a given need and context; and (3) produce a roadmap for piloting appropriate methodologies with receptive countries. Twenty-nine participants attended, representing 10 countries and 16 institutions.

Key Findings

Workshop participants developed priority recommendations regarding SIA, including:

- **Create enabling conditions to ensure national-level support and ownership.** If SIA is to become an integral component of emerging national REDD+ programs, then the process must be owned by national governments and other stakeholders. Careful attention must be given to how SIA is introduced in different countries so that national governments view SIA as a positive component of their REDD+ program rather than as an infringement upon national sovereignty.
- **Draw upon existing approaches to assessing social impacts in different sectors for guidance and lessons learned.** Existing approaches to social impact assessment in different sectors, including the World Bank's Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA), the Poverty Impact Assessment (PIA) and the Social Assessment of Protected Areas Initiative (SAPA), have the potential to provide valuable methodological and procedural insight into the integration of SIA into emerging national REDD+ programs.
- **Encourage synergies between national REDD+ programs and complementary national level programs in related sectors.** Several countries are participating in forest governance and legality initiatives, such as the Forest Law Enforcement, Government and Trade (FLEGT) Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs), which

Background to LISA-REDD

Billions of dollars in international financial support to assist the development of national REDD+ programs is expected to be delivered over the next decade. There is increasing concern from civil society, donors, private sector investors and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) regarding the potential adverse social impacts of REDD+ programs and their ability to generate multiple benefits for local people. Concerns include the displacement of Indigenous Peoples and other communities from traditional lands and reduced access to forest resources for livelihood purposes, which may increase conflict over the use and control of natural resources. Despite the pressing need to identify and monitor the social impacts of REDD+ programs, no methodologies exist specifically for REDD+ that national governments can use to measure and report on these impacts.

require that national governments address many of the same issues as in REDD+ programs (i.e., social impact assessment, stakeholder engagement and benefit distribution). Although the VPAs focus on the same countries, peoples and forests as REDD+, they often involve different systems and institutional arrangements.

- **Ensure that SIA for national REDD+ programs complements ongoing efforts to address social safeguards.** SIA is addressed to varying degrees by donors, national governments and non-governmental organizations, such as through UN-REDD, the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (SES) and the Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), to meet the REDD+ safeguard requirements outlined in the Cancun Agreements of the UNFCCC. LISA-REDD should coordinate activities with these existing approaches to ensure that SIA is a prominent component that is addressed comprehensively.
- **Draw upon existing and oftentimes diverging approaches to SIA applied to REDD+ projects.** Valuable methodological lessons from REDD+ SIA at the project level are applicable to national level SIA of REDD+ programs, including methodologies that address attribution, theory of change, causality and counterfactuals.
- **Further refine and pilot a comprehensive framework to guide the impact assessment process.** An SIA Assessment Guidance Framework was introduced and refined by participants during the workshop to guide thinking about social assessment at the national level. If further refined, this framework can provide a comprehensive systems approach to integrating SIA into national level REDD+ programs.

Next Steps

Workshop participants identified the following key steps for LISA-REDD:

1. **Produce a comprehensive analysis of all SIA methods and approaches** that can be applied to national level REDD+ programs, which the FCMC Program will support. This analysis will contribute to a resource book that will guide national-level stakeholders on deciding which SIA method(s) is/are most appropriate for their REDD+ program.
2. **Organize facilitate working groups** so that participants can make progress on the following key areas: (a) methodological guidance; (b) refining the Assessment Guidance Framework; and (c) selecting countries in which to pilot SIA approaches and methods.
3. **Further develop LISA-REDD's governance structure and seek funding for future activities**, including the development of a secretariat and materials for communication and training purposes.
4. **Engage with international initiatives supporting REDD+ readiness**, including the FCPF, UN-REDD, REDD+ SES and bilateral donors.
5. **Pilot SIA methods and approaches** in four or five REDD+ countries and facilitate lessons learned for a wide range of stakeholders.

Overview

LISA-REDD

While methodologies exist for assessing the social impacts of REDD+ processes at the project level, there are no methodology or guidance for assessing social impacts of national REDD+ programs in a comprehensive way and the international programs supporting REDD+ readiness currently are not addressing this gap. A number of international organizations involved in REDD+ processes formed a partnership called the Learning Initiative on Social Assessment of REDD+ (LISA-REDD) to address this gap. The overall goal of LISA-REDD is “to provide methods and guidance for assessing social impacts of national and sub-national REDD+ programs to help governments and civil society design, implement, and build support for, effective and equitable REDD+.” LISA-REDD expects to focus on facilitating the development of methodologies, tools and guidance, alongside capacity building through a range of approaches that develop, capture, spread and apply learning in a small group of key countries.

LISA-REDD focuses on national REDD+ programs (and sub-national programs, where appropriate), and the implementation of national REDD+ strategies. These programs and policies have the aim of addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation from within and outside the forest sector. National REDD+ strategies also are likely to include other broad enabling policies and other measures to allow governments to effectively implement REDD+ through national institutions. Enabling policies may include land tenure reforms, institutional and governance reforms and harmonization of other sectorial policies. As REDD+ ultimately will involve a financial transfer from developed to developing countries based on emissions reductions, the way in which these finances are distributed at the national and sub-national level between and within stakeholder groups is likely to influence the social impacts or development outcomes generated by REDD+.

Core LISA-REDD Members

The organizations that are core members of LISA-REDD include: CARE International, Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA), Conservation International (CI), Center for International Forest Research (CIFOR), Forest Trends, Overseas Development Institute (ODI), International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)'s Forests, Carbon, Markets and Communities (FCMC) program. In addition to these core organizations, LISA-REDD collaborates with a range of other key stakeholders engaged in REDD+, such as the World Bank and UN-REDD.

Achieving Social and Environmental Benefits Through REDD+

Although REDD+ emerged as a climate change mitigation mechanism, there has been growing recognition that the REDD+ could contribute towards achieving important biodiversity and social goals. Examples of social benefits include:

- Poverty reduction;
- The development of sustainable livelihoods for forest dependent people, Indigenous Peoples and other communities;
- Reduction of inequality through targeted benefit distribution mechanisms;
- Improvements in forest governance;
- Enhanced security of land tenure and forest rights for Indigenous Peoples and other forest dependent people;

- Ensuring continued provision of ecosystem services of benefit to people; and
- Improving and stabilizing incomes derived from the forest sector.

There also is a strong interest in mitigating any negative social impacts of REDD+, especially on vulnerable populations, which has generated international pressure on donors and REDD+ countries to ensure that as a minimum REDD+ “does no harm”. This process has driven the development of the REDD+ safeguards under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Much of the work on understanding impacts of REDD+ focuses broadly on potential social impacts, as data from implementation at the project or program level is scarce.

The achievement of social benefits and the avoidance of harm through REDD+ implementation, however, is far from assured. Much will depend on national-level design and implementation of REDD+ programs, including how drivers of deforestation and degradation are identified and addressed, how costs and benefits are distributed within the country, how and whether forest land tenure issues are resolved and the level of participation of forest-dependent people and marginalized groups in the design and implementation of REDD+ programs.

The Importance of Social Impact Assessment

For national-level policies and measures for REDD+ (as opposed to site-based projects and actions), including readiness activities, there is a need to assess social impacts on an on-going basis to inform REDD+ strategy development and implementation and to comply with multilateral agency policies. The assessment of social impacts has increasingly become a central element of international funding processes in support of REDD+, through processes like the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)’s Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), the UN-REDD Social and Environmental Safeguards Framework, and the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES). Although such processes exist, there is no nationally-appropriate and comprehensive methodological guidance on how to apply these concepts.

The Experts' Workshop

With technical and financial support from the USAID-funded Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities (FCMC) Program, LISA-REDD organized a three-day experts' meeting at the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) in Nairobi, Kenya to help address these methodological gaps (see appendix 1). This meeting follows up the first LISA-REDD+ workshop that took place in March 2011, which was organized to explore options, opportunities and constraints for assessment of the social impacts of national REDD+ programs as requested or required by the FCPF and UN-REDD, the REDD+ SES and the UNFCCC REDD+ Safeguards.

The following are the primary objectives identified for the expert meeting:

1. Review and characterize different methods/tools for social impact assessment for national or sub-national REDD+ programs;
2. Develop an approach to select the most appropriate methods/tools for a given need and context and adapt these methods/tools as necessary; and
3. Set out a process and roadmap for piloting or testing the ‘best-bet’ methodologies with receptive countries.

Twenty-nine participants attended the workshop, representing 10 countries and 16 institutions (see appendix 2). This report provides a summary of the experts' workshop, which includes next steps for LISA-REDD. The report also captures the diverse questions posed by workshop participants throughout the meeting (see appendix 3).

Introduction

Dr. Tony Simons (Director General of ICRAF) gave the opening address. He stressed that although REDD+ involves a number of important social issues, to date REDD+ mostly has been addressed through a technical and political lens. He suggested approaching REDD+ using landscape-level approaches, which can help to address the drivers of deforestation, reduce problems such as leakage and enhance participation of rural communities and developing countries in REDD+ deals. Simons also discussed the concept of Climate Smart Agriculture and stressed that REDD+ interventions are also highly relevant for agricultural landscapes. He argued that ICRAF and the wider research community must do more on impact assessment and the social aspects of trees in the wider landscapes. Also, he said that the market will not solve deforestation and stressed the need to focus on rehabilitating agricultural landscapes in order to stop expansion into the remaining forests. Finally, Simons introduced the concept of "rainbow water" and how forested areas may actually drive rainfall patterns in agricultural regions.

Phil Franks (CARE International) provided an introductory presentation to LISA-REDD, which also included background on the origin of REDD+ social safeguards and assessment, the REDD+ social safeguards and safeguard information systems. He began his presentation with an analysis of REDD+ risks and opportunities (i.e., the potential for REDD+ to contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable development), which has led to the need to establish social safeguards. He presented different definitions of safeguards to distinguish between those that are designed to avoid "doing harm" and mitigate against negative impacts (i.e., the World Bank approach) versus those that both avoid doing harm and also ensure that people and the environment benefit from REDD+ (i.e., the approach in the Cancun Agreements). Franks reviewed the primary REDD+ safeguards mechanisms required of countries receiving REDD+ readiness funds from the FCPF and UN-REDD. He also described a voluntary set of standards, designed to ensure optimal social and environmental performance for national level REDD+ programs, referred to as REDD+ SES.

With this background, Franks further described the Cancun Principles and the request that developing countries Parties to develop a system for providing information on how the safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of the activities (referred to as safeguard information systems). He presented the potential elements of a national safeguards system for REDD+, as well as a diagram of a potential safeguard information system (see figure 1).¹ Franks also described the following three primary categories of information to which safeguards are applied: (1) content of REDD+ strategies, policies and plans; (2) processes of REDD+ policy development, design/planning and REDD+ implementation (including governance); and (3) the impacts of REDD+, which is the focus of LISA-REDD.

¹ This figure is a work in progress with CARE, UN-REDD, the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES) and others.




Figure 1. Potential Safeguards Information System

Franks provided the following three primary reasons that highlight why it is important to assess the social impacts of REDD+.

1. Assessing social impacts will help to determine to what extent REDD+ safeguards are actually working (i.e. enhancing benefits and avoiding harm);
2. Impact assessment will show that REDD+ is making a significant contribution to national poverty reduction/sustainable development goals (i.e. and therefore to offsetting opportunity costs); and
3. Social impact assessment will determine how REDD+ effectiveness can be maximised with least social cost and highest social benefit.

While there is substantial experience assessing the social impacts of site-based forest management and conservation activities and increasing efforts to develop and test methodologies for assessing the social impacts of REDD+ at the site level, Franks said that little attention has been given to assessing the social impacts of national REDD+ programs.

Franks explained that LISA-REDD was created, "to provide methods, tools and guidance for assessing social impacts of REDD+ programs to help governments and civil society to design, implement, and build support for, effective and equitable REDD+ that delivers on sustainable development, human rights and good governance objectives". He provided two clarifications regarding LISA-REDD. First, the initiative understands social impacts as including benefits and costs related to ecosystem services to the extent that these contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable development. Second, the initiative focuses on REDD+ programs at national or sub-national (i.e., state or provincial) levels and not REDD+ projects, although information from projects will contribute to the assessment process. The approach of LISA-REDD is to address

impact assessment needs from design through to evaluation (*ex-ante*, ongoing² and *ex-post*) by placing a strong emphasis on generating and sharing learning at both country and international levels.

The Assessment Guidance Framework

Dr. Diane Russell (USAID and activity manager for the FCMC Program's social and environment soundness (SES) component) introduced primary concepts related to the social aspects of REDD+ and a framework that can guide social assessment for REDD+. She referred to this framework as the Assessment Guidance Framework (AGF), which she explained that the workshop participants would be modifying throughout the meeting (see appendix 4).

Russell provided introductory information about why we are concerned with social issues in REDD+. She explained that there will be many impacts of REDD+ on land use and resources so it is vital to ensure that REDD+ does no harm and also generates co-benefits. We also need to examine the potential for REDD+ to make contributions towards broader social transformation and development. Although not everyone agrees with this perspective, Russell argued that LISA-REDD should look at how to do it efficiently and how to implement and track the process. The social dimensions of REDD+ include safeguard policies and processes, social performance standards, safeguard information systems, stakeholder engagement, social impact assessment (SIA) of REDD+ projects and the SESA of REDD+ programs.

With regard to REDD+, Russell explained that social impact assessment and strategic social assessment are vital to: (1) ensure that safeguards and standards are being met or identifying shortfalls that need to be addressed; (2) provide tools or approaches for working towards larger social and related development objectives; and (3) provide a means for management, accountability, evaluation and transparency. Social impact assessment and strategic social assessment also are important for adaptive management, which can be an extremely challenging process at the national level. She differentiated between project and national level SIA according to the following characterization:

- **Project level SIA** – *ex-ante* to improve project design and set up baseline data; *ex-post* to assess actual impacts (sometimes years later);
- **Program, sector, or national level** – broader, more strategic, focusing on assessing policies and enabling conditions (i.e., SESAs) to assess safeguard compliance and risks and to lay groundwork for risk management frameworks.

Russell highlighted a number of key challenges related to national level social assessments, including: (1) identifying who are the stakeholders; (2) accomplishing meaningful and representative consultations; (3) given the complexity of policy and other factors, identifying impacts of broader programs (attribution challenges); (4) given site-specificity, determining which methods and tools are most useful; and (5) determining how to make tradeoffs among time, resources, participation and capacities in undertaking assessments? She proposed the AGF to provide components or variables to take into account when thinking about social assessment at the national level.

² The World Bank refers to on-going assessment as "synchronous".

Russell also highlighted the following key issues that should be considered when thinking about how to conduct social impact assessments of national REDD+ programs:

- **Consider that the philosophy of the people who are developing and conducting social impact assessments** will greatly impact how these assessments are designed, including what they include (and leave out);
- **Ensure that vulnerable populations are not negatively affected by REDD+ programs.** Many regions are quite fragile socially and politically and anything that changes the definition of land and land use and ownership - such as REDD+ - could exacerbate or generate human conflict;
- **Consider that the logistical aspects of how to do social impact assessments of REDD+ programs in several countries,** such as the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), will be extremely challenging in light of existing social and political conflict;
- **Consider how to institutionalize the assessment framework** and approach within a country. It must be owned and supported by stakeholders in each country or it will not be useful;
- **Match methods to parameters in the AGF by looking at tradeoffs and by matching methods and tools.** For example, it is important to use participatory and reflective methods at community and national levels. Also, examples of matching methods to parameters include participatory/adaptive management, process/qualitative, case study/comparative, impact, quantitative, indicators, impact/fine-grained/ethnographic, GIS/map based and multi-sectorial;
- **Consider several key REDD+ elements,** including drivers of deforestation hypothesis testing, stakeholder mapping, local participation, capacity, international reporting protocol/standards, safeguards monitoring, standards verification and monitoring, independent watchdog monitoring, and integration/harmonization with MRV;
- **Take a systems approach,** which requires envisioning a whole system before narrowing things down. This approach requires mapping the social-biophysical impact pathways (i.e., a causal model) and the links between social impacts and ecosystem impacts. This approach also requires factoring in externalities (i.e., REDD+ is a tiny factor in a huge landscape of investments pouring in for mining, oil palm, etc.), as well as testing and re-testing assumptions. It is critical, for example, that there is evidence and baselines with controls to show that a program is actually reducing deforestation;
- **Be responsive and responsible** by identifying the most vulnerable populations, planning jointly and returning results, integrating grassroots indicators and building local capacity; and
- **Consider data quality** by matching methodologies to specific research questions, recognizing sensitive data (i.e., lots of things that people are doing are illegal) and identifying information that needs geo-referencing.

Elements of Social Impact Analysis and their Relevance to National Level REDD+

Paul Francis (independent consultant) discussed the elements of SIA and its relevance to national level REDD+. He provided a general overview of SIA (i.e.: What is impact analysis?

Why do social impact analysis? When do you do it *and* how do you do it?), after which he addressed the same questions for SIA in the context of national REDD+ programs.

General Overview

- **What is impact analysis?** Impact analysis is the systematic investigation of the changes brought about by an intervention. It implies three things: (1) that there is an intervention; (2) that something is acted upon; and (3) that there is a change.
- **What is an intervention?** An intervention could comprise a project (large or small), a program and a policy or a set of policies, either national or international.
- **What is being acted upon?** This will be a bounded slice of reality: a situation or system, which - even if complex - is bounded (at least conceptually), defined by value and intention, and with characteristics that are physical, environmental, economic, societal, institutional and cultural.
- **What is impact?** The positive and negative, intended and unintended, direct and indirect, primary and secondary effects produced by an intervention.
- **What are social impacts?** Social impacts are subset of impact, although all impacts are social since they involve social relations. Hence the boundary is somewhat arbitrary: social impacts are not fully separable from other impacts either conceptually, causally or in value terms. Some social impacts may be of particular policy relevance, such as poverty, equity and social exclusion. In fact, poverty is prioritized in some approaches, such as the Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA) and the Poverty Impact Analysis (PIA).
- **What is Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA)?** A PSIA is an assessment of the distributional impact of specific policy reforms on the well-being or welfare of different stakeholder groups, with particular focus on the poor and vulnerable. PSIA is not a method but an approach.
- **Types of social impacts?** Some types of social impacts are easily measurable and some are not. Some of examples of changes to people include:
 - Way of life - how they live, work and interact with one another;
 - Culture - shared beliefs, customs, values and language;
 - Community - its cohesion, stability, character, services and facilities;
 - Political systems - ability to participate in decisions, level of democratization;
 - Environment - the availability or quality of air, water food; the level of hazard of risk (exposure to noise, toxic materials, dust); sanitation, safety and other resources;
 - Health and well-being - in the fullest sense;
 - Personal and property rights - including economic and civil liberties; and
 - Fears and aspirations - perceptions about their safety, their own future and that of their children and community.
- **Primary questions of an SIA:** (1) who will be affected; and (2) how will they be affected?
- **Why do an SIA?** To help design good interventions: design, plan, improve, engage, monitor, learn and understand.
- **When to do an SIA?**

- Before (*ex-ante*), in order to assess likely impacts in advance so as to improve design, promote positive impacts;
 - During (synchronous), to steer, modify the program or policy; and/or
 - After (*ex-post*), to learn the lessons (and act on them).
- **How to do an SIA?** There are three groups of activities:
 - (1) **Causal analysis** - develop a model of how the policy is supposed to work, which is your theory of change. This analysis should include both stakeholder and institutional analyses;
 - (2) **Collect data and information** - choose and use your methods based on questions to be answered (types of impacts, etc.), the form in which the answer is desired, existing data, client, audience, periodicity, capacities, resources available, etc. Generally a mix of methods will be appropriate for a mix of purposes. Choose your methods based upon the questions that you are asking; and
 - (3) **Interpret, conclude and act** - actions include learning, dissemination, advocacy, redesign and the fostering of public debate. It is critical to build this in from the first stage. This process is, at least in part, inherently political and not easy to achieve. Need to focus on the demand for, as much as the supply of, information and knowledge, the coherence of policy (which can be structured around social goals at a national level), and the institutionalization of procedures and standards.
 - **Crosscutting issues?** There also are two cross cutting issues when conducting and SIA - participation and poverty reduction.

Implications for REDD+?

With this background, Francis explained that within the context of REDD+ SIA and the preceding questions highlight the need to understand the intervention, the domain being acted upon and the impacts (both direct and indirect).

- **What are national REDD+ interventions?** REDD+ policies and mechanisms are still being defined, especially key issues such as benefit distribution and opportunity costs. We don't have the policy yet, so it is hard to figure out the impacts when we do not know what we are assessing. However, this situation can also be viewed as an advantage since we have the opportunity to integrate social concerns into the very formulation of the policy. REDD+ interventions are broad (sectorally and geographically) and include complex and multi-layered sets of stakeholders and institutions. REDD+ also overlaps substantially with existing national policies (in forestry, environment, etc.) and also with other programs (i.e., the FLEGT Voluntary Partnership Agreements - VPAs).
- **Social analysis and assessment in existing REDD+ formats and procedures?** Some social analysis and assessment is included in existing REDD+ formats and procedures (i.e., REDD+ Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) formats, SESA and ESMF, safeguards requirements, other standards, etc.), but it is not clear how it all fits together.
- **What are the impacts of REDD+?** They are complex, differentiated (by stakeholder and social group, which the stakeholder analysis will have shown), deferred (possibly by many years), difficult to predict, contested (who is actually causing deforestation?),

difficult to measure, institutional and governance process elements are critical, especially in the short term (i.e., the thing you will be measuring is to what extent the institution and processes are functioning and then their impact later on).

- **Possible REDD+ impacts at the local level?** Local impacts may include impacts on formal and informal (i.e., customary) tenure and access rights, income and employment sources (created/destroyed), distribution of new sources of income (i.e., benefit sharing), impacts of cash on communities, local institutions and culture, gender dimensions of impacts, change in access to public goods, services and infrastructure and changes in demand for products and prices.
- **Possible REDD+ impacts at the national level?** Improved environmental quality, savings due to improved environmental services (i.e., expenditure on flood reduction), contribution to Gross Domestic Product (GDP), improved physical infrastructure, improved institutions (i.e., forestry), more accountable national institutions and impact on national social indicators.
- **Is PSIA applicable to REDD+?** It is focused on policy for evidence-based policy making, has a country, sector or issues focus, focuses on equity, combines analysis with process, promotes inclusive policy making and can address political economy issues, and can be done before (*ex-ante*), during or after (*ex-post*) reform.

Conclusions

Method is important and methodological choice and rigor are critical. However, methodology and data collection are merely part of a set of systems (and often the least problematic part) that may include:

- A conceptual system, which is a causal structure of theory of change. What do you expect to happen and why?
- A knowledge and learning system for the on-going generation, flow of information and data, and ability to act on it;
- An institutional network that channels, disseminates and uses the data (or not);
- A political-economic system, which is part of the political world through which stakeholder interests are expressed, alliances built, decisions made and implemented (or not); and
- A financial/resource system, which is a sustainable system that supports costs of continuing knowledge generation.

Some Learning from Large Scale Assessments of Livelihood Change

Dr. Frank Place (ICRAF) presented on lessons learned from large-scale assessments of livelihood change. He addressed lessons about what to measure, going beyond "what changed," to counterfactuals for attribution and precision, design, sampling and nesting, data collection and thoughts on property rights issues.

- **What to measure:** Impacts are varied from environmental to economic to social and cultural, and you must leave space for unintended impacts. The underlying outcome changes are very important, especially for addressing the sustainability of the impacts measured. Some examples include institutional and policy change, the capacity of

organizations and individuals, efficiency gains (i.e., monitoring costs) and value chain strengthening, all of which are not easy to measure.

- **Beyond the "what":** Assessing why and how changes have occurred (or not) is where the lessons are learned and is critical for improving strategy over time and dissemination to other initiatives. This process is not easy since it requires multiple methods to be applied across a range of stakeholders.
- **Counterfactuals:** What would have happened in the absence of the intervention(s), project or program? This information is needed to present unbiased estimates of the intervention and for understanding attribution to the intervention. The concept of counterfactual is not only about quantitative assessment. In large, national scale programs, challenges include: (1) influence of the program outside of the target intervention areas (i.e., tree cover outside of REDD+ site); and (2) influence of other interventions taking place in the site at the same time. Also, the creation of observation sites/household where the intervention is not occurring is much more difficult the larger the scale of intervention.
- **Design issues:** You must address nesting with REDD+ programs on the ground in different places since you cannot measure everything everywhere. The nesting of impact design in REDD+ is important to consider in such cases but requires attention to a range of design issues, including the representativeness of sites, the importance of strata (ecological, institutional, etc.), possible different scales of interventions, and differences in costs of measurement.
- **Data collection:** Clear questions that minimize the degree of subjectivity of assessment are important so that they are replicable in the future. The balance of survey detail across sectors can be important (so as to avoid generating biased information), as is clear meta-analysis and data storage so someone else can use the data later on (i.e., sustainability of the system).
- **Property rights:** It is important to measure both the difference between what people "can" do versus what people actually do (especially women). Rights to carbon involves rights to the land, trees and the final carbon 'product'. Many dimensions need to be considered, such as how security is related to rights, external influence and assurance or conflict. Improved rights can be a useful reward for provision of ecosystem services.
- **Property rights and REDD+:** REDD+ may have effects on farms, perhaps by providing more incentives for on-farm planting if trees in forests are better conserved. In Kenya, there are farm forestry rules that may also have similar impacts, so it will be important to differentiate between the two when assessing causal chains. In other countries, forest regulations of trees may inhibit the ability of farmers to respond. As the demand for specific products changes, the effects of benefits will go to different users of tree products (i.e., cultivators, herders, fuel wood producers). Also, it is important to look at issues related to women and trees as commercialization opportunities increase. For example, men might take over even if women started the enterprise.

Conclusions

Place questioned how detailed we can go with a national monitoring system. He argued that you cannot monitor everything, but what you monitor must be carefully considered. LISA-REDD must be a learning process so it is imperative to develop a monitoring and assessment strategy and operational plan that the key stakeholders jointly own. This process should be guided by key evaluation questions.

Social Impact Assessment for Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs) - The Relevance for REDD+

Mary Hobley (independent consultant) presented her experience in undertaking social impact assessment of Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) and described the relevance of this process to REDD+.

Background on the VPA

The VPAs are one of the key elements of the European Union's (EU's) Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Action Plan to tackle illegal logging. These agreements are between wood producing countries and the EU to ensure that wood being exported to the EU is legal and that forest governance in the exporting country is improved. VPAs are a national legally-binding agreement that work by tackling the root causes of illegality, which include corruption and lack of clarity about land rights.³ The major focus of these agreements is on forest governance and legality, such as the legal and policy framework and the rights of local people over forest resources. The process combines strong multi-stakeholder deliberative processes with legal reforms, and is backed up by enforcement and monitoring.

Hobley highlighted the following six primary issues with the VPA, which might also be relevant to REDD+:

1. There is no real knowledge about the potential or actual effects of VPAs on peoples' livelihoods and on poverty outcomes, even though FLEGT has been in effect for over ten years. It is assumed that outcomes will be positive, but this assumption is not being tested. We also know that enforcing legality does have effects on formal and informal livelihood uses of forests;
2. The design and preparation process is based upon a weak understanding of the potential poverty effects of FLEGT/VPA;
3. There are variable levels of stakeholder involvement in the VPAs and the right stakeholders are not necessarily involved;
4. Baseline data against which to assess and attribute future impacts, or corresponding system for monitoring impact, does not exist;
5. Although one article of the VPA agreement commits to understanding livelihoods and to monitoring impacts, there is no guidance on how to do either activity in practice; and
6. While the VPAs are being planned and implemented in many of the same countries, and impacting the same people and forests as REDD+, they involve different systems and institutional arrangements.

VPAs and Social Impact

Specific references to safeguards in the VPAs call for the monitoring of social impacts. Hobley categorized the key references to safeguards in the following way:

³ This information about the VPAs was taken from the <http://www.fern.org/campaign/forest-law-and-governance/what-flegt-vpa>. Additional information about this process can be found at this site.

- To minimize possible adverse impacts, the Parties agree to develop a better understanding of the livelihoods of potentially affected indigenous and local communities as well as the timber industry, including those engaged in illegal logging (a preventative statement);
- The Parties will monitor the impacts of this Agreement on those communities and other actors identified in paragraph one of the VPA, while taking reasonable steps to mitigate any adverse impacts. The Parties may agree on additional measure to address adverse impacts (a reactive statement); and
- VPAs are moving beyond just 'do no harm' to improved poverty outcomes; and
- VPAs have 'hard' safeguards (i.e., the legal content of VPAs) and 'soft' safeguards (procedural processes of engagement and deliberation).

Poverty Impact Assessment (PIA) and the VPA

Hobley further explained that a number of groups are interested in Poverty Impact Assessment (PIA) for VPAs, including national governments, civil society, local people, the private sector and donors. She discussed how VPAs might build poverty impact understanding into their processes and content. She explained that poverty is multi-dimensional and that the VPAs are interested in human, economic, political and protective (i.e., insecurity, risk and vulnerability) aspects. The key elements of a VPA include bringing together governance and multi-dimensional aspects of poverty. The following four dimensions of change are necessary to reduce poverty:

1. Providing space for deliberation in order to provide context for meaningful negotiation, representation and accountability;
2. Building capacity of the poor to engage, influence and hold accountable;
3. Making changes to the 'rules of the game', which includes policies, regulations and legislation that supports changes in voice and access to assets and services and protection from increasing vulnerability of the poor; and
4. Accessing livelihood assets and services in order to build livelihood security for the poor through improving access to diverse assets and services (to ensure economic, socio-cultural and human capabilities).

Given this context, monitoring of impacts should occur as a continuum of understanding, learning and assessing poverty impacts. She and her colleague Michael Richards (Forest Trends) are conducting a PIA in a few selected VPA countries using this approach. She argued that it is important to conduct an *ex-ante* PIA (i.e., before we start the intervention) because it:

- Builds a shared understanding of the VPA's potential effects;
- Focuses on the distributional and gendered effects of policy and legislative change - both positively and negatively - and allows for preventative action to be taken;
- Is a systematic approach to assessing social consequences, enhancing positive social effects and ameliorating negative ones, including through the identification of appropriate mitigation and social risk reduction measure;
- Ensures that the right people are represented during the negotiation process with an understanding of the VPAs potential effects;
- Provides opportunities to influence policy and legal options in a VPA that provide positive poverty outcomes;

- Increases space and opportunity for on-going policy dialogue among a range of stakeholders contributing to increased transparency, accountability and ownership of policy formulation, and allowing decisions to be based on empirical evidence;
- Provides accountability upwards to taxpayers and donors that their money is being wisely invested in a VPA and downwards to those affected by VPAs, especially vulnerable groups;
- Provides a basis for poverty and social impact monitoring needed for adaptive management of VPAs based on a learning process, early detection of social problems before they become difficult and costly to counteract, and to help assess the social success of VPAs in terms of their social outcomes and impacts; and
- Is a relatively low cost process (between USD\$15,000-\$40,000).

In addition, Hopley identified the following key elements of an *ex-ante* PIA:

- **Identifying stakeholders** – how are the stakeholders identified for the negotiation process? This process should include those who are affected positively and negatively (i.e., the winners and losers) and those influential groups and actors who can influence decision-making and implementation;
- **Understanding the transmission channels (i.e., pathways for change)** – modelling the major impacts of the intervention. This process includes analysing:
 - **Prices:** production, consumption, wages;
 - **Employment:** formal and informal including self-employment;
 - **Transfers and taxes:** private and public;
 - **Access:** to private and public goods and services;
 - **Assets:** human, physical, social, financial, natural, levels/values and return; and
 - **Authority:** formal and informal power relations and structures.
- **Assessing institutions** - to what extent the envisaged impacts can be realised in view of the capacities and other constraints of involved institutions and organisations;
- **Analysing impacts** - whether intended or not at the micro-level and their distribution across social groups;
- **Assessing risks** - to anticipate and avoid unintended consequences; and
- **Assessing socio-cultural and political dimensions of well-being** - impacts of intervention on capabilities of individuals or social groups.

Key Questions to Ask During Ex-Ante PIA

- Who are the groups, people affected and in what way (i.e., stakeholder analysis);
- How are these groups, institutions affected (i.e., institutional analysis);
- What are the pathways through which change happens (i.e., transmission pathways); and
- What is the theory of change?

Conclusions

- The FLEGT/VPA is also about poverty and not just about illegal logging and poverty is more than income. The VPAs can support all aspects of poverty reduction.

- The VPA process and content offers opportunities to address poverty and that poverty outcomes depend on quality of process and understanding. For example, who is involved with the process (i.e., what issues are presented, what analysis is available, whose voice is listened to), how is understanding translated into the content of the VPA, how to attach implementation and importance to poverty outcomes and how to institutionalize learning and the authority to act?
- The quality of the process is an absolutely key aspect and unless the right people and institutions are involved then the process will not make a difference. How the process is institutionalized at the very beginning also is very important so that there is clear authority to act.

Participatory Social Impact Assessment (SIA) for National and Subnational REDD+ Programs

Michael Richards (Forest Trends) and Oscar Maldonado (independent consultant) presented on participatory SIA for national and subnational REDD+ programs. Richards began the presentation by reviewing the challenges of SIA and potential methodologies, and Maldonado concluded with a discussion of the Open Standards initiative.

Some Key Challenges for SIA of REDD+

According to Richards, some of the key challenges for conducting an SIA of national REDD+ programs include:

- The nature of social impacts, since they tend to be long-term, indirect and unexpected;
- The complexity of addressing attribution and cost (i.e., understanding the how and why);
- The fact that overall there is a weak understanding of the social effects of REDD+;
- The complexity of achieving stakeholder participation and Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC); and
- How to address social differentiation.

Methodological Implications

Richards explained that the methodological implications of these key challenges include:

- Factoring in attribution, which is a vital role of creating credible indicators;
- Informing the program management cycle (i.e., strategic design, including the need to analyze potential negative impacts and risks to design mitigation measures and for adaptive management);
- Ensuring that methods are FPIC compatible (i.e., participatory and transparent); and
- Differentiating stakeholders, especially vulnerable people.

Potential Suite of Methods

Richards presented the following possible suite of methods to use for SIA, which is based on a combination of PSIA, PIA (OECD 2007)⁴ and the Social and Biodiversity Impact Assessment (SBIA) manual:

- **Stakeholder and institutional/political economy analysis:** Who are the vulnerable stakeholders and how are they affected?
- **Transmissions pathway analysis:** How would REDD+ affect vulnerable stakeholder groups? What are the likely indirect social effects of REDD+ policies?
- **Participatory theory of change (TOC) analysis:** This is informed by 1 & 2 (although TOC could come before 2 but would then need to be revised after 2).

He focused only on the third method, the participatory theory of change (TOC) analysis, since Hobley touched upon the other two in her presentation.

The SBIA Manual

Richards explained how the SBIA manual was developed, beginning with research conducted by Forest Trends from 2008-2009 that indicated that there was weak practice on impact assessment due to poor understanding and lack of appropriate guidance. Forest Trends, therefore, established an alliance with three non-governmental organizations (NGOs) - the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA), Rainforest Alliance (RA) and Fauna and Flora International (FFI) - to develop a social impact assessment manual for forest carbon projects. The first edition was produced in 2010, which was oriented to support the Climate, Community and Biodiversity (CCB) Standards, but also to have a wider application. This edition was peer reviewed and field tested with three REDD+ projects. The second version of the manual was produced in 2011, which was expanded to include biodiversity impact assessment. This most recent version is also available in Spanish and French and is divided into the following three sections: (1) core guidance; (2) SIA toolbox; and (3) biodiversity impact assessment (BIA) toolbox.

The SBIA is divided into seven stages (see appendix 7). The SBIA approach is based upon a causal model or theory of change (TOC), which is a roadmap that describe how to get from activities to desired impacts, or an explanation of how a project or program will achieve its social objectives based on cause and effect analysis. This approach is increasingly used for projects and sector-wide analysis, such as the micro-finance sector, donors and the Conservation Measures Partnership of NGOs.

Richards elaborated on the first six stages of the SBIA manual, which are summarized below:

Table 1. The six primary stages of the SBIA manual

Stage 1 - Identifying focal issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focal issues are problems or issues that threaten success of REDD+, such as

⁴ See OECD (2007). Promoting Pro-Poor Growth. A Practical Guide to *Ex Ante* Poverty Impact Assessment. DAC Guidelines and Reference Series. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Paris.

governance, poverty, livelihoods and food security, gender cultural integrity and land use conflicts and tenure issues. They are selected either by multiple stakeholder participants in the Open Standards approach, or from stakeholder & institutional analysis and transmissions pathway analysis.
Stage 2 - Problem flow diagram of focal issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This stage involves preparing a problem tree that presents focal issues, threats and contributing factors, as well as potential opportunities.
Stage 3 - Results chain of focal issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results chain helps to identify the scope of interventions, results, intermediate results and overall strategy, based on problems identified in Stage 2.
Stage 4 - Negative impacts, risks and mitigation measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These measures help to identify potential negative impact of proposed interventions and suggest mitigation measures
Stages 5 and 6 - Indicators and monitoring plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These stages identify the most important results in the result chain, define SMART⁵ objectives for each result (clear objectives are critical) and define indicator(s) for each SMART objective, data collection methods, including when, who, where, etc.

The Open Standards



Figure 2. The Open Standards Process

Source: Conservation Measures Partnership. 2007. Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation. http://www.conservationmeasures.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/CMP_Open_Standards_Version_2.0.pdf

⁵ SMART is a monitoring and evaluation term that is used to describe good indicators: **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**ealistic, **T**ime bound.

Maldonado described the Open Standards process (see figure 2 above), which represents an important approach because it not only enables *ex-ante* and *ex-post* assessment but also assessment during the process. It is not an assessment tool but rather a project management approach. Although it was not conceptualized to address social issues, the approach is very adaptive and that it is now being applied to social issues related to conservation projects and programs. He said that a strength of this approach is how the inputs inform each of the steps and that it can be used at different levels of scale (i.e., for projects and national level programs), for a variety of thematic areas and large-scale strategies (i.e., climate change mitigation, sustainable grazing practices, fisheries and great ape conservation). Madonado provided two examples of open standards sectoral analysis, the first for Great Apes Conservation in Eastern DRC and the second for the Climate Change Adaptation Project of the Mesoamerican REDD Multi-National Program.

Lessons learned

- Open Standards are independent of scale and applicable at many levels;
- Analyses via the Open Standards (i.e. focal issues, problem flow diagrams, results chains) look very similar to project level analysis;
- When applied at larger scales, they help identify less visible issues at project level, issues requiring higher level actions (law, policy, etc.) or common issues to several projects that could be better tackled at higher levels (economies of scale);
- The Open Standards approach can be effectively used for sectoral analysis; and
- The approach has the potential to be used to identify common or shared indicators among projects.

Benefits of participatory theory of change (TOC) for national REDD+: Richards concluded by citing the benefits of TOC for national REDD+:

- TOC is a key part of the jigsaw or suite of methods;
- *Ex-ante* SIA via TOC helps strategic design, and synchronised SIA, and provides a powerful adaptive management tool;
- Credible indicators (regarding attribution) and monitoring system allow for tracking indicator progress along causal chains from REDD+ strategies to outcomes to impacts;
- Low cost compared to quantitative methods of showing attribution;
- Reduced cost of baseline studies if well-defined indicators;
- Stakeholder ownership and transparency is compatible with rights-based approach & FPIC (participant selection and capacity building process);
- Complementarity and compatibility with PSIA, SESA, etc.; and
- Appropriate imprecision vs. inappropriate precision: *"It is better to be roughly right than precisely wrong"* (a quote that is popularly attributed to the famous economist J.M. Keynes).

Social Impacts of REDD+

Dr. Pam Jagger (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and CIFOR) presented on the social impacts of REDD+ and particularly on the concepts of attribution and causality. She divided her presentation into the following two sections: (1) recent learning on evidence based policy making; and (2) a description of CIFOR's global comparative study.

Recent Learning on Evidence-based Policy Making

Jagger argued that within the development community it is imperative to show impact and clear evidence that what we are doing is having some sort of effect. Internal validity refers to how certain we are that the intervention is causing the outcome(s) that we are observing. In the context of REDD+, how sure can we be that the observed outcome was caused by REDD+? External validity is about whether the findings can be applied across a diversity of settings (i.e., how representative is the case?). She explained that with regard to social impact and national REDD+ programs, we are more concerned with internal rather than external validity.

Jagger further noted that randomized control trials (RCTs) are the "gold standard" for impact assessment. This approach is used primarily in the medical field for drug trials. There are two specific components of RCTs: (1) randomization of the intervention, which is a very effective approach to use in a drug trial or discrete intervention; and (2) controls groups that are not impacted by the intervention. RCTs recently have been applied to all manner of public policy programs, including cash transfers, mosquito nets, fertilizer subsidies and information about utility bills. Jagger argued, however, that this approach is not likely to be relevant for REDD+ since it would require REDD+ activities to be randomly assigned, which does not make sense given the objectives and nature of REDD+ interventions when applied at the national level. Given this context, Jagger introduced the following examples of next best options for impact assessment in order to attribute causality (in order of confidence):

- **Quasi experimental design** - which includes with randomization or control groups, but not both. This approach is best for causality because there is a high level of confidence that what you are seeing is a result of the intervention. Examples of this approach include: multiple time series (control and intervention); non-equivalent comparison group design; separate random sample pre and post-test; interrupted time series (regression discontinuity design); and control and intervention; and
- **Non-experimental designs** - before and after, statistical analyses, comparative case studies and single case studies.

She clarified that when designing interventions to attribute causality at national scales, it would be necessary to distinguish between interventions and control sites. The controls could be areas that are forested and not forested. Perhaps these are not perfect controls, but you can match different characteristics. In the ideal scenario we would have a time series of observations for both groups before we even had a REDD+ intervention. The intervention would take place and the same pattern of observations would occur after the intervention for both groups. The result would be that there is some confidence about what the impact has been using relatively simple math or regression models.

Jagger made the following recommendations regarding the best design for attributing causality at the national scale:

- Consider that *ex-ante* vs. *ex-post* is a false dichotomy since there is no "after" for REDD+. Instead she suggested *ex ante* approaches that use baseline data, an intervention, and then periodic check-ins after the intervention. The difference is really about control groups and whether or not you can find them and collect data over time.
- Think about creative ways to leverage existing longitudinal data sources, such as the Living Standards Measurement Study (LSMS), Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and national census data. Some critics feel that these are huge data sets that are

completely inaccessible, but Jagger said that the World Bank is training people to use the data so that we should think about this resource more carefully. Also, better information is being integrated into these surveys and data quality is improving.

- Build in controls for as long as we can (we do not have the option to randomize). Eventually all controls will go away if REDD+ really takes off, but there is a tremendous benefit to having controls in order to understand the trajectory of impacts.
- Large scope for addressing impact heterogeneity (i.e., gender impacts, ethnicity and poverty status).

CIFOR's Global Comparative Study (GCS) on REDD+

According to Jagger, the GCS study is the largest research project that CIFOR has ever had. It is divided into the following two components:

- **National level policies and process** - involves compiling a comprehensive story about policy processes in each country using a number of different research tools. This information is posted on the CIFOR website. The analyses include discourse in media, what is going on at the country level, network analyses of policy actors and policy content analysis. The overall goal is to understand what is happening with REDD+ using a comparative case study framework.
- **Analyzing REDD+ pilot projects** - a collection of data in both intervention and control sites in the before stage. Baselines are done in a number of sites. Since it is critically important to get in the site before REDD+ started, there was a rush to collect data with the expectation that REDD+ activities would happen quickly. This study also is designed to collect data after REDD+ activities begin. She said that their experience is a cautionary tale in making heavy investments in this kind of work.

The decision regarding where to work was largely an issue of cost. After a project was selected, they went through an intense process of village selection and they made their selection based on the ability to create matched pairs (i.e., control and intervention villages that look as similar as possible). Households were randomly selected to participate in the survey so that they had a robust sampling design. They also collected village level data. They are returning results to the field and provided information to the communities about the baselines, and they are now using the baseline information in order to write a series of thematic papers (13 total), which were launched at the Rio+20 meeting in June 2012.

How Can More Rigorous Research Designs Better Inform the Design and More Appropriate Targeting of Evidence-Based Policies for Improved Rural Livelihoods and Improved Forests?

Dr. Lauren Persha (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) presented an abbreviated version of her research project in Tanzania, which applies a counterfactual, quasi-experimental research design to evaluate the social impacts of forest sector decentralization on household livelihoods and village level governance. The social issues that are typically assessed for decentralization, such as household livelihoods, governance impacts and equitable distribution of benefits, are virtually the same as many of the social impacts that one might want to assess for REDD+ outcomes. A quasi-experimental approach requires some additional legwork to

understand and select appropriate control cases for comparison with the treatment cases (e.g., villages or households that participate in a REDD+ program), and attention to potential biases that may overtly or less obviously render some households or villages more likely to participate or *not* to participate in the program. These biases need to be taken into account in the analyses in order to accurately estimate the magnitude of the impact, and to be confident that the observed impacts are indeed due to a REDD+ program (for instance) and not to other confounding factors.

Persha gave some examples of how she and her collaborators have addressed this issue for their project. She emphasized that having multiple time periods of data is particularly useful, including where possible the incorporation of baseline data from before the program began – this helps to "cut out the noise" in the statistical analyses so that any effects coming out of the analysis (such as a change in livelihoods) can be picked up more clearly and can be more confidently attributed to the REDD+ "treatment" itself. There are many existing, public datasets that can be useful for this, and there are benefits to seeking these out and determining their usefulness. In Persha's case she is using survey data collected by the Government of Tanzania in 2001. She also talked about how she determined an appropriate sample size for her study, noting that it is possible to use existing information to make informed decisions about what sample size might be necessary for a given context or assessment, in order to have sufficient statistical power to detect differences that can actually be attributed to the intervention (such as a REDD+ program). She noted that in general this sample size is likely to be quite a bit larger than the 5-10 case studies that are often done in existing social impact assessment work.

Why Spend the Time and Money for Counterfactual Design?

Persha also used an example drawn from a recently published assessment of the impacts of protected areas on poverty to illustrate how the use of a counterfactual, quasi-experimental research approach can generate very different (and more robust) results than other approaches. An analysis conducted by Andam et al. (2010)⁶ examined whether or not living next to a protected area contributes to people being poorer. They show that a simple analysis of differences in poverty rates between communities living close to and far from protected areas in Costa Rica would show that yes, living next to protected areas does make people poorer. However, when they implemented a quasi-experimental research design that uses appropriately matched communities as controls for comparison and baseline poverty data from prior to the existence of protected areas in the country, their findings are the exact opposite - poverty rates in communities near protected areas are actually no different, or in some cases lower. This difference in findings across the two assessment approaches is related to the existence of strong selection biases already going into why protected areas exist where they do – they are disproportionately located in areas of the country that were already poorer prior to the establishment of the protected area. This bias is not taken into account in the simple analysis of differences, leading to incorrect results and conclusions. Quasi-experimental approaches are worth the additional time and effort if one would like to have a high degree of confidence in the estimate of impacts, and to be much more certain that changes which are observed are in fact due to a particular intervention (i.e., REDD+) rather than to other confounding factors.

⁶ The full citation for this article is Andam, K.S., Ferraro, P. J., Simms, K. R., Healy, A. and Margaret B. Holland. 2010. Protected areas reduced poverty in Costa Rica and Thailand. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107 (22) 9996-10001.

Persha concluded her presentation by encouraging greater consideration of these more rigorous assessment approaches for social impacts of REDD+. She noted that although this approach can require more intensive or extensive data collection - depending on availability of existing data - the costs of undertaking such work are not overly prohibitive relative to funding currently spent on related REDD+ activities, piloting, monitoring and case study-based work (e.g., her national-scale study costs approximately \$400,000).

Strategic Social and Environmental Assessment (SESA) and the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) as Developed by the FCPF

Tom Blomley presented about the FCPF in order to explain what it is and what it does, including the SESA and the ESMF.

- **What is the FCPF?** The FCPF is a program that supports developing countries with REDD+ readiness. The World Bank manages the FCPF, acting as the Trustee and Secretariat for the Facility. The FCPF is working with 48 countries,⁷ which involves providing initial grants of 300,000 USD to prepare R-PPs. Once the proposals are approved countries can receive up to 3.2 Million USD to support the implementation of the R-PPs. Most participating countries now have approved R-PPs.
- **What is a SESA and what do they do?** A SESA is applied to national level REDD+ Programs. It is a key output of the implementation of R-PPs and demonstrates compliance with World Bank safeguard policies. The assessment is undertaken by government agencies who report back to the World Bank. Involvement and ownership of information by other parties is limited. Implementation of SESAs to date has proven to be a challenge due to the complexity of the process and a general lack of guidance from the World Bank.
- **What does SESA do?** SESA allows for the incorporation of environmental and social considerations into the REDD+ readiness process during both the preparation and the implementation of the REDD+ strategy, as follows:
 - Enhancing the REDD+ Strategy: Generates recommendations to address legal, institutional, regulatory and capacity gaps to manage environmental and social priorities associated with the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; and
 - Environmental and Social Safeguards: Assessment of environmental and social risks and potential impacts of REDD+ Strategy Options during preparation of REDD+ Strategy.
- **What is ESMF and what does it do?** The ESMF is done once REDD+ strategies are known and when relevant safeguard policies of the World Bank are triggered. The ESMF provides a framework for managing and mitigating the environmental and social risks associated with future investments (projects, activities, and/or policies and regulations) associated with implementing a country's REDD+ strategy. The framework

⁷ There are 36 country participants, 12 country candidates and one country selected in the FCPF that has yet to sign a Participation Agreement. See www.forestcarbonpartnership.org for additional information.

is based around the World Bank Safeguard Policies.⁸ It must include “monitoring arrangements” (but not specifically monitoring plans) for approval. A monitoring plan monitors the implementation of the framework and not broader social impacts.

- **How is a SESA designed?** Strategic Assessments are typically applied as a separate and independent process to sector level policy reforms. Originally this approach was considered for REDD+, which required preparing a separate terms of reference for Component 2d of the R-PP (which covers environmental and social impacts) and a separate consultation and participatory process. However, feedback from stakeholders called for simplifying the process in order to eliminate overlap and duplication between analytical and diagnostic work in 2d and other R-PP components and duplication between processes (i.e., consultation and participation between the R-PP and the SESA given that majority of analytical considerations are already covered in other R-PP components). As a result, a "strategic" element has been mainstreamed in the R-PP and can be applied as fully integrated into the readiness preparation process. Integrating the SESA into the R-PP template rather than have it as a separate track strengthens the thinking about safeguards and the actions required at the country level and also allows for an iterative process whereby information on environmental and social considerations can be included during the selection and development of REDD+ strategy options. Yet continuous revisions to SESA (both in terms of method and approach) have generated some level of confusion, especially for those countries that are ahead of others with regard to REDD+ readiness activities.
- **Added values of SESA?** The SESA provides added value as it: (1) assesses the extent to which the REDD+ strategy addresses the existing institutional, policy, legal, regulatory and capacity gaps to manage the environmental and social priority issues in the context of REDD+; (2) helps select among indicative REDD+ strategy options, based on identification of environmental and social risks of potential interventions/projects; (3) links SESA to the World Bank’s Safeguard Policies; and (4) provides incentives for countries to undertake SESA and also for countries to engage with different interest groups beyond the government.

Conclusions

- Heavy emphasis on *ex-ante* assessment although REDD+ strategies have been developed already in many countries;
- Is a World Bank requirement, so it is going to happen in at least 48 countries that are participating in the FCPF program;
- Methodological guidance is needed;
- Heavily geared towards compliance to the World Bank safeguards;
- The *ex-ante* aspect (i.e., ESMF) is about developing a plan to mitigate impacts associated with World Bank safeguards;
- Limited linkage to non-governmental stakeholders or nationally defined indicators / processes;
- Heavily reliant on external consultants; and
- Limited reference to the World Bank’s PSIA approaches.

⁸ For additional information on World Bank safeguards see <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/EXTPOLICIES/EXTSAFEPOL/0,,menuPK:584441~pagePK:64168427~piPK:64168435~theSitePK:584435,00.html>

Social Assessment of Protected Areas Initiative (SAPA)

Phil Franks presented on the Social Assessment of Protected Areas Initiative (SAPA) to compare the SAPA and social impact assessment of national REDD+ programs. The SAPA emerged from a growing concern around bias in assessing the social impacts of protected areas (PAs), which fuels the polarization of views and undermines political will to improve social equity in conservation. According to international guidance, PAs should do no harm and where possible contribute to poverty reduction (WPC 2003),⁹ calling for assessment of economic and social-cultural costs and benefits (CBD Program of Work on PAs 2004).¹⁰ The SAPA, therefore, was launched 2008 as an initiative of CARE International, IIED, International Union for Conservation of Nature - Theme on Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas (IUCN-TILCEPA), United Nations Environment Programme - World Conservation Monitoring Center (UNEP-WCMC) and The Nature Conservancy (TNC).

The following is the SAPA's two primary phases and steps that should be taken:

Phase 1 - Defining Focus:

- **Define goal** - "identify, develop and evaluate a range of methodologies and tools for assessing the social impacts of PAs that enable conservation policy and practice to better adhere to the globally accepted principle that PAs should strive to contribute to poverty reduction at the local level, and at the very minimum must not contribute to or exacerbate poverty";
- **Characterize users**;
- **Characterize existing methods** - clustering them into two main groups: "rapid" methods and those that are more comprehensive (i.e., "Rolls-Royce" methods); and
- **Agree to focus on** - (1) on-going (synchronous) and *ex-post* assessment; and (2) relatively rapid (i.e., "quick and dirty") methods.

Phase 2 - Reviewing Methodology:¹¹

- **Clarify terminology**, including tools (i.e., specific data gathering instruments and exercises); methods (set of tools of a certain type, such as Participatory Rural Appraisal - PRA); methodologies (overall package of experimental design and information gathering tools); and approach (process comprising enabling actions, development and application of methodology and applying the results);
- **Review methods and tools** and select those that are applicable to PA social assessment;
- **Characterize methods**, using 12 descriptors;

⁹ See World Parks Congress (2003) Recommendation #29.

¹⁰ See CBD Program of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) - www.cbd.int/protected/

¹¹ For a detailed review of SAPA methodologies, see Schreckenberg et al. (2010). Social Assessment of Conservation Initiatives: a Review of Rapid Methodologies (International Institute for Environment and Development, UK).

- **Develop conceptual frameworks**, including sustainable livelihoods, World Bank poverty framework (based on opportunities), and causal model/theory of change;
- **Identify Indicators** (approx. 200), including output, outcome/effect, impact; quantitative and qualitative; externally and internally defined; and household, community, PA and national levels (Millennium Development Goal indicators);
- **Identify types of tools** to use, including participatory well-being ranking; household survey; focus group discussion; PRA; key informant interview; and participant observation;
- **Identify some methods used**, including focus groups to identify priority positive and negative impacts prior to assessment (i.e., scoping);
- **Address attribution** in order to determine to what extent are the observed impacts due to the PA rather than to other factors, and to what extent are impacts due to the PA as an institution (Natural Resource Management approach) versus the PA as an ecosystem;
- **Identify approaches to attribution**, including defining the counterfactual:
 - with/without;
 - before/after;
 - reflexive comparison - respondents imagine, or think back to, a PA scenario and related their PA impact experience to this; and
 - causal model approaches can develop a "business as usual" scenario - less appropriate for PAs that have existed for some time.
- **Identify key weaknesses** of many methods and tools, including a focus on data rather than learning; lack of guidance on data analysis; lack of capacity for upward aggregation; inability to assess intangible benefits and costs (which were often very significant); focusing only/mainly on benefits (eight out of 20 methods did not explicitly address costs).

Conclusions

- There is no one universally applicable model, but you could define a generic process to identify and tailor one or more methodologies for a given context that meet acceptable standards of objectivity, participation and transparency.
- You cannot assume that good governance leads to positive social impact (especially for marginalized and vulnerable groups) because, for example:
 - What looks like good governance is not when you look more closely (i.e., because of elite capture); and
 - Benefits may be negated by high transaction costs of participatory processes (e.g. PA co-management).
- Watch out for attempts to attribute all benefits of a particular ecosystem to the particular NRM approach (e.g. PA governance type) applied to that ecosystem;
 - It's about exploring the different scenarios of PA management/ governance and their social and conservation impacts.
- The existence of significant livelihood benefits does not mean a net positive social benefit/impact (as it may be negated by costs). It is important to assess both positive and negative impacts.

- The existence of net positive social benefit/impact does not necessarily lead to poverty reduction. It may just maintain the *status quo*.
- The existence of net social benefit or impact does not indicate the equitable distribution or sharing of benefits and costs.
 - At individual, household and community levels (within and between);
 - Along the carbon value chain (“vertical equity”);
- Evidence of impacts at community level says little about impacts on specific social groups (positive impacts can obscure negative):
 - Social differentiation in assessment is crucially important.

Group Work Part 1 - Applying the Assessment Guidance Framework to Pilot Countries

Tom Blomley organized participants to draw upon the Assessment Guidance Framework (AGF) to identify the desired characteristic of social impact assessment for a national REDD+ program in three pilot countries: Ghana, Kenya and Cameroon. Participants were assigned to one of the three case study groups and were asked to fill in the questions provided in the AGF and then to identify a sequenced set of actions that would be needed to undertake a comprehensive social impact assessment in the assigned country.

The following sections represent the summary sessions of each group and the primary themes that emerged during each session. The section is divided by country (Kenya, Ghana and Cameroon) and addresses the following: (1) the primary issues discussed; and (2) the sequenced set of actions identified to undertake a comprehensive social impact assessment. Each group also filled out the AGF table and the results are located in the appendices (appendix 6 - Ghana; appendix 7 - Kenya; appendix 8 - Cameroon).



Case Study 1 - Ghana

1. Discussion

- **Could SIA generate evidence that might help to justify the wider contribution of the forest sector to the national economy?** Perhaps SIA can be a way to sell REDD+ to decision makers? The agricultural sector makes a more clear contribution to the economy, so SIA with REDD+ could help show positive social impacts of the forestry sector. But what if the process reveals too many negative impacts? Perhaps overall SIA is a way to broaden the buy in to technical REDD+?

- **Who owns a SIA?** Those involved with REDD+ in Ghana include the national REDD+ working group and the cabinet advisory council. REDD+ covers a range of different sectors and there are series of different ministries that have different responsibilities. The group members tried to think through what you would actually need in terms of the functions and decided that it is important to have someone who can actually implement a SIA (i.e., do the day-to-day tasks), but who also needs to be accountable to a boss with cross sectorial reach. A cabinet is something to be accountable to, but they tend not to be involved with accomplishing actions on the ground. Perhaps they can be an advisory body, but how often do they meet? The group members first talked about the many different parts of government structures within the government that have a role in REDD+ or will be impacted by REDD+ (i.e., the climate change group). They discussed the complexity of the governance issues related to REDD+ and decided that it is important to think back to SIA regarding who actually does the work and who is accountable for making the decisions being implemented.
- **What impacts should be studied and how should the impacts come about?** What are the potential negative impacts and who might be affected? Who is the most vulnerable? The group decided that stakeholder mapping is needed to identify vulnerabilities and how different stakeholders are affected by REDD+. Group members said that you must also examine positive impacts and the lens through which you are looking, which led to a wider discussion regarding the objective of REDD+ (i.e., poverty reduction and reducing emissions? Just one or the other?). The group discussed the issue of tradeoffs and whether REDD+ should be viewed through a poverty lens or a rights lens. The impacts you look at will depend on the objectives of the program. How far do you want to go in terms of benefits?
- **The SIA process needs a built in component around capacity building**, since the group very much felt that an SIA is something that must end up within the country (i.e., be country led and owned).
- **It is important to rank methods, or at least to review the characteristics of different methods** against different criteria so that countries can make a selection. No one in the group felt confident to say that they would recommend a certain SIA method for one reason or the other, and some suggested the need to hire a consultant to provide guidance about which method (or combinations of methods) is best to use.

2. Actions Identified:

- Determine how national ownership and buy-in is created and built;
- Develop a strategy to dialogue with the World Bank, especially since Ghana is doing the SESA process. The group labeled the process "SESA+", which entails taking the process beyond what it is and recognizing that the current SESA is not a thorough impact assessment;
- Identify funding options since SESA does not cover everything. Cost is key methodological consideration with SIA;
- Identify an institutional home is a critical step so that it is clear who will take the process forward;
- Plan an experts' workshop with key stakeholders to design what you are going to do. What would happen during the experts' meeting? Write the terms of reference, pick a consultant and then implement the impact assessment? What about buy-in and

institutional capacity? Some in the group did not feel the Government of Ghana would have the capacity to design the process and that they would need to have outside guidance; and

- Determine how LISA-REDD will pilot SIA in different countries, especially since there is no institutional framework to carry it out or resources to support the process.
- The following are a list of specific steps that group members outlined as being needed to implement an SIA:
 - a. Prepare the ground (i.e., coordinate initial meetings);
 - b. Generate national level buy-in;
 - c. Dialogue with the World Bank so that they accept SIA as a complementary process to SESA - "SESA+";
 - d. Explore other funding options and ways to access funding;
 - e. Identify an institutional home for the process within the national government; and
 - f. Define and plan an experts' workshop with key stakeholder in order to develop the impact assessment plan, including the selection of methodologies.

Case Study 2 - Kenya

1. Discussion:

- **How is social impact assessment nested within the national process?** This question of “nesting” was the most difficult and challenging for the group. They looked from the national scale downward or above the national scale.
- **Methodological considerations?** Methods for what and about what? The group had a long discussion about this issue and came up with quantitative, qualitative and spatial methods. They wanted to skip methods but had to address human resource needs, which brought them back to methodology. Capacity to bring together data and make sense of it is required. For SIA you need people who can plan and look ahead and make strategic decisions. They decided that this activity would be done by the Social Research Institute housed in universities.
- **What kind of information is needed?** Some of it is being driven by audiences, so does the framework need another layer of question? The use of the information might have different specific needs.

2. Actions Identified:

- Form and build the capacity of the social assessment team. It is important to find out who is out there and what capacity exists;
- Conduct a scoping study to analyze stakeholders and to determine what data exists;
- Conduct policy and institutional analyses;
- Set priorities. For example, the REDD+ working group would decide criteria for



- setting priorities and communication with various stakeholders;
- Continue to unpack methods for data collection; and
- Synthesize the information generated so that it can be disseminated and used for reporting. The information must also be feedback into adaptive management.

Case Study 3 - Cameroon

1. Discussion:

- **In Cameroon who is "indigenous?"** The group discussed how to determine which groups are indigenous and which are most vulnerable. They noted that hunter-gatherers would be impacted differently than other groups with different policy practices. Impacts are related to forest and land reforms, as well as who owns the carbon.
- **What is the best strategy for communicating results of a SIA?** They discussed how to translate the national results of a SIA to the local communities, as well as what should be done with the outputs and who will work on the process. They talked at length about government buy-in, but also raised the importance of community buy-in.
- **The issue of scaling up is very important.** Methods will vary between communities. For example, how you get data will vary based on how you work with a community. Also, government is nebulous. What is the technical level that needs to engage the process and what is the more political level to figure out what to do with it? The process needs to involve the different sectors and how to do that?



2. Actions Identified:

- Divide the process into two: (1) enabling environment; and (2) implementation;
- Define the leader of the process;
- Build the business case for national governments;
- Identify stakeholders and conduct an assessment of capacity needs;
- Determine funding needs and sources;
- Identify host institutions, such as the national institute of statistics;
- Define roles and responsibilities;
- Determine how to use data;
- Agree upon the methodology;
- Address logistics and accessibility;
- Monitor and evaluate;
- Collect data and determine if there is existing data that can be used;
- Determine reporting requirements;
- Determine if there is capacity at national level to do this work;
- Data analysis and interpretation;

- p. Determine how to report the information (i.e., will there be just one study or several discrete studies?); and
- q. Determine how to consult with key stakeholders to validate the process.

Group Work Part 2 - Enabling Conditions and Methodological Guidance

Tom Blomley and Phil Franks organized the second working group session to further identify enabling conditions for SIA and methodological guidance. Participants were divided into two primary groups to discuss the following questions:

- **Group 1 - Enabling Conditions:** focused on how to build national ownership of SIA, as well as how best to make a business case and to anchor the process at the national level. The group was encouraged to consider how best to create enabling conditions for SIA, how to determine the best approach for the process (i.e., scoping), the selection of methodologies, assessment and synthesis of information, applying the results and outputs and to identify what international guidance and capacity might be needed to support the process.
- **Group 2 – Methodological Guidance:** considered a number of issues related to methods, including the kind of methodological guidance that might be needed for SIA (an appropriate for different audiences), how to develop an overall typology of assessment methods and approaches, how to characterize methodologies (i.e., methods as a process or a framework), how to develop general guidance on social assessment (i.e., what, why, and how SIA relates to safeguards), ways to approach the development of a capacity building package for SIA and how best to promote understanding and collaboration at international level in order to avoid duplication and confusion and to enhance synergies.

Report from Group 1 - Enabling Conditions: This group developed the following seven step approach through which to establish enabling conditions for SIA.

Steps	Description of Activities
Step 1. Identify national institutions and leaders to coordinate or champion the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify a steering committee to lead and coordinate the process; • Conduct a gap analysis to identify lessons and to link social impact assess to existing processes. This process enables us to justify and build rational arguments; • Integrate the process with climate change mitigation and adaptation; and • Ensure that all steps have specific funding.
Step 2. Build the business case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine structure and institutional interest and identify what is needed for a country to actually own the process and to create demand for the tool; and • Determine how to maximize buy-ins and how, support government incentives, and identify advantages and disadvantages.
Step 3. Define which	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish the linkage between civil society and

stakeholders are present and how to involve them	governmental structure.
Step 4. Identify scope and scale of the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broaden REDD+.
Step 5. Develop strong agreement and consensus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attribution must be clearly identified and defined, adaptive management must be implemented, and it must be clear how the data collected will fit in and be used at a later stage.
Step 6. Fine tune the process and establish a structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine who will carry out the SIA; • Identify implementing agencies; • Define implementing arrangements; • Determine where the process will be anchored; and • Ensure that there is structure and capacity to manage the process.
Step 7. Identify specific actions once the institution is defined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key pieces include identifying neutral actors to help with consultations and improving the administrative and technical capacity of the government that are focused on the social assessment process; and • A multi-disciplinary team of experts must be part of this process.

Report from Group 2 - Methodological Guidance: The group divided the session into three areas of discussion: (1) guiding principles related to methodologies; (2) elements that help us to determine whether or not the methodology is robust; and (3) some of the considerations and characteristics that one would evaluate when selecting the methodology.

1. Overall guiding principles related to methodologies for SIA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design the process in order to attribute impacts, guide adaptive management and inform how REDD+ activities are implemented; • Return results to stakeholders; • Validate results and findings with stakeholders; • Ensure that methodologies are objectively verifiable for credibility and robustness; • Identify both positive and negative impacts; • Look explicitly at poverty and livelihoods; • Ensure feasibility and practicality for implementation; • Avoid collecting data that will not be usable; • Build and use domestic expertise in countries in which systems are implemented; • Ensure that the scope for methods is national; • Ensure that data collection is appropriate for different stakeholder groups; • Strive for transparency and participation; and • Create a sustainable process that can be continued over time and that it is thematically inclusive and carried out in an ethical manner.
2. Standards of methodological robustness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use methods that incorporate randomization and ensure that a sufficient sample size; • Ensure that attribution is considered in order to understand cause and effect and to be able to establish the observed effects as being related to REDD+ with high degree of confidence;

- Capture indirect social benefits and costs;
- Collect robust baseline data and data on starting conditions;
- Include a theory of change, based on the best available data;
- Identify a mechanism with which to aggregate site specific qualitative data;
- Stratify and disaggregate data in order to understand the different impacts in terms of vulnerability and gender;
- Ensure that methods are comprehensive in terms of space, place and status;
- Ensure that data collection is geographically referenced;
- Strive for parsimonious data collection;
- Use international best practice guidance on methods and approach;
- Ensure that data is available for other researchers to access, use and understand;
- Ensure that methods are repeatable and transferrable;
- Ensure that the recurrent costs after the start-up phase are no more than 1% of annual REDD+ revenue; and
- Ensure that data is triangulated, especially for the qualitative results.

3. Specific qualities of social assessment methodologies to consider when characterizing particular methodologies

- The ability of the method to assess intangible or indirect impacts;
- The degree to which the method explains why certain changes are observed;
- The timeframe for delivery of results;
- The degree to which the method can disaggregate information about impacts;
- The degree to which the methodology can analyze impacts on political economy and institutions;
- The degree to which the methodology is multidisciplinary and links complementary methods;
- The degree to which it is iterative and a strong contributor to adaptive management;
- Cost effective and financially sustainable;
- Can be embedded in national institutions;
- Scientifically repeatable;
- The degree to which the method can use already available data – the more the better;
- Identifies and engages vulnerable people in the design and communication of result;
- Feasibility for accessing information given limitations of budget, time and skills and capacity of team implementing the method; and
- Availability of local skills and knowledge or whether the capacity can be built at the beginning of the process and be sustained.

Country Selection for Piloting

Dr. Eva Garen (Conservation International and the FCMC Program) provided preliminary insight into selecting potential REDD+ countries that might be appropriate to pilot SIA via LISA-REDD. Garen divided her presentation into the following sections: (1) a categorization of potential pilot countries based on the following criteria - participation in the FCPF, the Forest Investment Program (FIP), UN-REDD and REDD+ SES; progress in the SESA process; and donor support and interest; and (2) a review of additional criteria that should be considered when thinking about the selection of pilot countries.

How Many Countries are Participating in the FCPF, the FIP, UN-REDD and the SESA processes?

Table 2. Country Selection Criteria¹²

Criteria	Number of Countries
FCPF Participant Countries	36
FCPF Candidate Countries	12
FIP Pilot Countries	8
REDD+ SES Countries – Group 1	4
REDD+ SES Countries – Group 2	6
UN-REDD Direct Recipient Countries	13
UN-REDD Observer Countries	26
USAID Sustainable Landscape Countries FY13	14
Norad Priority Funding Countries 2013-2015	10

Garen presented how many countries were participating in different REDD+ readiness process, as well as how many countries are receiving REDD+ funding from some of the key donors (i.e., the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad)) (see table 2 above).

Given this context, Garen analyzed which countries were participating in the previously identified REDD+ readiness processes (i.e., FCPF, FIP, SESA, UN-REDD and REDD+ SES), as well as which one were on the priority list for REDD+ funding (Norad) or receiving REDD+ funding (USAID). She proposed the following seven potential pilot countries for LISA-REDD based on which countries were participating in, or selected for, these criteria: Indonesia, Mexico, Peru, Tanzania, Argentina, Guatemala and Ghana (see appendix 12). Garen concluded with a discussion of other potential criteria that could be considered when thinking about pilot country selection, including articulated demand or interest by a host country, interest in multi-stakeholder process, capacity and resources, land and tree tenure, forest cover, deforestation rates, Indigenous Peoples issues, corruption levels, drivers of deforestation, political and legal aspects, government systems and institutions, international conventions, regional representation and existing relationships.

¹² This information was compiled from various sources, including the FCPF website (www.forestcarbonpartnership.org), the REDD+ SES initiative (www.redd-standards.org), the UN-REDD website (www.un-redd.org), USAID and Norad's 2013-15 funding call.

Conclusions and Next Steps

Phil Franks summarized the outputs of the workshop and facilitated the discussion about where LISA-REDD should go from here. He presented the following summary points to help to guide the discussion:

Summary Points

- Investment in REDD+ national and sub-national programs will be up to \$5 billion per year by 2015 and up to \$20-30 billion per year by 2020;
- REDD+ readiness processes are underway in 60+ national and sub-national REDD+ countries sponsored by UN-REDD, FCPF, bilateral agencies, and governments;
- Request and demands for effective "safeguards information systems" have been made to civil society, donors, private sector investors, and the UNFCCC;
- Social assessment is a critical element of safeguards, and is also crucial to inform REDD+ strategy development and to justify, strengthen and thus sustain REDD+ & donor investment;
- Combines *ex-ante*, on-going and *ex-post* assessment;
- Must be country-level and country-led;
- Virtually no existing methodologies or guidance are currently available to do this (national-level social impact assessment);
- This large gap also creates a window of opportunity; and
- **Lisa-REDD offers the opportunity to fill this gap by working toward its goals of: *providing methods, tools and guidance for assessing social impacts of REDD+ programs to help governments and civil society design, implement, and build support for, effective and equitable REDD+.***

Franks identified the following three thematic areas around which working groups were formed by workshop participants:

1) Engaging key actors, including country selection and enabling conditions

- Participants who volunteered include Diane Russell, Emily Brickell, Eva Garen, Andrea Quesada, Phil Franks, Gabrielle Kissinger and Samuel Nnah.

2) The Assessment Guidance Framework

- Participants who volunteered include Tom Blomley, Diane Russell and Steve Panfil.

3) Methodological guidance

- Participants who volunteered include Peter Minang, Oscar Madonado, Diane Russell, Pam Jagger, Michael Richards, Paul Francis, Mary Hobley, Phil Franks, Eva Garen, Enock Kanyanya, Mwangi Githiru and Emily Brickell.

Key Issues

A number of key issues also were raised regarding how to move the initiative forward, including:

- How do we build synergies between LISA-REDD and existing processes such as the FLEGT VPA? We should focus on building synergies rather than on creating competition for resources;
- Who will be part of the LISA-REDD core group? Will the group be open up for new members, such as ICRAF;
- How do we raise awareness about LISA-REDD so that SIA for national REDD+ is in demand? Should we organize a side event at one of the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties (COP), similar to the REDD+ SES process? However, we must be careful that we do not invite people without anything to show other than a concept. There is no secretariat for LISA-REDD, so who will do this? We need a story line and materials;
- Several participants supported the idea of producing a LISA-REDD concept note for distribution. We need to make the case for why SIA is so critical for national REDD+ programs. It also is very important to include the history of REDD+ in this note;
- We need to engage a variety of stakeholders so that we don't just have one document for all audiences. Rather, we need to think strategically about which audience you are reaching and what their needs are and really understand what will help them;
- The business case and concept is a bit different from materials. Other groups might become more interested if there was a demand for SIA. Some participants suggested the LISA-REDD target donors since a country will not turn down a donor request. Others suggested reaching out to the World Bank so that SIA is embedded within the SESA process;
- How do we think through enabling conditions at the national level so that SIA is an accepted part of REDD+ programs; and
- Who will be taking all of these ideas forward? LISA-REDD is an *ad hoc* collection of organizations with some experience and ability to convene this group. The FCMC Program has resources to support an analysis on methodological guidance but not field testing to lead to methodological guidance. The idea is to produce a book like the one Kate Schreckenber produced for SAPA, which was a characterization of different methodology with criteria. It would be a resource book that brings to all the methods for SIA via comparative analysis, which could inform field testing and the development of a manual. The methodological analysis will include concepts, terms, what it all means, characteristics of different methods, but not what you should do. A resource book should not be prescriptive but perhaps could include best practices. It could define what a good assessment would look like and the value added of what we are doing via LISA-REDD.

Next Steps

Workshop participants agreed upon the following key steps to address after the meeting:

- Design a country-led process for social assessment of national and sub-national REDD+ programs;
- Develop a social assessment resource book that will guide national-level stakeholders as they develop national and sub-national REDD+ programs; and

- Increase strategic engagement with international initiatives supporting REDD+ readiness, such as the FCPF, UN-REDD, the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES) and bilateral donors, as well as the UNFCCC;
- Develop and pilot a targeted capacity building program for LISA-REDD on social assessment for REDD+, including training materials, supporting documents and a website;
- Launch a country-led social assessment processes in four to five REDD+ countries;
- Facilitate learning between pilot countries and other key stakeholders; and
- Develop a REDD+ program social assessment manual based on country experience and synthesis of learning.

Appendix 1. Workshop Agenda

Day I – Tuesday May 8th		
Time	Item	Responsible
9.00 – 9.30 am	Introductions, aims and objectives of the workshop	Tom Blomley, Facilitator
9.20 – 9.35 am	Opening remarks	Tony Simons, ICRAF
9.35 – 10.00 am	Background to the LISA-REDD initiative and progress made to date. Overview of social and environmental safeguards for REDD+ at national levels.	Phil Franks, CARE International
10.00 – 10.30 am	Overview of issues, definition of terms, considerations for development of national level methodologies	Diane Russell, USAID
10.30 – 11.00 am	<i>Refreshment Break</i>	All
11.00 am – 11.30 am	An overview and framework for national level social assessment methodologies. Key parameters, descriptors and variables. Presentation followed by questions and discussion	Paul Francis, Independent Consultant
11.30 – 12.00	ICRAF experience in social assessment methodologies for national level processes	Frank Place, ICRAF
12.00 – 12.30 pm	Plenary discussion – common themes, gaps, emerging issues	All
12.30 – 1.30 pm	<i>Lunch Break</i>	All
1.30 – 2.30 pm	Plenary – Descriptors / Dimensions of social impact assessment	Tom Blomley, Facilitator
2.30 – 3.00 pm	Presentation of the VPA / FLEGT Social Assessment initiative, followed by questions and discussions	Mary Hobley, Independent Consultant
3.00 – 3.30 pm	<i>Refreshment Break</i>	All
3.30 – 4.00 pm	Participatory Social Impact Assessment based on a Theory of Change Approach – Potential for National REDD+? Presentation followed by questions and discussion	Michael Richards (Forest Trends) / Oscar Maldonado
4.00 - 5.00 pm	Plenary session with contributions from participants	All
5.00 pm	Close	

Day II – Wednesday May 9th		
Time	Item	Responsible
9.00 – 9.15 am	Recap on Day I discussions	Mary Hobley, Independent Consultant
9.15 – 9.45 am	CIFOR Global Comparative Study. Presentation followed by questions and discussion.	Pam Jagger, CIFOR
9.45 – 10.15 pm	Presentation of World Bank FCPF Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment methodology, followed by questions and discussions.	Tom Blomley, Independent Consultant
10.15 – 10.45 pm	Social Assessment of Protected Areas Initiative – Methodological considerations. Presentation followed by questions and discussion.	Phil Franks, CARE International
10.45 – 11.15 am	<i>Refreshment Break</i>	All
11.15 – 11.30 am	Summing up and presentation of Group Work	Tom Blomley, Facilitator
11.30 am – 1.00 pm	Case Study Discussion – Kenya, Ghana and Cameroon, in Break-out groups	3 Working Groups
1.00 – 2.00 pm	<i>Lunch Break</i>	All
2.00 – 3.15 pm	Case Study Discussion – Kenya, Ghana and Cameroon, in Break-out groups – (Continued)	3 Working Groups
3.15 – 3.45 pm	<i>Refreshment Break</i>	All
3.45 – 5.00 pm	Feedback from Working Groups - Kenya	Group Chairs
5.00 pm	Close	

7.00 pm	Group Dinner (Venue to be Announced)	All
---------	--------------------------------------	-----

Day III – Thursday May 10th		
Time	Item	Responsible
9.00 – 9.15 am	Recap on previous two days discussions	Paul Francis
9.15 – 10.15 am	Feedback from Working Groups (Continued)	All
10.15 – 10.45 am	<i>Refreshment Break</i>	All
10.45 – 11.45 am	Plenary discussion on key steps required to	Plenary discussion

	develop outputs of group work into tools and methods	
11.45 – 12.00 am	Presentation on country status with regard to FCPF, UN-REDD etc.	Eva Garen, Conservation International
12.00 – 1.00 pm	Development of country selection criteria for piloting of tools and methods. Application of criteria to country-selection process ¹³ .	Group work
12.30 – 1.30 pm	<i>Lunch Break</i>	All
1.30 – 3.00 pm	Feedback from groups and identification of four to six countries where methods, tools and guidance could be tested.	Group Rapporteurs and plenary discussion
3.30 – 3.45 pm	<i>Refreshment Break</i>	All
3.45 – 4.45 pm	Discussion of Phase II. Core aspects, outputs, institutional partners, and agreement on responsibilities to develop concrete plan	Plenary discussion or group work
4.45 – 5.30 pm	Wrap up and recap on agreed way forward	Tom Blomley, Phil Franks
5.30 pm	Close of meeting and participants disperse	All
6.00 – 7.00 pm	LISA-REDD Core Group meeting	All

¹³ Potential criteria could include commitment to using effective social and environmental safeguards at national level, existence of suitable expertise in-country and presence of key bilateral and multi-lateral REDD+ donors (eg FCPF, UN-REDD, Norad)

Appendix 2 - Participant List

Participant's Name	Affiliation	Email address
1. Phil Franks	CARE Kenya	pfranks@careclimatechange.org
2. Pam Jagger	Univ. N. Carolina/ Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)	pjagger@unc.edu
3. Michael Richards	Forest Trends	mrichards@forest-trends.org
4. Emily Brickell	ODI	e.brickell@odi.org.uk
5. Diane Russell	USAID/Washington DC	dirussell@usaid.gov
6. Paula Williams	FCCM	paula.williams@fccmglobal.org
7. Ani Zamgochian	FCCM	ani.zamgochian@fccmglobal.org
8. Eva Garen	Conservation International /FCCM	e.garen@conservation.org
9. Tom Blomley	Workshop facilitator/ consultant	tom.blomley@acacia-natural-resources.co.uk
10. Mary Hobley	Consultant	mary@maryhobley.co.uk
11. Paul Francis	Consultant	paul.francis3@gmail.com
12. Sara Namirembe	ICRAF	sara.namirembe@gmail.com
13. Peter Minang	ICRAF/ASB Partnership	A.Minang@cgiar.org
14. Frank Place	ICRAF	f.place@cgiar.org
15. Joyce Kasyoki	ICRAF	j.kasyoki@cgiar.org
16. Elena Florian	CATIE	eflorian@catie.ac.cr
17. Robert Buzzard	USAID/West Africa	robuzzard@usaid.gov
18. Enock Kanyanya	USAID/Kenya	ekanyanya@usaid.gov
19. Oscar Maldonado	Consultant	oimaldonadov@gmail.com
20. Andrea Quesada-Aguiliar	Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO)	andrea@wedo.org
21. Samuel Kwabena Nketiah	Tropenbos International Ghana	ksnketiah@yahoo.com
22. Samuel Nnah Ndobe	Centre for Environment and Development, Cameroon	samnnah@yahoo.com
23. Emma Liwenga	University of Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania	liwenga99@yahoo.com
24. Jane Dunlop	Fauna & Flora International	jane.dunlop@fauna-flora.org
25. Lauren Persha	Univ. N. Carolina, Chapel Hill	lpersha@email.unc.edu
26. Steve Panfil	Conservation International	s.panfil@conservation.org
27. Cheri Sugal	Terra Global Capital	cheri.sugal@terraglobalcapital.com
28. Gabrielle Kissinger	Consultant	gabrielle@lexemeconsulting.com
29. Mwangi Githiru	Wildlife Works	mwangi@wildlifeworks.com

Appendix 3. Compilation of Participant Questions and Comments

The following is a compilation of all the comments and questions made by participants during the course of the three-day workshop.

1. Questions and Comments from General Discussions Sessions

- **Overall approach:** Social impact assessment is not just about a set of tools or methodological approaches. Rather, it is about a whole system, which means getting all the stakeholders and institutions involved, addressing political processes, ownership issues, etc. It is important not to get bogged down in discussions about tools and methods so that we lose sight of the larger picture.
- **Theory of change (TOC):** TOC is very important so that we know what we are out there to assess. It also is critically important to understand causal mechanisms and which mechanisms are important in different contexts.
- **Detail:** What kind of detail do we need with social impact assessment? What kinds of baselines do we need? What sort of accuracy do we require? What is affordable and feasible?
- **Approach:** Will social impact assessment be imposed from the outside to meet UNFCCC requirements, or will it be something that is internally defined within a country so that there is local buy-in?
- **Baselines:** Do we need baselines for social impact assessment of national REDD+ programs, or is it even feasible to have baselines?
- **Audience:** Understanding the audience for social impact assessment of national REDD+ programs is critically important. These kinds of assessments really are for donors to show impacts and for the investors who will be purchasing carbon credits. Do these two audiences want elaborate stories or data from a few indicators?
- **Triangulation and verification** of data is very important since people often will say something that they think the investigator wants to hear while their actual actions are different.
- **The timing:** of witnessing outcomes and impacts is challenging. Sometimes you only have funding for a short time and a donor will want to see impacts, but is this expectation realistic?
- **Attribution:** How do you address attribution with overlapping policies? How do you know that something was a consequence of a REDD+ policy vs. something else?
- **Government:** What if government does not want social impact assessment, or the way they go about it only weakens the process? The suggestion was made to rely upon civil society since we can only provide recommendations about what to do but not force a government to do it. Also, the right people must be found in government to champion the process. The importance of making SIA demand driven rather than supply driven was stressed.
- **Methodologies:** The suggestion was made that we need a description of each methodology that can be used in SIA and a description of the pros and cons of each.

- **Buy-in:** It is critically important to obtain the buy in for SIA from civil society, especially in conflict regions. Having case studies of REDD+ SIA in different countries also will help the buy-in process. If governments can see how it is working in a handful of pilot countries then they might be more inclined to move forward.
- **Stakeholders:** How do you identify the stakeholders in this process and who does it? The Cancun safeguards call for the full and relevant identification of all stakeholders, but how? Support, guidance and tools will help build the buy-in process.

2. Session by Paul Francis

- **Costs and scale of a PSIA?** It costs between \$100,000-150,000 to do a PSIA and it takes a year or more to complete. There is another approach to use that focuses on the political aspects only and take a few months only, costing approximately \$40,000. It depends on how in-depth you want to go and how poverty impacts are transmitted down to livelihoods. The PSIA can be as big or as deep as you want it to be. You have to adapt to the resources that you have and make sure everyone is on board with the questions being asked.
- **Ownership?** The initial ownership over the process is very important. You cannot simply fly in, do it, and then leave. You must think in the beginning of who will use it and how it will be used, otherwise it will be an interesting analysis with no traction.
- **When is PSIA undertaken (*ex-ante*, ongoing, or *ex-post*)?** Originally it was used *ex-ante* (before), but it is equally suited as an assessment tool both during and after. The principles remain the same for *ex-ante* and *ex-post*.

3. Session by Frank Place

- **Baselines:** Developing a baseline for a national level program will be extremely complex. We will have to think about this issue in order to measure impacts over time. Also, when talking about baselines are we referring to starting conditions or the counterfactual projection?
- **Scale:** How do we measure very local farm scale issues? Perhaps when setting baselines you will have to look at different scales? How can this be done in the context of a national REDD+ program?
- **How much to include in an assessment?** How do we address tradeoffs with necessity and methodology? If we look at all variables and also add the topic of gender that will require lengthy processes and intricate webs of collaboration with various actors. How do we define this?

4. Session by Mary Hobley

- **What do you do about an idiosyncratic shock, such as a global increase in food prices?** Doesn't this kind of occurrence cause the whole process to implode? How do you institutionalize the process and keep coming back to a theory of change and the assumptions within it so that we can understand why it isn't working as we thought it should? Some participants responded by explaining that in *ex-ante* analyses must know what you are looking for and you can ask questions earlier rather than at a later stage.
- **Bias based on who does the assessment?** In Nepal, for example, the average person is blind to gender issues, so how do we ensure that the people who are doing the

assessment have an open mind to look at these kinds of impacts? We need support from civil society so that they can ask these questions.

- **Role of science?** This is really about power relations. Who defines legality? We need independent scientific research that complements the impact assessment process.

5. Session by Michael Richards and Oscar Maldonado

- **Stakeholder selection at larger scales?** You must have the right people involved if this is a participatory process, so we will need to think about the complexity of selecting good stakeholders and participants at larger scales.
- **Evidence based decision-making?** This method was developed by conservation scientists to bypass social science research. The evidence base is on perception, so you need a research process that parallels this and a systems model before a causal model. Maldonado responded by explaining that in Latin America they have adapted the open standards approach significantly and that it is based on social science and analysis.
- **Attribution?** The SBIA approach can be used as a way of getting around the attribution problem. If there is a robust theory of change then it is possible to go backward down the theory of change so that you have something that is easy to attribute. So long as your theory of change is very robust, then in theory it will enable you to get back to something that is attributable to REDD+. For some participants, however, it is still unclear how to establish attribution out of what was presented.

6. Session by Pam Jagger

- **The value of time series before REDD+?** The purpose of the time series before REDD+ is to extract idiosyncratic impacts, such as post-election violence and rapid increases in food prices. A longer time series allows us to make a clearer trajectory over time and to tease out some of the external factors that we are trying to control for.
- **How do you know that this is the data that you need?** This approach is not a substitute for a theory of change analysis, but is rather more of a companion so that your assessment is more robust. In order to assess impact in a more rigorous way you need to have preliminary insights.
- **Oversimplification of reality?** We are tracking impacts in the same place over time so what about the time element in terms of things starting to act well or to have problems. You need to know when the intervention does something on the group and with REDD+ being all over the map we need to collect data on the status of interventions. It is true that this is an oversimplification of reality, which is ok when you are dealing with mosquito nets but is much messier when we are dealing with REDD+. We need to be able to cross reference what is happening on the ground, which is a big deal for CIFOR since projects are in different stages and we must collect data at different times and place.
- **Sampling design with REDD+:** With our sample designs should we think about selecting communities right around a REDD+ project and then at different distances to measure subsequent impacts? Jagger said yes and since there is a staggered roll out of REDD+ it generates further opportunities. Also, the most robust design will have communities and villages in different areas in order to measure leakage.

- **Definition of a REDD+ intervention?** How do you define a REDD+ intervention since in practice it is comprised of different policies and programs? In Acre, for example, they are starting to put together a number of programs under the REDD+ heading when these exact programs have been going on in other places long before REDD+ came about. Are we just using REDD+ money to put in place policies that are already underway? Jagger agreed that this issue is a key point and also notes that some projects no longer self-identify as REDD+ projects since those involved are concerned that it is not the way to go and they are now pulling back.
- **How did CIFOR pick the pilot sites?** Jagger explained that project selection was based upon project that looked like they were the first out of the gate since you must first have something happening on the ground. She said that they had an inventory of all REDD+ projects and then ranked them according to which ones would be rolling out some sort of intervention.

7. Session by Tom Blomley

- **Does the SESA require a theory of change?** SESA does not require a theory of change. The identification of deforestation drivers and the template that countries are required to fill out does give guidance on how to identify deforestation drivers and stakeholders, but only a small number of people are identifying the drivers and many civil society groups do not agree with the identified drivers. Now civil society groups are getting funding to do their own studies.
- **Integration of the UN-REDD and FCPF safeguards?** There have been a series of meetings with representatives of these groups to look at the equivalence between safeguards. Would one safeguard measure be equivalent to the others? However, the World Bank said that if they have to change their safeguards then they would have to change procedures across the World Bank. Also, the principle is that whatever standard is higher is applied.
- **Why the FCMC's focus on social soundness and REDD+?** This component was included in the FCMC Program in part because USAID does not have social safeguards. This issue came up when President Obama committed \$1 billion to climate change. Civil society went to the State Department and then to USAID about safeguard issues. Since USAID supports national level frameworks for REDD+, the FCMC Program is supposed to help the Agency come up with guidance. However, there will not be a formal change any time soon, so USAID is working on getting informal guidance out to people as possible so they can use it while they program funds.

Appendix 4. The Assessment Guidance Framework (AGF)¹⁴

Why?	Who owns it? (Institutionalisation)	What are the impacts that are being studied	Who or what is being impacted	Who are users of the information	How is the national process nested with other scales	What are the methodological Considerations?	What are the human resources and capacity needed?	What will it Cost?
Risk and feasibility assessments	Forestry / natural resource department	Whole system (e.g., SLF+) and links	All REDD+ stakeholders	Donor(s)	Trans-boundary / regional	Discipline(s) of team/leaders Philosophy (e.g., rights-based)	Need for comparative international guidance	High cost over the long term
Assess and design	Higher level government body	Poverty reduction	Forest dependent communities	Government	National	Conformity with standard	Need for comparative international input	High cost start up, moderate cost over time
Evaluate process	Civil Society Organisation	Enabling environment (policies and institutions)	Small scale enterprises	Research community	Sub-national	Attribution	Need for high level national expertise	Moderate cost
Evaluate impact		Social, cultural and territorial dimensions	Private sector enterprises	Local stakeholders	Landscape	Sensitivity to conflict and differential vulnerability	Need for high level national input	Low cost
Monitor impact		Livelihoods broadly defined	Social groups (e.g., indigenous people)	International convention	Selected areas	Logistics	Local experts	
Contribute to science		Livelihoods narrowly defined	Government institutions	NGOs/civil society	Site	Leverage for social change	Communities/ local actors	
Adaptive Management		Negative impacts		Initiative (e.g., RRI)	“Terroir” indigenous/ethnic area	Ethics and sensitivity of information	Intra-governmental	
Compliance to Standards		Specific impact (e.g., land tenure)		Private Sector	Global	Timing		
		Enabling environment institutions, governance, economic		Investors		Transparency and disclosure		
		Agro-eco-systems		Media/Public				
				Indigenous Peoples Organizations		Theory of change robustness		
				Standard setting body		Rigor and practicality		

¹⁴ The initial framework was developed by Diane Russell (USAID). However, this version of the framework is a later version that includes the inputs and revisions from the core LISA-REDD members and from the workshop participants.

Appendix 5. The seven stages of the SBIA process



Source: Richards & Panfil (2011). Manual for Social Impacts Assessment of Land-Based Carbon Projects.

Appendix 6. Group Work Part 1 - Assessment Guidance Framework - Ghana¹⁵

Question	Detail Specific to Ghana						
Why?	Inform adaptive management	Inform the design of REDD+ strategies (policies and measures)	Comply w/ World Bank	Identify risk that requires mitigation	Identify social impacts not covered by WB safeguards	Support design and implementation of social impact monitoring system	Justifying the forest sector to other sectors
Owner?	Ideally implementation should not be in the Ministry of Lands and Resources - should be a separate entity	National REDD+ working group	Accountable to Cabinet Advisory Council (NREAC) - Technical Committee	Ministry of Lands			
Impacts Studied?	<i>Ex-ante</i> to provide scenarios re: impacts of different policies and legislation reforms	Negative impacts and harms - scoping to identify who is most at risk and focus on this	Positive impacts - poverty lens and rights lens				
Who or What Impacts?	People most at risk from negative impacts	To be determined by stakeholder analysis					
Users?	Primary user groups - REDD+ Working group Implementing safeguards committee Donors like the World Bank Civil society				Secondary user groups - Those involved with UNFCCC - negotiating and reporting Advocacy NGOs REDD+ pilots Private sector		
Methods?	Criteria	Purpose and primary users	Timeframe for delivering results	Cost	Capacity	Explain the why & how (including attribution), as well as what impact	
Human Capacity?							

¹⁵ This group did not address the nesting column during the exercise so it is not included in the table.

Appendix 7. Group Work Part 1 - Assessment Guidance Framework - Kenya

Question	Detail Specific to Kenya				
Why?	Risk & feasibility assessment	Assess & design	Compliance to standards	Adaptive management	
Owner?	Ministry of Forestry & Wildlife	REDD+ working group	Community consultation working group		
Impacts Studied?	Socio-economic - charcoal regulations	Benefit sharing arrangement	Social impacts of livestock improvements	New trustland & management arrangements	
Who or What Impacted¹⁶?	Small-scale producers & users (i.e., urban)	Pastoralists	Forest dependent communities & households		
Users?	All impacted	Government (i.e., REDD+ working group and Ministry of Forestry)	Private sector and donors	Public, media, CSO, NGOs	Standards, validators, verifiers
National process nested w/ other scales?	Household, user and community groups, county				
Methods?	Qualitative	Quantitative	Spatial	Costs?	
Human Capacity?	Experience in large scale collaborative work	Strategists	Social research institute		

¹⁶ A card that labeled "Disaggregated" was included in this column, but I did not put it in the table because it appears to make reference to the need to disaggregate impacts within each category.

Appendix 8. Group Work Part 1 - Assessment Guidance Framework - Cameroon

Question	Detail Specific to Cameroon							
Why?	All + policy change and development	Establishing baselines	Investor interest					
Owner?	Government (Ministry of Environment and Protection of Nature - MINEP)	Universities	Conservation organizations					
Impacts Studied?	Rights of Indigenous Peoples	Land and forest tenure	Forest production and access	Sustainable use of biodiversity	Policies			
Who or What Impacted ¹⁷ ?	Indigenous communities	Livelihoods	Poverty	Enabling environment	Agro-ecosystems			
Users?	Government	Private sector and investors	Communities (local)	Donors	Civil society			
National process nested with other scales?	National/sub-national	Site/project level						
Methods?	Costs - simple, low cost, but reliable	The nesting "thing" - macro/micro	Spatial linkages	Use available data	Frequency of data collection	Quantitative and Qualitative	Multiple source analyses	Returning back implications - also theory of change
Human Capacity?	Need in-house national capacity							

¹⁷ A card that labeled "Disaggregated" was included in this column, but I did not put it in the table because it appears to make reference to the need to disaggregate impacts within each category.

Appendix 9. Country selection scenarios for piloting based on initial set of criteria¹⁸

Country	FCPF	FIP	SESA Prep.	UN-REDD	REDD+ SES	Donors
Scenario 1						
Indonesia	Participant	X	Advanced	Recipient	Groups 1,2	Norad, USAID
Scenario 2						
Mexico	Participant	X	Middle	Observer	Group 2	Norad, USAID
Peru	Participant	X	Starting	Observer	Group 2	Norad, USAID
Scenario 3						
Tanzania	Participant	---	Middle	Recipient	Group 1	Norad
Scenario 4						
Argentina	Participant	X	Advanced	Observer	---	---
Scenario 5						
Guatemala	Participant	---	Middle	Observer	Group 2	USAID
Scenario 6						
Ghana	Participant	X	Advanced	Observer	---	---

¹⁸ This preliminary analysis was made with information from various sources, including the FCPF website (www.forestcarbonpartnership.org), the REDD+ SES initiative (www.redd-standards.org), the UN-REDD website (www.un-redd.org), USAID Sustainable Landscapes countries for FY13 and Norad's 2013-15 REDD+ funding call.