

Working group guidance note

On Days 2 and 3 of the workshop, participants will be organized in working groups. There will be three groups, two of them in English and one in French. The groups consist of a similar number of experts, taking into account gender balance, representation of civil society organizations, and representation of indigenous and local communities.

Each working group will address following main issues:

- developing advice on the application of relevant REDD-plus safeguards for biodiversity and indigenous and local communities
- identifying possible indicators to assess the contribution of REDD-plus to achieving the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity

Under each task, the working groups will be expected to provide detailed recommendations.

The working groups will have a **facilitator** from a partner organization of the CBD. The working group results should be documented by a **rapporteur** chosen from the participants of each group. The rapporteur should report back to plenary on his/her group's findings, and the CBD Secretariat will compile results into a workshop report that will be presented to plenary for adoption on the final workshop day.

Developing advice on the application of relevant REDD-plus safeguards

The working groups will work on the basis of UNFCCC decision 1/CP.16. It will compare existing safeguard frameworks, including the FCPF's Common Approach to Environmental and Social Safeguards for Multiple Delivery Partners, the Draft UN-REDD Principles and Criteria and the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards. The relevant documents are available on the workshop website at: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=WSCBREDD-AFR-01>

Key questions to be addressed will be:

- Do the existing safeguard frameworks adequately cover the main risks to biodiversity and indigenous peoples and local communities (see Annex)?
- Are there any gaps in the frameworks and if so how could they be closed?
- Are these frameworks relevant to country needs? What are the challenges and constraints in terms of applying them?

Identifying possible indicators to assess the contribution of REDD-plus to achieving CBD objectives

Key questions to be addressed will be:

- What sets of forest-related indicators are already existing?
- Are they feasible, and are they sufficient?
- What information is needed at national level to assess REDD-plus impacts?
- Are there any gaps in the availability of data at national level? How could those gaps be closed?

A table of existing biodiversity indicators from the Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) is available as a basis for discussion on the workshop website at: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=WSCBREDD-AFR-01>

ANNEX

Main risks of REDD-plus to biodiversity and indigenous peoples and local communities

1. Other specific risks for biodiversity identified by the meeting include:
 - (a) The conversion of natural forests to plantations and other land uses of low biodiversity value and low resilience; and the introduction of growing of biofuel crops;
 - (b) Displacement of deforestation and forest degradation to areas of lower carbon value and high biodiversity value;
 - (c) Increased pressure on non-forest ecosystems with high biodiversity value;
 - (d) Afforestation in areas of high biodiversity value.
2. Other specific risks of REDD-plus for indigenous peoples and local communities include:
 - (a) The loss of traditional territories and restriction of land and natural resource rights;
 - (b) Lack of tangible livelihood benefits to indigenous peoples and local communities and lack of equitable benefit sharing;
 - (c) Exclusion from designing and implementation of policies and measures;
 - (d) Loss of traditional ecological knowledge.

Source: Final report of the Global Expert Workshop on Biodiversity Benefits of Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries, Nairobi, Kenya, 20-23 September 2010 (UNEP/CBD/WS-REDD/1/3)