

FCPF Capacity Building on REDD+ for Forest-Dependent Indigenous Peoples in East Asia and the Pacific and South Asia Region Project

PROJECT ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP REPORT

Bangkok, Thailand
September 13-14, 2019



Tebtebba

Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research & Education
No. 1 Roman Ayson Rd., 2600, Baguio City, Philippines
Tel: +63 74 4447703 * Tel/Fax: +63 74 4439459
Email: tebtebba@tebtebba.org Website: www.tebtebba.org



NGO in Special Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council of the UN

Executive Summary

The regional project assessment was organized under Component 2 (Sub-component 2.1: Regional Learning and Exchange) with the following objectives: 1) To bring together representatives of indigenous peoples and their organizations involved in capacity building sub-projects financed by the project to share their experiences and good practices in project implementation; 2) To identify facilitating and hindering factors in sub-project implementation for IPs and other forest dwellers; 3) To unite on possible ways to address hindering issues and concerns and maximize good practices; and 4) To discuss additional capacity building needs of IPs and other forest dwellers.

The workshop gathered 23 participants from sub-grantee organizations, representatives of the Regional Steering Committee (RSC), ANSAB and the World Bank (WB). The workshop opened formally with a prayer and words of welcome from the RSC, WB and Tebtebba. The agenda included presentations, work groups, and questions and answers.

The project provided capacity building sub-grants to seven (7) organizations in the Kingdom of Bhutan - Royal Society for Protection of Nature (RSPN) and Tarayana Foundation); Republic of Fiji - Grace Trifam Ministry (GTM) and Soqosoqo Vakamarama iTaukei Trust Board (SSV)); Republic of Vanuatu - Vanuatu Foresters Association (VFA); and Socialist Republic of Vietnam – Hoa Binh Cooperative on Agriculture, Forestry and Environment (Hoa Binh) and International Center for Highland Ecosystems Research (ICTHER). SSV is a national women’s organization. Direct beneficiaries are indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers living in remote communities and students. Representatives of governments at national and local levels and other REDD+ stakeholders participated in some of the activities.

The sub-projects focused awareness/training activities on topics related to climate change, forest management, REDD+, benefit sharing and forest carbon accounting albeit at different levels. Trainings were delivered bilingually (English and the national languages) to address technical terms and in most cases in collaboration with governments. Some sub-grantees translated training materials, and developed information materials.

At least four organizations were conscious and made efforts to increase women’s participation by including women facilitators in the team, providing time for women to finish household chores, not allowing women to prepare food for the training, directly encouraging women to participate, having women only focused group discussions, allowing them to take a seat of their choice and partnering with government women’s organization.

Working with and developing partnerships with governments, national and/or local, has facilitated implementation of sub-projects. In Vietnam, the sub-grantees worked very closely with the provincial, district and commune offices while in Bhutan, collaboration was at national and local levels. In the Pacific, they work with the national REDD+ offices through the CSO platform and/or directly with the concerned agencies.

Major constraints to sub-projects implementation were the very short time for delivery, REDD+ related technical terminologies with no exact translations in national/local languages, and unfavorable weather conditions exacerbated by geographic locations of communities. To complete the sub-projects, extensions of the implementation period were requested. Some sub-grantees addressed difficulties on technical terms by synchronizing these with communities' definitions, started the discussions from simpler topics and participation in related trainings to improve their own capacities.

Other challenges included training fatigue, poor qualities and confusing REDD+ messages from previous activities outside the sub-projects, low literary and limited knowledge of direct beneficiaries, lack of appropriate materials, and no tangible outputs. There were expectations that the sub-projects will provide support for livelihoods. Particular to Vietnam is the time consuming and numerous papers required to secure a permit to proceed with implementation.

Forest in Bhutan is government owned, communities are management partners only but they can use forest provided they abide by government rules and procedures. Devolution of forest carbon rights to communities is still in progress and remains a challenge. However, the country is not contemplating to enter the carbon market given the size of its forest so the REDD+ national office is emphasizing non-carbon benefits especially alternative livelihoods.

Improving women's participation was hindered by their multiple roles including income generation which is compounded when women and youth have to work away from home. For Tarayana which worked closely with community forest management groups, only few women are able to fulfill their financial obligations hence are dropped from the group. In the case of SSV, one constraint that contributed to the non-completion of the sub-project was the unfulfilled commitments of two partners. Poor access roads affected pregnant women's participation.

Overall, the good partnerships/relationships developed between governments and sub-grantees contributed the successful and timely completion of the sub-projects. In addition are the trust and good working relationship of some sub-grantees with the recipient organization, and sub-grantees' presence in the communities, communities' interest and trust to sub-grantees, existence of traditional structures, vitality of traditional knowledge and customary practices on natural resource management and prior knowledge on climate change.

Recommendations from the workshop were directed at different levels:

- A. For donors, including the FCPF, to continue and increase financial support for the capacity building program (CBP) and on a longer term, and include an alternative livelihood and climate change adaptation at the community level components. Donors should recognize the geographic particularities and cultural specificities of the Pacific and create a Pacific Region specific capacity building program.

The CBP should cover activities for IPOs and CSOs (Sub-grantees) to strengthen their capacities on how to engage effectively in REDD+ national programs; trainings on

international instruments related to climate change and REDD+ and indigenous peoples/forest dwellers; and how to promote/enhance women's participation.

Alternative livelihoods assistance could focus on enterprise development on community eco-tourism and cottage industries on non-timber forest products and access to markets. This could increase women's participation.

- B. Regional Steering Committee (RSC) to revisit the sub-grantees eligibility criteria to ensure momentum and include more qualified countries; and provide more spaces for interaction with sub-grantees.
- C. Recipient organizations to allocate sufficient time for delivery; organize inception workshop for sub-grantees/partners to level off expectations and establish/improve relationships; and provide opportunities for direct beneficiaries to participate in knowledge sharing activities and increase knowledge sharing.
- D. For governments:
 - 1. Bhutan to continue the partnership with IPOs/CSOs to build their capacity and increase outreach; and mainstream gender in REDD+ decision-making processes.
 - 2. Fiji to review its laws, harmonize its policies and programs and for the Ministry of Forest (REDD+ Unit) to provide more visible assistance.
 - 3. Vietnam to implement forest laws and policies at community level including allocation of forest use rights to ethnic minorities as an effective mechanism for forest protection; recognize ethnic minorities' right to free, prior and informed consent; and recognize and respect traditional knowledge and practices of ethnic minorities on sustainable forest management.
- E. For IPOs/CSOs (Sub-Grantees) to understand community dynamics and consult them before submitting any project proposal; sustain/develop partnerships with governments at national and local levels; use project funds to leverage/mobilize government support for communities; adapt activities to community situations and existing indigenous knowledge and customary governance/structures; and encourage the youth who could be the future leaders to participate. Sub-grantees should adhere to the provisions on the sub-grant agreement including submission of timely and accurate reports which document the outputs and impacts of their sub-projects.
- F. For beneficiary communities to maintain/develop partnerships/relationships with governments at several levels and forest owners/management entities in their communities; and understand/bear in mind that livelihood sustainability and sustainable forest management are complementary goals.

It was observed that the structure of the capacity building program seems to have worked and could be replicated: donor downloads funds to a capable recipient organization which in turn provides funds, guidance and capacity building to country organizations. These national organizations look at the local needs and situations and provide capacity building activities to local communities. Some sub-grantees accepted that the project built their capacities in project management, research, reporting, etc.

Workshop participants, however, were reminded that a third phase of the CBP has not been guaranteed by the Participants Committee but has advised to conduct regional consultations and come up with specific global recommendations which will be presented at the next donors' meeting.

Background

The regional project assessment¹ was organized under Component 2 (Sub-component 2.1: Regional Learning and Exchange), to share results of the sub-projects, what was learned, what worked/what didn't work during the implementation of sub-projects; and outputs, outcomes and impacts (positive and negative) generated by the project. Participants included representatives from sub-project implementing IP organizations as well as members of the Regional Steering Committee (RSC).

Workshop Objectives

1. To bring together representatives of indigenous peoples and their organizations involved in capacity building sub-projects financed by the project to share their experiences and good practices in project implementation;
2. To identify facilitating and hindering factors in sub-project implementation for IPs and other forest dwellers;
3. To unite on possible ways to address hindering issues and concerns and maximize good practices; and
4. To discuss additional capacity building needs of IPs and other forest dwellers.

The results of the workshop fed into and informed a regional dialogue for IPs and CSOs in Asia-Pacific, including a gender-focused discussion, organized by the World Bank for representatives from the 11 FCPF countries in the five days that followed the Project Assessment Workshop, also conducted in Bangkok.

Preliminaries

Raymond de Chavez, Deputy Director of Tebtebba, briefed the participants on the proper use and care of the translation equipment. Likewise, the security officer on the emergency protocols of the hotel.

The workshop started formally with an opening prayer by Mr. Sonam Jamtsho, Senior Field Officer of Tarayana Foundation in Bhutan. Mr. Lakpa Nuri Sherpa of the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP), Ms. Haddy Jatou Sey of the World Bank (WB) and Mr. Raymond de Chavez of Tebtebba welcomed the participants. Mr. Lakpa informed that AIPP is the convenor of the project's Regional Steering Committee (RSC). According to him, one of the project results from the parent financing is increased awareness among the project beneficiaries. Another is the collaboration and partnership developed with governments. Knowledge products were also developed. It is the first time we are having direct participation of all the partner organizations. On behalf of the RSC, we are looking forward to hear the good works you did on the ground.

Ms. Haddy welcomed everybody. It is good that we are into the finalization of the project. We've been reading your progress reports. Whatever lessons we derive from this 2-day workshop we hope to feed them into the regional dialogue. These can be presented to the

¹ The concept note is attached as Annex 1

donors in November. For Mr. Raymond de Chavez, it has been an incredible journey. “We are happy to have everybody here, we are now assessing what we have achieved and see the ways forward to make sure that indigenous peoples are able to benefit from REDD+ projects. Welcome and thank you so much for coming over to Bangkok.”

Participants² introduced themselves by mentioning their name, organization and country. The workshop was participated by 14 representatives of sub-grantee organizations from four countries (Bhutan, Fiji, Vanuatu and Vietnam), four members of the RSC, one from ANSAB and three from the WB for a total of 23 (male-11, female-12). The program for the 2-day activity was presented.

Exercise: The Tree introduced by *Ms. Eleanor Bang-oa, Gender Coordinator of Tebtebba*

Participants were grouped by country - Vanuatu, Fiji, Vietnam and Bhutan but participants from Vietnam group split into 2 groups. The groups reflected on their sub-project implementation and illustrated these by drawing a tree. The roots represented the major interventions and inputs, the trunk are the objectives achieved, the branches are the specific approaches used, the leaves represent the results, the flowers or fruits are the success stories. The participants were reminded to ensure that gender and women-related interventions are reflected in the sub-project tree and were requested to refer to their tree when they present their sub-project.

Sub-Project Sharing/Presentations³

A. Kingdom of Bhutan

Traditional and customary forest management was practiced before 1961 but management was nationalized in 1969 which diminished customary rights (open access). The current system is a gradual transition to sustainable and participatory forest management. Currently, four management regimes prevail - protected area management, community forest management, forest management unit and local forest management group. The country has 71% forest cover with diverse wildlife and is carbon negative. Participation of the community is key in forest management with 32,669 households (39.1% of rural HH) registered as members of community forests managing 93,633.59 hectares or about 3.4% of total forest.

Royal Society for Protection of Nature (RSPN) by Narayan Ghalley

RSPN is a registered non-profit environmental organization established in 1987 and has been working on environment and wildlife conservation.

The direct beneficiaries are members of community forest across Zhemgang District, students and other relevant REDD+ stakeholders like the Department of Forest and Parks Services

² The list of participants is found in Annex 2

³ Copies of the sub-project's full presentations are found in Annex 3 (Royal Society for Protection of Nature, Bhutan); Annex 4 (Tarayana Foundation, Bhutan); Annex 5 (Grace Trifam Ministry, Fiji); Annex 6 (Soqosoqo Vakamarama iTaukei Trust Board, Fiji); Annex 7 (Vanuatu Foresters' Association, Vanuatu); Annex 8 (Hoa Binh Cooperative, Vietnam); and Annex 9 (International Center for Tropical Highland Ecosystems Research, Vietnam)

(DoFPS) and its related agencies. The activities were implemented in collaboration with the DoFPS and focused on awareness raising/trainings on climate change and REDD+ in general, REDD+ in the country, benefit sharing, and carbon accounting delivered bilingually (English and national language). The sub-project also assessed carbon stock in two community forests; conducted a training of trainers on carbon accounting; and organized multi-stakeholder workshops where lessons learned were shared. In addition, it completed a documentation of traditional knowledge, a baseline on non-carbon benefits; a feasibility study on ecotourism opportunity as non-carbon benefit; and translated a simplified document on forest carbon accounting to the national language.

Among the challenges identified in relation to implementation are short time for planning and execution; limited appropriate awareness materials and technical capacity among NGOs and CSOs; and level of literacy and ageing direct beneficiaries. Recommendations included request for support to capacity building programs for a) CSOs to be able to engage effectively in REDD+ programs, b) local governments on the importance of NRM, and c) CFMGs on governance and management of CFs in relation to REDD+ including water resource management; to enterprise development like eco-tourism and cottage industries in rural communities; for clean energy, climate change adaptation and mitigation at community level; and for an assessment study on past customary practices on natural resource management.

Tarayana Foundation by Sonam Chhoden

The organization focuses on social and economic development.

The direct beneficiaries are forest dependent communities in Dagana, Haa, Lhuentse, Monggar, Pemagatshel, Samtse, Trongsa, Tsirang, and Wangdue districts. The activities implemented were trainings on climate change, integrated watershed management, community based forest monitoring; awareness raising activities on the importance of benefit sharing and carbon accounting in community forests (CFs); supported the formation of new CFs; assessment of 29 existing CFs; and organizing a multi stakeholder sharing workshop. Some of the activities were implemented in collaboration with the Social Forestry Extension Division(SFED) of the DoFPS.

Challenges in working with CFs are gender disparity (few women participants due to different factors), not socially inclusive (disadvantaged members who cannot pay the fees are left behind thus, losing their rights to maximize NWFPs), and limited capacity of the members on governance. Recommendations included creation of awareness and building capacities of CF facilitators towards social inclusion, CSOs to focus on promoting women's participation, and building capacities of CF office bearers on proper management.

Tebtebba: RSPN included the legal framework for the community forest. We saw how communities are participating in the management of forests. Both sub-grantees started with basic awareness on climate change and REDD+, and moved on to benefit sharing. RSPN moved further making sure that forest carbon stocks are estimated in two communities.

Discussion/Open Forum

Target beneficiaries of Tarayana Foundation:

Tarayana is working with indigenous peoples and rural communities in Bhutan. The government does not reach these villages.

Country's movement from customary forest ownership to state controlled ownership:

RSPN: Before the introduction of forest management rules and regulations, there was increasing scale of forest degradation. Communities cannot actually manage, they have free access to forest, practice unsustainable harvest of natural resources and grazing patterns. The government started the management regimes. However, the government felt that it should not just be the government alone, there should also be community participation in forest management. That's how the transition started and that is what we have at present.

Land ownership in Bhutan and gender sensitivity:

RSPN: Community forest is state owned. The people manage and have the right to use the forest but does not own the community forests. It is still the government backstopping and guiding them how to use the forest sustainably.

Communities have forest use rights only; carbon rights belong to the state. How to make sure carbon benefits go to the communities?

RSPN: These are important considerations that our country is looking into. There are mechanisms being developed to channel the benefits to the communities. Very soon with the new parliament, the (concerned) department will review our forest law and act. They will give the carbon rights to the community forest members the fact that they have good management plans. In the management plan, there is no concept of carbon trading because there is no framework on how Bhutan will gain from it. We are still in the process of coming up with a mechanism. This is our main challenge.

Difference between customary practices and community forests; government negotiations for carbon and non-carbon benefits in the international level:

RSPN: We are not exactly involved in community forests management because it is mainly the government's prerogative. Customary practices on forest management were there before but not now because forests are state owned. We try to revive customary practices in forest management and try to document. On carbon benefits, the size of the forest is not as big compared to other countries and will not bring us much benefit like other countries. Even the REDD+ Secretariat is emphasizing non-carbon benefits and we see more potentials in it especially in relation to livelihood.

Presence of forest managers' organization for forest protection; does success come from the people or the policy?

RSPN: We are only there to facilitate forest management. Customary practices were there before. Management of forest is influenced by our religious beliefs/spiritual.

One of the challenges is the role of people is not clear. Whose role is not clear - the community, women, or youth?

RSPN: The national government did consultations at the local and district levels including the private sector during the development of the national REDD+ strategy. The government is addressing forest degradation at the national level. Implementation at the grassroots level is not clear because the focus is addressing the national challenges on deforestation and forest degradation. The rural people have no specific role and do not know where they can come in. RSPN and Tarayana are represented in the Technical Working Group.

Comment from Ms. Luong Thi Truong, CSDM, Vietnam:

You conducted many trainings and sensitizations on REDD+ and forest protection which are basic. You did important and effective activities that contribute to the sustainability of your sub-projects. With our experience in Vietnam, we identify the role of men and women when we set up the community forest management group. Since women cannot patrol the forest, women can have indirect role in managing the forest through development of livelihood that can contribute to forest protection. This could be a strategy to ensure women's participation.

Efforts of sub-grantee organizations to reach target beneficiaries, women in particular; country specific context that facilitate women's participation

RSPN: Women's situation is quite different in Bhutan. In general, we do not have pronounced gender issues. Women are always given priority, our laws and regulations do not deprive women in economic and development activities. In our sub-project, we did not come up with specific interventions to enhance women's engagement. We made sure that in all processes women are given priority and encouraged them to join all activities and interventions.

Trans-boundary issues with other countries that tarnish REDD+ plans; conduct of transparent consultations between government and communities related to extractive industry:

RSPN: We are just a small NGO and not involved well at the national level. There are issues like timber rights and illegal wildlife trading. The government have a lot of negotiations and consultations with our neighboring countries. We have regulations in place on mining. Affected communities including all stakeholders are thoroughly consulted.

Sustainability of Tarayana supported plantations and nurseries

Tarayana: The community forests have 10-year management plans. All activities are included here.

B. Republic of Fiji

Fiji has 332 islands with 55% forest cover. Majority of the population are indigenous peoples (iTaukei) who owns nearly all of the land (90%) guaranteed by laws and the constitution. The country however, is not a signatory to UNDRIP because of political reasons. It is an ERP country (July 2019).

Grace Trifam Ministry (GTM) by Mr. Selevacio Taqivuni

GTM is a registered Faith-Based Community Service Organization established in 2002 which focuses on environmental stewardship among others.

The sub-project provided basic awareness trainings on carbon accounting including field practices to 6 IPs communities and translated the related training manual to the national language. It included women facilitators in the awareness team, made special provision for women to complete daily necessary chores in between workshop, and let them sit wherever they feel comfortable to increase women's participation. The Ministries of Forest and iTaukei assisted in selecting the beneficiary communities and provided technical assistance during implementation.

There was a sense that the recipient (Tebtebba) was too imposing on the timeline, however, the sub-grantee admitted that its capacity was built up and realized the need for transparent discussions (talanoa) with stakeholders during any project conceptualization and before execution, and to upgrade and adhere to SOPs.

The main constraints in implementation are very short timeline with the sub-project competing with sub-grantee's other national program priorities, unfavorable weather condition compounding situations of communities which are prone to disasters, translation requirements to align REDD+ definitions to peoples' definitions, and too much awareness (talks) already in the communities with no tangible outputs.

GTM has recommended that government should harmonize its policies and programs, the MOF (REDD+ Unit) to provide more visible assistance, and donors to focus grants directly to non-carbon benefits like alternative livelihoods and health components. A general recommendation was forwarded not to treat beneficiaries as objects of interventions.

Soqosoqo Vakamara iTaukei Trust Board (SSV) by Ms. Alisi Daurewa

SSV was established in 1924 and claimed to be the oldest and biggest women's organization in Fiji with seats in various levels of government- villages, districts and provinces.

The sub-project beneficiaries are iTaukei in 25 villages of Nadroga/Navosa and Macuata provinces. Referring to the tree drawn earlier, the roots or project inputs include the sub-grant, SSV institutional support and the government's enabling system. The sub-project used 2 approaches--- a baseline survey of indigenous peoples living in the forests as basis for the awareness raising and awareness raising on REDD+, climate change and the environment including social issues. The women became aware of REDD+ and climate change, and the people became concerned with carbon and non-carbon benefits. The sub-project also increased the capacity of the organization to manage projects--- better project managers, better researchers and better organizers. Networking with land owning units, the youth and government was helpful. With the leaves or project outcomes, SSV was awarded a consultancy by the government to develop a gender in REDD+ and FPIC guidelines after the sub-project closed.

Lessons learned include letting the people talk on their views on the environment and the changes they want, and the need for adequate funding. One constraint that contributed to the

non-completion of the sub-project was the unfulfilled commitments of two partners. Poor access roads affected women's participation--- expectant mothers go and stay near safe delivery facilities, and are overworked (engaged in both economic-agriculture and vending, and domestic work). Parents/guardians are also forced to live near the schools of their young children to take care of them while in school. Recommendations included stopping treating indigenous peoples as objects and providing support for access to social services (schools, hospitals and better roads) and economic empowerment (livelihoods and access to markets).

Discussion/Open Forum

Engagement of the youth in the sub-project implementation

SSV: The youth, including indigenous youth, were involved in the FGDs conducted under the sub-project.

Activities focused on non-iTaukei women

SSV: We only consulted with iTaukei women because they are the resource owners. There is a very small portion of the forest that is privately owned--- plantation land being leased. Non-indigenous peoples own some of these lands but that is a very insignificant portion.

How the sub-project complemented what the REDD+ unit is doing in terms of awareness raising; extent of support to and understanding of the sub-project by the REDD unit

SSV: We emphasized to them the need to gather data. There is a need to create a certain mechanism to deliver the awareness raising. There is the National Steering committee on REDD+, we are seating as CSO and make input to the REDD+ national program at the national level but participation in the decision-making process is quite limited.

GTM: There is a need for more cohesiveness. The REDD+ unit is severely challenged in terms of number of staff. There is disconnectedness between HQ and division offices. There is a greater need for appreciation from them to identify as partner. It's critically important to understand the dynamics of indigenous peoples. We never had the chance for a face-to-face discussion. We really need to continue dialogue through the CSO platform.

90% of the community have land ownership, how are issues on the environment and forest degradation being handled? What is the role of the government to ensure that REDD+ is mainstreamed?

SSV: There are several legislations with regard to the environment like mining, irresponsible logging and burning. The importance of harmonizing the legislations should be part of the role of the government.

GTM: Fiji was a British colony. Most of the legislations are from time immemorial and have not been reviewed. Environment Management Act of 2005 covers waste and pollution control but there is no monitoring due to lack of resources. One government ministry is on REDD+ and another ministry is talking about rural millionaires championed by district commissioners.

Integration of traditional knowledge like spirit and value of the forest and customary laws in sub-project implementation

GTM: Fiji is communal in terms of land and resources ownership. We have our totems which are the trees. We really would love to champion that in the CSO platform to reconcile the framework--- marrying cultural and spiritual aspects of ecosystem services to contemporary model which is the REDD+. When we go the communities, they have different definitions of REDD+. These are the things we need to reconcile.

C. Republic of Vanuatu

There are 83 small islands with 98% of the land under customary landownership and 75% are forest lands.

Vanuatu Foresters' Association (VFA) by Mr. William Bani Aruduvo

The sub-project was implemented in 2018 to build the capacity of the communities on REDD+. It covered 21 communities in only 5 of the islands and representatives of NGOs and government departments were involved in the activities. Prior to implementation, relevant government institutions and NGOs were consulted for site selection.

Challenges included unfavorable weather conditions, inaccessibility of communities, awareness trainings fatigue, confusing REDD+ messages from earlier activities, and absence of stationed technical forests officers in the communities to ensure consistent/ reinforced REDD+ messages. The sub-grantee recommended that REDD+ studies should be conducted in communities where REDD+ awareness messages have been delivered

Discussion/Open Forum

Comment of Ms. Tamara, SSV, Fiji: I like your strategy in forming the foresters' association to get through from being victimized by the government.

Any further push/ efforts from all the sub-projects to include women in the process whether successful or not

VFA: Women came with us in our activities, we conducted workshops for 1 and half day. We have FGDs where we divided participants--- men, women and youth to ensure women's participation and give them a chance to speak out.

Level of funding assistance in Vanuatu

VFA: This is project based and is quite small allocated in some areas. The REDD+ national program is considering to add more areas.

For the WB on the possibility of the 3 countries (Fiji, Vanuatu and PNG) coming together to share and the future positioning of the same countries

WB: Over the years, we have seen the challenges in including the Pacific into this kind of program. The opportunities for Pacific countries are very limited. My advice is during the

workshops tomorrow, come up with concrete recommendations in expanding the scope of this regional program. Map out a concrete program for the Pacific island nations disaster management and climate change in particular. These will be fed into the regional dialogue that starts on September 18th. We can put it to the donors whether they would like to provide additional funding to expand this program to 2025 and create a Pacific specific program. There is a very strong justification to put it as a concrete proposal.

Tebtebba: We have been recommending to other multi-lateral agencies like IFAD that there should be a separate grouping for Pacific countries. They recognized this idea. If the World Bank also recognizes this, then it will be good for the Pacific countries. Have a stronger voice. Insist to separate Pacific in terms of funding. Pacific countries have different context from Asia.

WB: Fiji was part of UNFCCC COP for a long time and it gained global visibility. There is the Pacific Islands Climate Action Forum and there was significant funding from the donors to support the Pacific for climate change adaptation and mitigation and disaster management. To what extent did you (CSOs) participate in those fora in putting these proposals? The donors that pledged to the climate action are the same donors that are seating in the Participants Committee meetings and providing the funding for this capacity building program. I am assuming that if you can raise your issues those donors could listen.

GTM: This is a crossroad for us. While we continue to appreciate the East Asia Pacific connection, this is very critical for us. Let us not be pushed away from this forum. We do not want to say goodbye.

WB: We are not pushing you away. It is not isolating but creating a space for you. The donors also appreciate the Pacific island nations that is why they have that forum. They realized that the Pacific needs holistic and integrated approach to address climate change resilience, mitigation and adaptation. Advocate to the donors the importance of Pacific as a region. When you craft your recommendations, come up with a good rationale in advocating a specific program for the Pacific.

D. Socialist Republic of Vietnam

Vietnam is an ERP country. The ER program encompasses the entirety of the North-Central Coast Region comprising the provinces of Thanh Hoa, Nghe An, Ha Tinh, Quang Binh, Quang Tri and Thua Thien Hue.

Hao Binh Cooperative on Agriculture, Forestry and Environment by Mr. Phung Van Ken

The direct beneficiaries are ethnic minorities and forest dependent communities in 5 communes of Vo Nhai district, Thai Nguyen province and 4 communes in Nhu Xuan district, Thanh Hoa province (ERP area).

Most of the activities were participated by representatives of commune, district and provincial governments. Aside from awareness raising trainings on climate change and REDD+, activities included developing community based legal institutions (cooperatives); trainings to prepare communities to participate in the ERP; piloting the inter-community landscape customary

governance based forest management model over 2,884.43 has covered by a forest protection contract signed by the communities with the government (for 7 years compared to the usual 1 year contract), and policy advocacy by sharing sub-project results and lessons learned with national and provincial policy makers and implementers of forest laws and policies. Some households completed their applications to register the lands they have been using without certificates with the local authorities after learning their rights and the requirements/procedures during the trainings.

Some challenges during implementation are serious lack of knowledge, especially rights, laws and policies; poor quality of previous village meetings affected participation; strong individual production practice; women and poor households are less involved in collective/social work and a high number of women and youth work away from home; and natural calamities like storms and strong rains.

Recommendations included recognition and support for FPIC which could be a key to the success of REDD+; government to recognize and respect sustainable forest management of ethnic minorities and allocate forest use rights to them as an effective mechanism for forest protection; and provide support for the a) establishment and sustained capacity building of legal community institutions and community trainers, b) replication of the ‘inter-community landscape and customary governance based forest management’ model, and c) implementation of forest laws and policies at ground level with the direct, effective and full involvement of ethnic minorities and local communities.

International Center for Tropical Highland Ecosystems Research (ICTHER) by Dr. Thong Le Quang

The sub-project aimed to empower ethnic minorities and local communities who depend on forest resources for sustenance. The direct beneficiaries are ethnic minorities in Trung Ly Commune, Muang Lat District, Thanh Hoa Province and Ta Long Commune, Dakrong District, Quang Tri Province which are ERP provinces.

Its outputs included social economic and REDD+ needs assessment reports, development of Adaptive Collaborative Management Approach (ACMA) operations manual and implementation through FMC establishment, and increased community capacity on citizen’s rights, climate change, forest, REDD+, benefit sharing and carbon accounting among others. It also supported some households in composting. In most of its activities, ICTHER collaborated with the government especially at the district level.

Constraints and challenges experienced by ICTHER are short time for delivery of activities; misunderstanding on sub-project objectives (capacity building vis livelihood); limited access to information especially on how to quantify communities’ share from benefits under the benefit sharing mechanism; how to sustain the practice of indigenous knowledge on natural resource management alongside “modern knowledge” and still respond to community needs; not very clear land use and land use planning despite the new Forest Law (e.g. the terms of “internal

buffer”); and how to improve women’s participation due to their multiple roles including income generation.

ICTHER recommended the following for future actions: conduct consultations with communities during project conceptualization and levelling off of expectations before implementation; provide opportunities for beneficiaries to participate in knowledge sharing activities; support replication of the sub-project in other areas, capacity building of sub-grantee organization and forest management groups, and technical activities adapted to community situation and existing indigenous knowledge like those in food production; and use project funds to leverage/mobilize support of government especially at community level.

Discussion/Open Forum

Reflection of GTM is to make sure that representatives of beneficiaries or local communities should be the one talking about the sub-project in this workshop.

Comment from CERDA: One thing I want to share is the conflict between state law and customary law. Indigenous peoples are very vulnerable.

Traditional knowledge (TK) is very valuable. Forest management is easier because of the rich TK like on how to maintain and harvest resources sustainably. You mentioned that maintenance of TK is a challenge.

ICTHER: I totally agree that TK is really valuable. The challenge for us is how to sell, protect and implement indigenous knowledge because the conditions, needs, and environment have changed.

Comment from GTM: We have pushed aside the faith that we have. We all believe in the sustainability of nature. We have different beliefs. We will come to the fact that we will appreciate traditional knowledge. We need to balance things.

Tebtebba: We learned a lot of lessons from the sub-projects. In all of our advocacies, we are calling for data. We have to tell the stories behind the statistics, so that whatever we do will be appropriate to the time and context. And the importance of correct messaging and need for tangible results.

The second and final day started with a recap by the participants recounting what transpired in the previous day. Highlighted were the interactions on good practices, lessons learned, and women’s participation.

Project Implementation at Recipient’s Level by Ms. Helen Valdez, Tebtebba

In October 2016, the grant agreement was signed between Tebtebba Foundation and World Bank. It is the first time that Tebtebba Foundation is a recipient of a WB managed project. It was required to develop a project specific operational manual. The project objectives are to strengthen knowledge of forest-dependent indigenous peoples on REDD+ readiness at national level and knowledge exchange at the regional level.

The presentation focused on the source of funds, project governance structure, salient provisions of the grant agreement and the sub-grant agreement, and project outputs vis-à-vis the results framework. The discussion on the grant agreement highlighted the responsibilities of the recipient. To clarify some points raised by sub-grantees during their presentation and in their self-assessment of their sub-project report, relevant provisions of the sub-grant agreement were presented. It was pointed out that submission of accurate and timely sub-grantee reports is required because these are collated and submitted to the WB.

Comment from WB: In the last diagram, the blue arrows represent the feedback mechanism for the donors and informs the WB-FCPF how to do things better. It's not just how you use the money but the impact that the money made in your communities.

Workshops Outputs

For the group workshops, participants were grouped into three: Bhutan, Fiji and Vanuatu, and Vietnam. The members of the RSC and the representative from ANSAB were asked to join the group of their choice. The groups were requested to identify factors that facilitated and hindered implementation (Workshop 1), how sub-grantees maximized facilitating/favorable factors and minimized challenges/hindering factors, and addressed community issues including gender sensitivity/women's participation (Workshop 2) and formulate recommendations on ways forward (Workshop 3) in relation to the different stakeholders (recipient organization, government, sub-grantees, and beneficiary communities). Except for Vietnam, Bhutan and the Pacific Groups worked together in Workshop 1. In workshops 2 and 3, only Bhutan worked together while the other sub-grantees worked individually. The salient outputs⁴ of the workshops are as follows:

Bhutan (RSPN and Tarayana Foundation)

Stakeholders	Facilitating Factors & how these were maximized	Hindering Factors & how these were minimized
Recipient Organization	Timely responses to questions/clarifications and transfer of funds, accommodates changes, and good technical expertise Maximized good working relationship	Insufficient time for planning & implementation; insufficient time and resources to cover more areas; training evaluation form to gather improvement in knowledge of participants is complicated for the communities Requested for extension
Government	There is trust & good relation; the national REDD+ Secretariat & DoFPS provided technical assistance & backstopping & the local government assisted in community mobilization Engaged government in executing activities	Limited technical capacity at the local forestry level Participated in national government & project sponsored trainings

⁴ The details of all the Workshop outputs are attached as Annex 11.

Sub-Grantee	Community presence, technical expertise/qualified staff & conducive policies, membership in the REDD+ TWG Used technical skills learned	Technical knowledge gaps in relation to REDD+ (RSPN) Participated in government & project sponsored capacity building activities
Communities	High level of trust & participation including women, existing knowledge on climate change, traditional knowledge & strong customary practices on natural resource management Delivered activities In community language	Difficulty on technical REDD+ terms with no direct translation in community languages; unmatched expectations on livelihood support

In addition, sub-grantees levelled-off on expectations from the sub-project with the communities at the beginning of implementation, linked them with other projects for livelihood needs, and simplified and translated educational materials.

The group forwarded the following recommendations to the:

- a) Participants Committee to continue the CBP with additional components on livelihood and climate change adaptation; have longer term vision and financing; and provide stronger information dissemination on the projects and available resources.
- b) Government of Bhutan to continue the partnership with CSOs and IPOs; cooperate with NGOs and IPs/forest dependent communities to build their capacity and increase outreach; and mainstream gender in REDD+ decision-making.
- c) Regional Steering Committee to revisit the sub-grantees eligibility criteria to ensure momentum and include more countries; and to have more interaction with sub-grantees.
- d) Recipient Organization (Tebtebba) to continue as recipient organization/intermediary; allocate sufficient time for planning, implementation and evaluation; and organize inception workshop for sub-grantees/partners to set expectations and establish relationship.
- e) Sub-Grantees (RSPN & Tarayana) and beneficiary communities to have consultations including on livelihood and advanced technologies needs before submitting any project proposal; and sustain/develop partnerships with government at national and local levels to build capacities.

Discussion/Open Forum

WB: I like that you mentioned that the government provided technical support. Was there financial support as well? Did the government participate in the awareness raising that you conducted at the national level?

RSPN: We received some funds from the government for the communities to come up with the information on the drivers of deforestation. This was before we started our sub-project. We participated in a ToT on developing strategies for REDD+ consultation process organized by the government. The REDD+ Secretariat participation was limited because there are few staff. At the national and district levels, they were there but at the community level, the participation of REDD+ government office was not always there.

Tebtebba: The government did not only support the project, it also built the capacity at the local level. This is a very good gain of the project. There were three activities of Tarayana funded by the Watershed Management Division.

Socialist Republic of Vietnam

Sub-grantees in Vietnam (ICTHER and Hoa Binh Cooperative) rated the stakeholders on facilitating factors using the following: (1-unsatisfied, 2-satisfied, 3-good, 4-very good, and 5-excellent).

International Center for Tropical Highland Ecosystems Research (ICTHER)

Stakeholders	Facilitating Factors & how these were maximized	Hindering Factors & how these were minimized
Recipient Organization	Capacity – 4 or 5	Short period for preparation (selection of sub-project area) & delivery
Government	Support and policy – 4: recommendation of and access to sub-project site and provision of secondary data; Gender – 2: has laws on gender equality & women’s protection and women’s union Local government encouraged women & social organization’s participation; engagement with sub-grantee	Procedure for approval of any project takes time; insufficient documents & information on women’s rights (participation is not enough); low visibility of sub-project at international level
Sub-Grantee	Procedures-5, timeliness-4.5; good relationship with recipient organization, government & forest management boards Followed schedule, instructions & comments of recipient; learned from REDD+ program	Difficult to explain all technical terms; some community expectations not included Delivered trainings on human capacity building & conducted local meetings; organized community activities in places & time appropriate for them
Communities	Capacity-3: has IP knowledge & awareness, willing to allocate time & collaborate Included local facilitators	Geographic location also affected communication; limited gender sensitivity Started from simple topics to more complicated, minimized sub-project’s time impact on farming households, facilitated opportunities for community representatives to meet government officials, allowed communities to learn by doing,

Below are recommendations from ICTHER:

- a) For beneficiary communities: Maintain and develop partnerships/relationships with government at several levels (province, district and commune) and management boards/ individual forest owners/entities in the sub-project site; and consider livelihood sustainability and forest conservation as complementary goals.
- b) For sub-grantees: Persuade beneficiary communities to own the sub-project; and find opportunities i) for the members of the established entity (FMC) to demonstrate their newly acquired capacity, and ii) for support to livelihood activities, and documentation and exchange of lessons and experiences from the sub-project.

Hoa Binh Cooperative/CERDA

Stakeholders	Facilitating Factors & how these were maximized	Hindering Factors & how these were minimized
Recipient Organization	Capacity, clarity and timeliness – 5 Maintained the same implementation approach	Short time for implementation
Government	Support-5, system & procedures-3 Applied for forest use rights to communities	Long time for approval and many paper requirements, too difficult to overcome
Communities	Participation, presence of traditional structure and gender issues-4 Provided more capacity building for community institution development and organizational strengthening	Rated 2 at the beginning; women’s participation affected by work far from home and doing household work; provided capacity building on gender equality law Partnered with local authorities & the women’s union

Below are the recommendations of Hoa Binh Cooperative:

- a) Sub-project duration should be longer, at least 2 years;
- b) It should include non-carbon benefits like support for forest use rights allocation to communities, community institutional development, and livelihood (NTFP trading); and
- c) Include capacity building on international instruments like updates on climate change and IPs and learning exchanges.

Tebtebba: Common to both presentations is the active support of government and problems in government procedures and systems regarding requirements and lengthy time of approval of projects, and issues in language and gender sensitivity.

Workshop 1: Fiji (SSV & GTM) and Vanuatu (VFA)

Stakeholders	Facilitating Factors	Hindering Factors
Recipient Organization	Legal aspect: sub-grant agreement signed; sub-project prerequisite-focused on REDD+; enabled positive discussions on gender	Required timeline for delivery Managed the conflict with own program
Governments (Fiji and Vanuatu)	Support from the ministry of Forest	Disconnectedness in national level policies and actual field implementation
Sub-Grantees (SSV, GTM & VFA)	Delivered sub-projects voluntarily, determination, upgraded & adhered to SOPs	
Communities	There is great interest, required respect for traditional structure	Many technical REDD+ definitions Synchronized these with peoples’ definitions

Workshops 2 & 3: Soqosoqo Vakamarama iTaukei Trust Board (SSV)

How did you handle/ address the challenges/ hindering factors?	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSV used its own resources to enable the completion of the project and satisfy project agreement with recipient organization (Note: Tebtebba was never informed on this) 	<p>For the Recipient:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology in data collection is left to the sub-grantee to decide Enable sub-grantee to select community appropriate tools of engagement that is exploratory and able to probe into deep issues of concern- as expressed in the need of indigenous communities particularly women and youth (Note: The questionnaire for the baseline survey was developed in coordination with the REDD+ Unit)

Workshops 2 & 3: Vanuatu Foresters' Association (VFA)

How did you maximize the favorable/ facilitating factors?	How did you handle/ address the challenges/ hindering factors?	How did you address the issues in the communities including women's participation?
<p>Used the positive and enabling elements to successfully complete the activities. E.g.</p> <p>(a) requested Tebtebba for an extension to the project timeframe due to weather limitations.</p> <p>(b) did additional communities with the available funds/time</p> <p>(c) consulted/utilized available government technicians to choose locations as well as to assist in implementing activities on the ground</p>	<p>Expended organizations funds to execute practical activities such as purchase of seedlings for demonstrative planting exercises (funds received were only for awareness materials) (Note: This was not reported)</p> <p>Exercised patients to deal with community restraints</p> <p>Take time to explain to other government technicians why their participation was important</p>	<p>Included women facilitators in the awareness team</p> <p>Encouraged focus groups discussions in order to have a representative gender feedback</p> <p>Made special provision for women to complete daily necessary chores in between workshop</p> <p>Let them sit wherever it was possible for them to feel comfortable</p>

Workshops 2 & 3: Grace Trifam Ministry (GTM)

How did you maximize the favorable/ facilitating factors?	How did you handle/ address the challenges/ hindering factors?	How did you address the issues in the communities including women's participation?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested extension to complete our tasks GTM always have courtesy visitation to REDD+ unit (MOF) in the limited time they offered us for updates of our work and activities The enabling factors allowed capacity building activities to be realized It allowed GTM to work with other collaborating agencies/ partners and other government ministries to take the REDD+ message together to ur 	<p><u>REDD+ Unit</u> (<i>Non-attendance of the unit</i>) We seek PS mandate and REDD+ unit to allow us to work with their Division office</p> <p><u>Provincial Office</u> We seek the approval of provincial administrator for us to liaise and connect with his Deputy.</p> <p>This opened the door for GTM to link directly with District Representatives and Village Headmen.</p>	<p>Respect the traditional protocol is paramount</p> <p>Be frank with your intensions</p> <p>GTM asked all women to come and join the activities. They are not allowed to cater and cook for the activities.</p> <p>Be patient with community restraints</p>

target communities	Recommended to GTM a Local Community Liaison (LCL) to assist GTM for grassroots roll out.	
--------------------	---	--

Recommendations of GTM are as follows:

- a) There should be ample time for preparatory activities like pre-planning due to required multi-offices approval before the rollouts;
- b) Increase number of targeted beneficiaries and include livelihood and health component in future financing opportunities; and
- c) Indigenous peoples and faith-based organization leaders’ forum must be the next level of capacity building in our rural communities.

Open Forum/Discussions

Comment from GTM: Need to do baselines, not use outdated baselines from government reports.

WB: This is not a question but an observation. The overall structure of capacity building seems to have worked where the money, capacity and responsibility is given to the organizations from the country to the beneficiaries. Tebtebba providing the money, capacity and guidance to the national NGOs. The organizations looking at the local needs providing capacities to the local communities. For me, it is a working structure that can be replicated in the future.

Tebtebba: The project is helping build the capacity of the organizations. We at Tebtebba has to upscale to meet the requirements. This is challenging but the results show that it helped build the capacity of the different organizations.

WB: The spirit of partnership between the sub-grantees and the governments resonates very well with the FCPF. The P in FCPF is partnership. This lesson of creating partnership between sub-grantee and government is very important. It is extremely important to document the partnership. How to strengthen the partnership? When we request our donors for additional money, donors are always asking us why should we give? We have to make a strong case on the importance of giving independent money to indigenous peoples and NGOs. They are afraid that this capacity building program will not complement the government readiness or resource-based payment program. When we collate the recommendations, this program did not only complement the government readiness process but more importantly, it has created the partnership that we are talking about.

Tebtebba: Based on the reports we received, the governments in the Pacific are thanking the sub-grantees that they are reaching the communities that they cannot reach.

GTM: Yes, we will continue working with the government. There is high expectation from the Ministry of Forest (MOF) to continue working with them but they cannot make it here to hear what I have presented.

Tebtebba: It is unfortunate that the government representative of Fiji has decided not to come. In the case of Fiji, Reama, the Communications Officer of the REDD+ unit, has been with the team of SSV going to the communities.

CERDA: We do advocacy on how to implement government policies. Government at the district level should learn how to do capacity building in the communities. CSOs are doing it differently in terms of methodology.

CIYA: What is the guide that can make all the people in this project have the same understanding? How to maintain our exchange of learning?

WB: Vietnam has a different case. This program has created a good space to demonstrate to government what meaningful participation is all about. There were a lot of engagements at the local and provincial levels of government.

AIPP: Just an observation. AIPP has been working in the region for a long time. This workshop gave us the opportunity to understand the context of the Pacific. One of the enabling factors is the good partnership and work on the ground, continuation of the work that you started in the beginning. What would be our recommendation for the future of FCPF? There is very good partnership between the sub-grantees and the governments. We need to engage/work with the government. One thing that came out very clearly from the presentations is the expectation from the communities where people want something very concrete. This is something that we need to consider in the future.

NEFIN: Partnership between sub-grantee and government. We might rethink the criteria for the selection of IPOs. Bring these out in the regional dialogue on September 18-20 so the countries can still continue, otherwise we will lose the momentum.

SSV: The greatest benefit is the increased capacity of the sub-grantee to carry out research and program. The government assisted us.

CIYA: Documentation is very important for indigenous peoples but we are not really into writing. Tebtebba and WB should work together and maximize available media to share information and promote the project.

AIPP: Bring on board the younger generations- new set of leaders. There should be specific target to include the youth in the project implementation.

WB: I want to clarify a few points because I feel that there's a lot of expectations that there will be a third phase. The Participants Committee have not provided any guarantee that there will be a third phase. We presented during the last donor's meeting in March of this year to

explore the possibility of extending the capacity building program. Most of the donors did not agree simply because the readiness phase is closing at the end of next year (2020). We pushed a little bit to expand the capacity building program to carbon-fund countries so indigenous peoples and CSOs can do something meaningful. They did not say yes, they advised us to conduct regional consultations and come up with one global recommendations from the regional consultations, which can be presented to the next donor meeting. Some of your recommendations were very general. It would be very critical for all of you who will be presenting your sub-projects to propose activities, corresponding results and concrete recommendations. We need to be very concrete. I like the recommendations about FPIC guidelines and gender inclusion. These are the kind of activities that the donors will be looking for when we present them on November. Other bilateral donors or your governments can pick up your recommendations.

NEFIN: Our recommendations are the vehicle to secure the region. Livelihood component and adaptation are the similarities with carbon fund. These are the possibilities that we can demand continued support.

WB: Be specific with the livelihood component. Think outside the box in order to convince the donors to continue funding.

Closing of the workshop

WB: Haddy and I know your projects very well, we've been reading your progress reports. It was good learning from you first hand, learning your challenges and opportunities. This is invaluable in designing new projects and doing things differently. We appreciate your time and your openness. We look forward to seeing you in the regional dialogue.

WB: Juliet will be writing the implementation completion report. For all the sub-projects, the reports should be evidence driven and results based.

AIPP: The situation in the region is there is always a gap in working with the government. The REDD+ provided unprecedented level of engagement. We can expand the partnership with indigenous peoples in the region. We saw the results of the project and should cherish the achievements. We should be strategic in convincing our donors to provide the next financial support. Let us hope that there will a good completion report. There are always things that we need to improve but overall the partnerships have been very good. On behalf of the RSC, thank you once again.

Annex 1: Workshop concept note

Introduction

The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), managed by the World Bank, is a global partnership of governments, donors, private sector, civil society, and IPs focused on REDD+. The FCPF Participants Committee (PC) established a capacity building program for IPs in 2009 (phase one) and subsequently allocated additional funding for phase two of the Capacity Building Program (CBP) of the Readiness Fund on REDD+ for forest-dependent IPs, Southern Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and other forest dwellers in response to requests during several regional dialogues and a global dialogue. 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.

The CBP has two components, one for IPs and another for Southern CSOs and local communities – each implemented in sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Asia and the Pacific through projects. For IPs in the East Asia-Pacific and South Asia regions, Tebtebba Foundation (Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education), a non-government organization with consultative status to the UN-ECOSOC, was chosen to be the Recipient and implementer of the project. The project became effective on October 21, 2016 and is closing on December 31, 2019

The beneficiaries of the project are forest-dependent IPs and their representative organizations and institutions in the ten FCPF eligible countries in Asia and the Pacific **namely: Kingdom of Bhutan, Kingdom of Cambodia, Republic of Fiji, Republic of Indonesia, Nepal, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Independent State of Papua New Guinea, Kingdom of Thailand, Republic of Vanuatu and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam**. Of these 10 countries, indigenous organizations/institutions from six countries have been eligible to participate in national-level activities (under Component 1 of the project) and several of them have been implementing REDD+ capacity building sub-projects for forest-dependent IPs in their respective countries, financed by the project. These countries are Kingdom of Bhutan, Republic of Fiji, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Independent State of Papua New Guinea, Republic of Vanuatu and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Prior to the implementation of national level activities (Component 1), a Regional Steering Committee (RSC), composed of IP organizations from the eligible FCPF countries in the region, was set up to act as an external advisory body and to ensure transparency. A regional IP network, in this case the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP), is represented and serves as the convenor. The RSC reviewed all sub-project proposals submitted against set selection criteria and made recommendations to Tebtebba for final approval and funding of national level activities. Tebtebba has been responsible for the overall implementation, coordination, grievance management, M&E and reporting of project activities to the World Bank.

Sub-projects which were selected and supported by the project are from organizations in: Bhutan (Royal Society for Protection of Nature and Tarayana Foundation); Fiji (Soqosoqo Vakamarama iTaukei Trust Board and Grace Trifam Ministry); Vanuatu (Vanuatu Foresters Association); and Vietnam (Hoa Binh Cooperative/CERDA and International Center for Tropical Highland Ecosystems Research).

The Project Assessment:

Under Component 2 (Sub-component 2.1: Regional Learning and Exchange), a regional project assessment is being organized to share results of the sub-projects, what was learned, what worked/what didn't work during the implementation of sub-projects; and outputs, outcomes and impacts (positive and negative) generated by the project. Participants will include representatives from sub-project implementing IP organizations as well as members of the Regional Steering Committee (RSC).

Objectives

1. To bring together representatives of indigenous peoples and their organizations involved in capacity building sub-projects financed by the project to share their experiences and good practices in project implementation;
2. To identify facilitating and hindering factors in sub-project implementation for IPs and other forest dwellers;
3. To unite on possible ways to address hindering issues and concerns and maximize good practices; and
4. To discuss additional capacity building needs of IPs and other forest dwellers.

The results of the workshop will feed into and inform a regional dialogue for IPs and CSOs in Asia-Pacific, including gender-focused discussions, organized by the World Bank for representatives from the 11 (Lao PDR to be invited in the regional dialogue) FCPF countries in the five days following the Project Assessment Workshop, to also be conducted in Bangkok. Some cost saving is therefore expected for both events.

Tentative Program

Schedule	Topic/Format	Facilitator/Resource Person
September 12, 2019		Arrival
Day 1: September 13, 2019		
08:00-09:00	Registration	Secretariat
09:00-09:05	Opening Prayer	
09:05-09:15	Words of Welcome	AIPP/RSC Convenor; WB, and Tebtebba
09:15-10:00	Introduction of Participants	
10:00-10:15	Presentation of the Program	
10:15-10:30	Coffee/Tea Break	

10:30-11:20	The Tree	Ms. Ellen Dictaan-Bang-oa Gender Coordinator, Tebtebba
11:20-12:20	Project Presentation 1: BHUTAN	RSPN and Tarayana
12:20-12:50	Open Forum	
12:50-02:00	Lunch Break	
02:00-03:00	Project Presentation 2: FIJI	SSV and GTM
03:00-03:30	Open Forum	
03:30-04:00	Project Presentation 3: VANUATU	VFA
04:00-04:15	Open Forum	
04:15-04:30	Coffee/Tea Break	
04:30-05:30	Project Presentation 4: VIETNAM	Hoa Binh /CERDA & ICTHER
05:30-06:00	Open Forum	
	End of Day 1	
Day 2: September 14, 2019		
08:30-08:45	Recap of Day 1	
08:45-09:15	Project Implementation at Recipient's Level	Tebtebba
09:15-09:45	Open Forum	
09:45-10:45	Workshop 1: Factors facilitating or hindering sub-project implementation Group 1. Bhutan; Group 2. Fiji and Vanuatu; Group 3. Vietnam; and Group 4: RSC Members (inclusive of Coffee/Tea Break)	
10:45-11:45	Presentation and Discussion	Workshop Groups
11:45-02:00	Workshop 2: The same groups - Maximizing facilitating factors and minimizing hindering factors (inclusive of Lunch Break)	
02:00-03:00	Presentation and Discussion	Workshop Groups
03:00-04:15	Workshop 3: The same groups - Recommendations on ways forward (inclusive of Coffee/Tea Break)	
04:15-05:15	Presentation and Discussion	Workshop Groups
05:15-05:30	Comments/ Responses	WB
05:30	Closing	RSC representative, WB, Tebtebba
September 15, 2019		
		Break; Transition to Gender Workshop

Annex 2: List of Participants

	Country	Name and Organization
1	Bhutan	Ms. Rinchen Wangmo, Programme Manager Royal Society for Protection of Nature (RSPN), Thimpu, Kingdom of Bhutan
2	Bhutan	Mr. Narayan Ghalley, Project Coordinator Royal Society for Protection of Nature (RSPN), Thimpu, Kingdom of Bhutan
3	Bhutan	Mr. Sonam Jamtsho, Sr.Field Officer, Tarayana Foundation, Thimpu, Kingdom of Bhutan
4	Bhutan	Ms. Sonam Chhoden, Jr. Programme Officer Tarayana Foundation, Thimpu, Kingdom of Bhutan
5	Cambodia	Mr. Samin Ngach, Cambodia Indigenous Youth Association (CIYA) Kingdom of Cambodia
6	Fiji	Ms. Tamara Finau Tabakaucoro, President, Soqosoqo Vakamarama iTaukei Trust Board (SSV), Suva, Republic of Fiji
7	Fiji	Ms. Alisi Daurewa, Soqosoqo Vakamarama iTaukei Trust Board (SSV), Suva, Republic of Fiji
8	Fiji	Ms. Safaira Tagivuni, Executive Director, Grace Trifam Ministry (GTM), Laotoka City, Republic of Fiji
9	Fiji	Mr. Selevacio Tagivuni, Grace Trifam Ministry (GTM), Laotoka City, Republic of Fiji
10	Nepal	Mr. Tunga Bhadra Rai, Nepal Federation of Indigenous Nationalities (NEFIN), Kathmandu, Nepal
11	Nepal	Mr. Sudarshan Chandra Khanal ANSAB, Kathmandu, Nepal
12	Thailand	Mr. Lakpa Nuri Sherpa, Member Regional Steering Committee, AIPP, Thailand
13	Vanuatu	Mr. William Bani Aruduvo, Chairperson, Vanuatu Foresters Association, Port Villa, Republic of Vanuatu
14	Vanuatu	Ms. Ruth Nalau, Vanuatu Foresters Association, Port Vila, Republic of Vanuatu
15	Vanuatu	Mr. Laisiasa Sakita, RSC Member, VANGO, Port Villa, Republic of Vanuatu
16	Vietnam	Mr. Phung Van Kien, Chairperson, Hoa Binh Cooperative, Thai Nguyen Province, Socialist Republic of Vietnam

17	Vietnam	Ms. Vu Thi Hien, Director, Center for Research and Development in the Upland Areas (CERDA), Hanoi, Socialist Republic of Vietnam
18	Vietnam	Mr. Thong Le Quang, Director, International Center for Tropical Highland Ecosystems Research (ICTHER), Ho Chi Minh, Socialist Republic of Vietnam
19	Vietnam	Ms. Tran Thi Nhu Phuong, International Center for Tropical Highland Ecosystems Research (ICTHER), Ho Chi Minh, Socialist Republic of Vietnam
20	Vietnam	Ms. Luong Thi Truong, Executive Director, CSDM, Hanoi, Socialist Republic of Vietnam
21	Vietnam	Mr. Nguyen Thanh Tung (Interpreter for Hoa Binh representative)
22	Tebtebba	Ms. Ruby Espanola, Documentor
23	Tebtebba	Mr. Catalino (Bong) Corpuz, Admin and Finance Department Manager
24	Tebtebba	Mr. Raymond de Chavez, Deputy Executive Director
25	Tebtebba	Ms. Janice Guzman, Project Finance Staff
26	Tebtebba	Ms. Lea Patugad, Finance Staff
27	Tebtebba	Ms. Elleanor Bang-oa, Gender Coordinator
28	Tebtebba	Ms. Helen Valdez, Project Staff
29	WB	Ms. Haddy Jatou Sey
30	WB	Ms. Ayala Peled Ben Ari
31	WB	Ms. Juliette Wilson