

Asia-Pacific FCPF Capacity Building Project on REDD+ for Indigenous Peoples Launch Workshop

20-22 April 2022

Organized by:



With support from:



Introduction

The Capacity Building Program (CBP) of the Readiness Fund on REDD+¹ for forest-dependent indigenous peoples (IPs), southern civil society organizations (CSOs) and other forest dwellers was approved by the Participants Committee (PA) of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) upon request of IPs. The objective of the CBP is to provide beneficiaries with information, knowledge, and awareness on REDD+ to enhance their understanding on REDD+, and to enable them to engage more meaningfully in the design and implementation of REDD+ readiness activities and emission reduction programs. The aim is to support activities that empower and enable these stakeholder groups, to enhance and influence REDD+ development outcomes, and also to strengthen mechanisms for inclusion, accountability, and participation.

For Asia-Pacific, [Tebtebba](#) Foundation (Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education), a non-government organization with consultative status to the UN-ECOSOC based in the Philippines, was chosen to be the Recipient and implementer of the IP component of the project.

Now on its 3rd and final phase, Component 1 (National Capacity Building and Awareness Raising) focuses on three (3) ERP countries namely Republic of Fiji, Nepal, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. The approved sub-projects will pilot key elements of REDD+, such as safeguards, grievance redress mechanisms, benefit sharing arrangements, monitoring, and carbon accounting. In relation to COVID-19, the sub-projects included a platform to address knowledge gaps among indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities on the impacts of the pandemic. Five (5) sub-projects were selected through a transparent process of call for proposals and screening with the support of experts and members of the project's Regional Steering Committee (RSC).

The project launch workshop was organized under Component 2 (Regional Exchange and Sharing Lessons Learned) with the following objectives: 1) Provide project partners an orientation on the status of the CBP, the new environmental and social framework and the project's results and monitoring framework; 2) Consult, clarify and level off on project implementation and compliance to reporting requirements; and 3) Bring project partners together to network, share and learn from each other's context and project strategies.

The workshop gathered 20 participants from sub-grantee organizations, representatives of the Regional Steering Committee (RSC), members of the research team and the World Bank (WB). The workshop opened formally with a prayer and words of welcome from Tebtebba. The agenda included a keynote address, presentations, and questions and answers.

Indigenous peoples and benefits from REDD+

Ms. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, Tebtebba's Executive Director, recalled the involvement and contributions of IPs in shaping and in the implementation of REDD+ programs and the benefits they received in her keynote address.

¹Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries

Indigenous Peoples involvement in REDD+ started in Bali during the UNFCCC COP13 in 2007 when the WB launched the REDD (REDD only as of the Bali COP) project. They strongly expressed the importance of respecting IP rights in the management and control of their forests; of their involvement in processes to shape, design and implement the program; and that projects should lead to better protection of their forests.

At UNFCCC COP16 (2010), IPs strongly lobbied to ensure a human rights-based approach (that IP rights is at the center =) in the implementation of the new initiative and for the respect, (inclusion) particularly of Indigenous Peoples rights, in the safeguards. The safeguards were adopted in Cancun despite opposition to (against) the discussion of rights in an environmental convention. This important milestone allows IPs to closely monitor how governments and other actors are ensuring their full participation in designing REDD processes and in implementation and evaluation of this program.

To support their work towards their inclusion in REDD+ processes at national and global levels, IPs received financial support from donors. NORAD, for example, provided funds for researches, advocacy/lobby work, community consultations, and dialogues with governments. Researches on national and local forest policies and indigenous knowledge and customary governance on forest management and control were undertaken. IPs were supported to participate in global processes like those of the UNFCCC's COP and SBSTA where they used research findings to strongly lobby for inclusion of rights in the safeguards and in the implementation of REDD+ programs. The research findings also helped strengthen the basis for the establishment of the UNFCCC platform for sharing traditional knowledge of IPLCs. A big part of this platform will look into the issue of forest and REDD+.

Community meetings/consultations were conducted that further enhanced IPs' capacities to engage their governments to influence national REDD+ processes. IPs engaged in various national REDD+ processes including in structures set-up by governments like the technical working group in Nepal. In addition to their existing knowledge on forests, they also used research findings in these undertakings.

The researches have strongly influenced some government policies and programs on REDD+. The FCPF project for IPs supported a research on Mainstreaming Gender into Fiji's REDD+ and Emissions Reduction Program (ERP) and another on Forest Policies and IPs' Traditional Knowledge and Practices on Sustainable Forest Management undertaken in Cambodia, Fiji and Thailand. Some recommendations of the former were adopted by the government.

IPs had direct engagement with their governments providing a venue for governments to appreciate much better the roles and contributions of IPs and engaged them in REDD+ processes. Several laws and policies came into place that recognized the contributions of IPs as far as design and implementation of REDD+ are concerned. In Vietnam, the work of ethnic minorities/IPs showed that monoculture of Gmelina dried up their water sources and managed to convince their government to cut down Gmelina and instead plant indigenous trees. Their water came

back as well as wild life like birds and diversity has been enhanced significantly. These IPs were also given some rights over the forest where they live.

The engagement of IPs should not be underestimated; it was through these that decisions were adopted that do not only strengthen their rights to have control and management of their forest but use their traditional knowledge and customary governance systems on forests which have been proven to be effective in conserving biological diversity and maintaining ecosystem services like water provision. The latter is supported by findings of the researches undertaken and is the strongest argument used to influence governments and multilateral bodies.

These happened because of the strengths of IPs in asserting the recognition of their knowledge and rights. The FCPF capacity building program should strengthen further those capacities and change remaining policies that discriminate IPs' knowledge and governance systems. IPs should never be marginalized in developing programs and in processes related to forest and natural resources management but always be part of government decision making bodies to implement forest projects including carbon emission mitigation and others related to climate change. There are recent decisions on climate change like including agriculture in carbon sequestration and use of technologies like geo engineering to mitigate impacts of climate change. IPs should look into these because while it may contribute in addressing the climate crisis, it can also lead to further marginalization of IPs.

In the last UNFCCC COP in Glasgow, there is an opening for IPs to engage in the carbon market for emissions sequestered by their forests, lands and oceans. What is being done is undertaking researches on the few IP experiences in the voluntary carbon market which could be shared and discussed in the FCPF processes so that IPs' rights will not be violated but these will be at the center of the carbon market. IP communities should be cautioned against carbon cowboys presenting themselves as authorized brokers for carbon markets.

IPs' main objective in all their efforts is to ensure that their contributions in mitigating climate change crisis are recognized and rewarded. The incentives are there, IPs should benefit from their knowledge and contributions in shaping national and global programs and not discriminated or their rights violated. If governments and multilateral bodies recognize, accept and acknowledge IPs participation, IPs can achieve their goal of getting protection of their rights from these actors as well as ensure that their contributions for environmental sustainability are also sustained.

Environmental and Social Framework

The ESF replaces the safeguards policies of the WB according to Mr. Svend E. Jensby, Senior Social Development Specialist of the WB. Its objectives are to ensure that people and the environment are protected from potential adverse impacts of WB-financed investment projects; improve the outcome and effectiveness of projects; and strengthen the capacity of Clients/Governments to implement environmental and social standards to increase sustainability and impact beyond the WB portfolio. The key concept of ESF is proportionality of risk

management. Risk management for this small project is less rigorous than for big projects. Mr. Jensby focused on the seven (7) environmental and social standards relevant to and required of the project.

ESS1: Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts. This is very important for IPs because projects are required to adopt measures so that adverse impacts do not fall disproportionately on the disadvantaged or vulnerable, and to enhance the benefits and opportunities to these people. Under the CBP, the sub-projects should integrate the ESF objectives; report any incidents or accidents of project workers/consultants within 48 hours; engage all stakeholders, disclose all information and provide mechanism for grievance redress; follow WB and public health guidance on COVID-19; and identify E&S management focal person.

ESS2: Labor and Working Conditions. This relates to the implementation of national labor and occupational and health safety (OHS) standards outlined in the Labor Management Procedures (LMP) of the project and related human resource policies, including on recruitment, discipline, appraisals and dismissals, grievance redress mechanism for project workers, and the need for OHS measures especially during travel and protection from COVID-19.

In response to a question on volunteers in sub-grantee organization, it was clarified that labor laws/standards are about contracts, working hours and compensation and does not apply to volunteers but OHS is very important like making sure that those travelling in motor cycles, for example, wear protective gears and COVID-19 kits are available. Insurance could be considered, too.

ESS4: Community Health and Safety. The project should avoid gender-based violence, sexual exploitation or abuse and sexual harassment; follow codes of conduct, and provide COVID-19 kits to community members/beneficiaries during implementation of project activities.

ESS6: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management Living Natural Resources. The capacity building activities is expected to have positive impacts on biodiversity and habitats and strengthen benefit-sharing and participatory forest management with IPs/local communities.

ESS7: Indigenous Peoples. The project is for the benefit of indigenous peoples so there is no need to prepare a stand-alone IPs' plan but there should be meaningful consultations with IP communities and representatives during sub-project preparation and implementation.

A concern was raised on the application of this standard in countries where IPs are not formally recognized. In the CBP, according to Mr. Jensby, IPs are recognized and there was a good consultation process. Although most countries recognize IPs or groups with similar characteristics, he acknowledged that there are challenges. Appropriate skills are also needed and understanding could be different and becomes difficult for some governments to implement.

ESS8: Cultural Heritage. Identify and recognize cultural heritage in consultation with local communities. This could be tangible or intangible and includes sacred areas.

ESS10: Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure. Sub-grantees should inform all stakeholders about the project, disclose relevant documents, including the grievance mechanism (GM) and address concerns promptly, effectively and transparently, and, document the resolution process and result. Anonymous complaints should be accepted. The grievance mechanism should make use of existing/traditional mechanisms and extra step within the sub-grantee organization or government is used only after exhausting existing systems. The GM should be shared in a format easily understood by communities according to a participant.

Another participant commented that the standards were developed wisely with many consultations but how we can make ourselves efficient to implement given that time and resources are very limited?

The FCPF Capacity Building Program and the Asia-Pacific Project for IPs

This program was launched by the Participants Committee (PC) of the FCPF in October 2008 according to Ms. Juliette Wilson, Task Team Leader at the WB of the project for Asia-Pacific. The program has been focused on increasing the capacities and understanding of forest dependent indigenous peoples (IPs), civil society and local communities in forest rich developing countries in Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin America regions. This is 3rd and final phase.

The objective of phase 3 is to strengthen the engagement of targeted forest dependent IP beneficiaries and civil society organizations to actively participate in REDD+ processes and decision making at the country and regional levels. The overall aim is to support activities to empower and enable all stakeholder groups to enhance and influence REDD+ development outcomes and also to strengthen mechanisms for inclusion, accountability and participation. The overall participation of IPs in REDD+ has been a long journey and there is significant progress but there is also a long way to go.

For the Asia-Pacific FCPF Capacity Building Project on REDD+ (for Forest-Dependent IPs) there are five (5) approved sub-projects being implemented under Component 1 (National Capacity Building and Awareness Raising through sub-grants as shared by Helen Valdez, Project Team Leader (PMTL). The sub-grantees are the Centre for Sustainable Development in Mountainous Areas (CSDM) and Center for Rural Development in Central Vietnam, Vietnam; Nepal Federation of Indigenous Nationalities (NEFIN) and Himalayan Grassroots Women's Natural Resource Management Association (HIMAWANTI), Nepal; and Soqosoqo Vakamarama I Taukei (SSV), Fiji.

Component 2 (Regional Exchange & Sharing Lessons Learned) activities include a research on IP women and benefit sharing in ERPs implementation being undertaken in Fiji, Indonesia and Nepal; a launch workshop (this workshop); and a lessons learned workshop to be held towards the end of the project. Component 3 covers management, M&E, reporting including audit.

Challenges for Tebtebba are low response to the call for proposals which was posted online and sent to contacts through email and staff turnover.

Discussion:

A participant from Fiji commented that the Pacific is never heard, invisible in international processes and always a part of the Asia-Pacific region. She asked what importance does the WB give to IPs' rights, to what extent they include this in their discussion and what specific programs are there for IPs.

The Pacific is not very visible because of the size of Asia, according to Ms. Corpuz, but it is big including the oceans which are significant in carbon sequestration and play a big role in climate change processes and should not be underestimated.

Within the FCPF, the global team pushed the agenda to recognize IP rights from the beginning of REDD+ by undertaking Bank financed research looking at tenure, rights situation and existing legislations in the different FCPF countries according to Mr. Jensby. It included identifying potential areas/options that can be done to strengthen the rights of IPs and other forest dependent communities including working with clients (governments) in the countries to address these but maybe more should have been done. It should be an ongoing process.

There is a good development in East-Asia, where the WB is now looking at tenure security and land titling for IPs although not in the FCPF but connected to it. There are several programs where the Bank is supporting tenure security for IPs in Asia. This was done before in Lat-Am where the legal basis existed so it is easier. In Asia, it is more difficult because most of the countries do not have strong legislation recognizing IP rights to land and to carbon also. These works are with governments and enhancing the recognition of IP rights is a challenge.

Activities under the capacity building program (CBP) could help. One element is the Bank will connect/facilitate engagement of the CSOs/NGOs/IPOs involved with governments. The emphasis of the 3rd phase is to help facilitate that engagement/dialogue through the ERP of the countries. Recognition of IP rights cannot be solved in a couple of years, it needs sustained efforts from everyone. There is also the new program called EnABLE which aims to support enhance the benefits of IPLCs in the ERPs.

A participant commented that there are multiple mechanisms within the WB, governments take loans/grants from the FCPF, FIP, GEF, etc. but not sure if the programs and projects are achieving their objectives and are complying with ESS7. Sometimes IP rights are violated. There are gaps in principles, speech, practices and experiences on the ground.

In terms of challenges in working with women in FCPF activities, it was pointed out that many IP structures in different countries are male dominated. Women is a stratified concept. In Fiji, for example, a woman married into a clan is voiceless and viewed as one who should not be talking about land and forest issues. What is being done is to enhance their capacities to become leaders; support them to transmit their indigenous knowledge and values to younger generations; and researches are being undertaken which could recommend concrete measures as well as policies to be developed to ensure their active participation in REDD+ processes. IP

women have multiple burden—domestic and economic roles, try to adjust schedule of activities to accommodate them.

Research on IP women and benefit sharing in ERPs implementation

Dr. Raymundo Rovillos, consultant hired as research coordinator, shared the research background which builds on the principles and views articulated by Tebtebba in its work on REDD+, the research objectives and guide questions. The objectives are: to identify IP communities covered and/or affected, whether directly or indirectly, by ERP implementation and their existing contributions to emissions reduction and barriers to sustaining these; analyze existing opportunities, actions, mechanisms, etc. that can drive or constrain equitable benefit sharing for IPs, especially women; and recommend how IP practices can enhance benefit sharing arrangements to reduce carbon emissions and propose a design for equitable benefits sharing to IPs with attention to indigenous women.

It is hoped that these research objectives will be addressed using agreed guide questions related to existing IP community actions and initiatives to preserve, conserve and sustainably manage their forests including the use of customary practices and knowledge systems; roles of all community stakeholders and the benefits that accrue to them and how these are distributed; changes over time and the facilitating or hindering factors affecting the sustainability of these practices, systems and values and recommendations to address hindering factors; key government policies on forest and forest managements and how these reinforce or weaken indigenous forest management; existing customary or formal benefit sharing scheme/s including the facilitating factors that ensure its effectivity and equity, and, the challenges and actions undertaken; and, the key principles of a customary or formal benefit sharing scheme for IPs and how these can be implemented describing the institutional arrangements, policy support, financial resource needed, among others.

The research will make use of indigenous and gender sensitive approaches in both primary and secondary data-gathering methods like in key informant interviews, focus group discussions (FGDs), rapid appraisal, document analysis and literature review, among others. . Data analyses should anchor primarily on a rights and ecosystems based approaches that surfaces the recognition, respect and protection of indigenous peoples' rights to their lands and territories, identity, culture, traditional knowledge systems, practices, customary governance and institutions, social justice and self-determined development; and the protection and sustainable management of the natural environment.

The country researchers (Dahniar Andriana-Indonesia, Akanisi Tarabe-Fiji, and Pasang Sherpa-Nepal) shared their initial work. The final output will include a comparative analysis.

The Sub-Projects

Representatives of the sub-grantee organizations shared their sub-projects in the following order (Mr. Hoang Key Sy ([CSDM](#)), Dr. Ho Le Phi Khanh ([CRD](#)), Mr. Tunga Bhadra Rai ([NEFIN](#)), Mr. Subesh

Gupta ([HIMAWANTI](#)) and Ms. Adi Finau TabaKaocoro ([SSV](#)) focusing on areas of implementation and targeted beneficiaries, activities to be implemented, expected outputs, outcomes and challenges.

Common challenges in sub-project implementation include COVID 19 and related protocols, securing permits from government entities, short time for implementation, monsoon season, language barrier, low literacy of targeted beneficiaries, and local elections (Nepal). For government permits, sub-grantees are requesting assistance from the FCPF/WB especially in countries where FCPF projects are being implemented by the government.

Project Management, M&E and Reporting

The discussion on activity reports was facilitated by the project team leader. Given the short timeframe of the sub-projects, it was agreed to amend Section 6 No 7.a, 7.b and 8 of the Sub-Grant Agreement as follows:

<i>Activities Implementation Period</i>	<i>Report Submission</i>
From start of sub-project until April 30, 2022	Not later than May 30, 2022 (sub-grantees who submitted reports earlier will submit reports for the months not yet reported)
May 1, 2022 to July 31, 2022	Not later than August 30, 2022
August 1, 2022 to October 31, 2022	Not later than November 30, 2022
November 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022	Not later than January 30, 2023
Completion Report	Not later than January 30, 2023 (format to be agreed with Tebtebba)

In addition, for sub-grantees who already submitted reports they need not revise the participants list. The participation frequency refers only to the current FCPF CBP and counting direct beneficiaries reached was also clarified. While there maybe criteria for participants, non-IPs should not be discriminated. There are one time questions and monitoring questions in the reporting template.

Although a monitoring and evaluation plan requires additional work and preparation time, the Results Framework was presented. It is likely that surveys during each activity are needed and sub-grantees should strategize to allow time for these. Likewise, a post survey will be undertaken towards the end of the project. Survey questions will be developed and agreed with sub-grantees.

It was pointed out by a participant that M&E is a rigorous work, requires brainstorming but time and resources are limited. The FCPF/WB should do M&E but another participant pointed out that while the WB can do evaluation, IPs should do their own. It was acknowledged that M&E is a difficult task but the project should show if there was any change in the knowledge of beneficiaries that can be attributed to the project rather than simply showing outputs. Lack of

budget to undertake post survey was also raised hence using social media should be explored. The initial M&E plan will be circulated for comments and/or online discussion could be scheduled.

Mr. Catalino (Bong) Corpuz, Administration and Finance Department Manager of Tebtebba, shared on administration, procurement and finance matters. It was reiterated that the Sub-Grant Agreement (SGA) is the main reference that defines the relationship of Tebtebba with sub-grantees including dispute settlement, procedures for amendments/changes in sub-projects projects and monitoring, among others. Related provisions were expounded.

Aside from the amount to be funded by FCPF, project cost includes agreed counterpart contribution (Section 4 No. 1c) to be provided by the sub-grantee or other donors. Expenses in excess of agreed project cost will be automatically charged as counterpart contribution. Release of funds are subject to the provisions of Section 4 No. 8 and Section 5 No. 1b. Submitted documents and reports will be reviewed and additional documents and/or clarifications will be requested as necessary. All requests for disbursements should be accompanied by a signed bank information form to ensure that bank information are updated to avoid funds being returned or lost. Additional bank charges for resending funds due to erroneous bank information will be charged to the sub-grantee. Local bank charges should be booked as expenses by sub-grantees. Tebtebba pays fund transfer charges but local bank charges are deducted as well. Tebtebba and sub-grantees should check with their respective depository banks.

The final tranche of 10% or retention fund (Section 5 No. 1c) may or may not be released depending on the level of expenditure per audited report (Section 6 No. 9a) officially submitted by the auditor, reviewed and accepted by Tebtebba. If the audited report shows that agreed total project cost was spent, the 10% is released. Unspent funds from the 90% released should be returned to Tebtebba immediately (Section 4 No. 7b) including expenses deemed ineligible per audited report or identified during monthly monitoring. A reputable auditor adhering to international standards, to be selected in coordination with Tebtebba, should audit the accounts of the sub-grantees.

The sub-grantees are expected to consistently maintain legal status by fulfilling government requirements and sound management system both in project implementation and finance management. Non-compliance could be a basis for dis-continuance of sub-project in addition to Section 4 Nos. 15 and 16. Change in leadership from IPs to non-IPs should be avoided because per principle the assistance is for IPs and IP-led IPOs.

As much as possible, agreed budget should be utilized guided by Section 4 No. 10. IPs lobbied strongly for direct support even if the FCPF/WB was adamant because they think that IPs are not capable to manage funds. If amounts were based on actual of IP communities' conditions, the budget is close to what is required.

For capacity building and grievance resolution (Section 5 Nos. 2 – 5), Tebtebba has a Training Institute which conducts a series of trainings and may invite sub-grantees if resources are available. Continuous guidance will be provided to sub-grantees including the finance staff. For

complaints/grievances, a formal complaint should be submitted which will be discussed by the Project Team and if not resolved will be forwarded to Tebtebba's Management Committee.

In the discussion on procurement and finance, Tebtebba appealed to sub-grantees for sound management of funds in terms of expenditure, accountability and reporting. The principle in procurement is transparency and getting the maximum output from the input. A copy of the procurement policy and procurement plan for the sub-project should be submitted. Those who do not have a procurement policy are encouraged to develop one. Contracts of suppliers and service providers should undergo a procurement process and related documents should be submitted.

A dedicated bank account should be opened and maintained (Section 4 No. 8) and a dedicated finance staff designated (Section 6 No 2). These will facilitate timely submission of monthly finance reports and preparation of overall finance report to be audited. Funds transferred are considered advances until liquidated. Financial reports and supporting documents should be in English or with English translation. For supporting documents, details such as the date, item being purchased/paid, amount, contract and attendance sheet should include English translation.

Original documents related to finance including procurement should be sent quarterly to Tebtebba for stamping with PAID as proof that these were accounted for, then returned to the sub-grantees. This is a practice of EU commission and other donors. These should be sent through a reputable courier service provider and the cost will be reimbursed but photocopies should be retained by the sub-grantees. The auditor has level of quality standards and would like to see the original documents as part of due diligence. Administrative forms should include Tebtebba and the name of the sub-grantee including in the Payee portion of receipts as required by Tebtebba's auditor.

Because not all country researchers were present, a separate discussion will be scheduled or arrangements on reimbursable expenses and consultancy fees will be communicated through emails.

For finance concerns, communications should be addressed to Bong Corpuz, research to Eleanor Dictaan – Bang-oa and Dr. Raymundo Rovillos and on overall project implementation to the Helen Valdez. In whichever case, the project team should be copied. The finance staff of the sub-grantee and of the project in Tebtebba should have close communication.

Annexes:

1. Agenda
2. Participants list
3. Results Framework

Annex 1. Agenda

(Philippine Time UTC+8)

Schedule	Topic	Facilitator/Resource Person
Day 1: April 20, 2022		Facilitator: Ellen
10:00-10:05	Opening Prayer	Adi Finau, Soqosoqo
10:06-10:45	Words of Welcome and Introduction of Participants	Tebtebba
10:46-10:50	Presentation of the Program	Facilitator
10:51-11:20	Keynote: Indigenous Peoples and Benefits from REDD+	Ms. Vicky Tauli-Corpuz, Tebtebba's Executive Director (to be confirmed)
11:21-11:30	Updates on the FCPF	Ms. Juliette Wilson Task Team Leader, World Bank
11:31-11:40	Open Forum	
11:41-11:55	Break	
11:56-12:05	Asia-Pacific CB Project on REDD+ for IPs	Helen, Tebtebba
12:06-12:25	IP Women and Benefit Sharing Research	Dr. Raymundo Rovillos, Research Coordinator
12:26-12:35	Open Forum	
12:36-01:05	CRD (Vietnam) Sub-Project	Dr. Ho Le Phi Khanh
01:06-01:35	CSDM (Vietnam) Sub-Project	Mr. Hoang Ke Sy
01:36-01:45	Open Forum	
01:46-01:50	Announcements	Catalino (Bong) Corpuz, Admin & Finance Department Manager
Day 2: April 21, 2022		Facilitator: Grace
10:00-10:05	Recap of Day 1	Facilitator
10:06-10:25	WB's Environmental & Social Framework (ESF)	Mr. Svend E. Jensby Senior Social Development Specialist, WB
10:26-10:35	Open Forum	
10:36-11:05	NEFIN (Nepal) Sub-Project	Mr. Tunga Bhadra Rai
11:06-11:35	HIMAWANTI (Nepal) Sub-Project	Mr. Subesh Gupta
11:36-11:45	Open Forum	
11:46-12:00	Break	
12:01-12:30	SSV (Fiji) Sub-Project	Adi Finau Tabakaucoro
12:31-12:40	Open Forum	
12:41-01:10	Sub-Grantees Narrative Reports	Tebtebba
01:11-01:20	Open Forum	
01:21-01:50	Results Framework	Helen, Tebtebba
01:51-02:00	Open Forum	
Day 3: April 22, 2022		Facilitators: AM-Grace/PM-Ellen
10:00-10:05	Recap of Day 2	Facilitator
10:06-11:00	Salient provisions of the Sub-Grant Agreement	Catalino (Bong) Corpuz
11:01-11:30	Open Forum	
11:31-11:45	Break	

Schedule	Topic	Facilitator/Resource Person
11:46-12:45	Sub-Grantees Procurement and Financial Reports	Catalino (Bong) Corpuz/Leon Ambatcan
12:46-01:20	Open Forum	
01:21-01:50	Other matters for coordination	
01:50-02:00	Words of gratitude/closing	Facilitator/WB

Annex 2. Participants List

Organization	Name
Sub-Grantees	
Center for Rural Development in Central Vietnam (CRD)	Mr. Ho Le Phi Khanh
	Ms. Nguyen Thi Lan Huong
Centre for Sustainable Development in Mountainous Areas (CSDM)	Mr. Hoang Ke Sy
	Ms. Nguyen Thi Bich Thao
Himalayan Grassroots Women's Natural Resource Management Association (HIMAWANTI)	Mr. Subesh Gupta
	Ms. Soni Gupta
Nepal Federation of Indigenous Nationalities (NEFIN)	Mr. Ashoka Pariyar
	Ms. Sangita Lama
Soqosoqo Vakamarama I Taukei (SSV), Fiji.	Ms. Adi Finau Tabakaucoro
	Ms. Eseta Tuinabua
Regional Steering Committee	
	Mr. Kittisak Rattanakrajangsri
	Ms. Luong Thi Truong
	Mr. Tunga Bhadra Rai
	Ms. Reama Naco
Research Team	
	Dr. Raymundo Rovillos
	Ms. Akanisi Tarabe
	Ms. Dahniar Andriani
	Dr. Pasang Dolma Sherpa
World Bank	
	Ms. Juliette E. Wilson
	Mr. Svend E. Jensby
	Mr. Chanthaphone Akhavong
Interpreter	
Tebtebba	
	Ms. Vicky Tauli-Corpuz
	Mr. Paul Nera
	Mr. Catalino (Bong) Corpuz
	Ms. Eleanor Dictaan-Bang-oa
	Ms. Grace Balawg
	Mr. Leon Ambatcan
	Mr. Russell Deponio
	Ms. Helen Valdez

Annex 3. Results Framework

Results	Targets	Indicator	Means and Sources of Verification	Possible Survey Questions	Pls indicate activities addressing Outcomes 1 and 2
Medium Term Outcome: Strengthened engagement of targeted forest-dependent beneficiaries in REDD+ processes and decision making at country and regional levels					
Outcome 1. Increased participation of direct project beneficiaries in formulation and implementation of REDD+ strategies and actions (disaggregated by IPs/CSOs and gender)	25	Number of participants (M/W/Y) who participated or who indicated they will definitely participate in formulation and implementation of REDD+ strategies and actions	Certificates of participation and/or copies of resolutions/recommendations submitted to REDD+ government entities Result of surveys to be conducted after each activity on REDD+ strategies and actions on who plans to participate in REDD+ processes, post survey needed?		
Output 1.a Beneficiaries with improved capacity, who directly utilize results of REDD+ activities	300	Number of participants (M/W/Y) indicating they will definitely apply the new knowledge or skills in their work	Survey after each activity on formulation and implementation of REDD+ strategies and actions; post survey needed?		
Output 1.b Meetings and capacity building activities held between IPs and national REDD+ decision making entities	6	Number of meetings and capacity building activities held between beneficiaries and national or local REDD+ decision making entities	Reports of sub-grantees; meetings/activity reports		
Outcome 2. Increased participation of direct project beneficiaries in	3	Number of participants who received benefits from ERP/BSP programs.	Result of post surveys on who among the participants		

Results	Targets	Indicator	Means and Sources of Verification	Possible Survey Questions	Pls indicate activities addressing Outcomes 1 and 2
Emission Reduction Programs and Benefit Sharing Programs (disaggregated by IPs/CSOs and gender)		Number of proposals submitted by direct beneficiaries after participating in capacity building activities (individually or as a group) requesting for ERP/BSP benefits	received benefits from ERP and BSP programs Copies of proposals submitted by direct beneficiaries and received by ERP/BSP government entities; maybe need follow-up on what happened to the proposals?		
Output 2.a Target beneficiaries benefiting from ERP and BSP activities at the local or national level	25	Number of beneficiaries who participate in capacity building activities on ERP and BSP	Reports of sub-grantees		
Outcome 3. Beneficiaries who feel project investments reflected their needs (disaggregated by IPs/CSOs and gender) (It is not direct in the ToC, but the assumption is that with increased capacity of beneficiaries it will translate into their participation in the overall process)	80%	Number of participants indicating that they are fully confident to engage with REDD+ processes	Results of surveys (self-assessment) to be conducted after each activity, post survey on who participated?		

Results	Targets	Indicator	Means and Sources of Verification	Possible Survey Questions	Pls indicate activities addressing Outcomes 1 and 2
Output 3.a Direct beneficiaries satisfied with activities, of which 50% are women	50	Number of participants who feel they do not need additional capacity building activities	Results of surveys (self-assessment) to be conducted after each activity		
Output 3.b Regional knowledge exchange among IPLCs	3	Number of learning activities among IPs/IPLCs conducted Number of knowledge products produced	Reports of launch and lessons learned workshops; Copy of publication on research on IP women & benefit sharing		