

**Republic of Fiji Islands
Forest Carbon Partnership Facility**

**Process Framework
for the
Emission Reduction Program**

Version 1.1

October 2019

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1 OVERVIEW..... | 9 |
| 1.1 PURPOSE AND PRINCIPLES | 9 |
| 1.2 FIJI LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORK | 10 |
| 1.3 PROGRAM IMPACTS..... | 16 |
| 2 RESTRICTIONS ON RESOURCE USE | 19 |
| 2.1 RESTRICTIONS ON RESOURCE USE..... | 19 |
| 2.2 POTENTIAL RELOCATION | 19 |
| 3 LIVELIHOODS RESTORATION AND DEVELOPMENT..... | 23 |
| 3.1 BENEFIT SHARING MECHANISMS..... | 23 |
| 3.2 PARTICIPATORY PROCESS | 26 |
| 3.3 OTHER ALTERNATIVE LIVELIHOODS | 26 |
| 4 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT..... | 29 |
| 5 GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM..... | 33 |
| 6 MONITORING AND EVALUATION..... | 40 |
| 6.1 INTERNAL MONITORING | 41 |
| 6.2 EXTERNAL MONITORING..... | 42 |
| 7 APPENDIX..... | 44 |

Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1.1 Comparison of Government of Fiji and World Bank’s Policies Related to Involuntary Resettlement..... | 12 |
| Table 5.1 Steps in the FGRM | 35 |
| Table 5.2 Example of an FGRM from ADB Transport Infrastructure Investment Project..... | 38 |
| Table 7.1 Possible Restriction on Access to and Use of Resources | 44 |
| Table 7.2 Main ER-Program Interventions Potential Environmental Impacts and Mitigations | 52 |

| | Acronyms and Abbreviations |
|-----------|--|
| ALTA | Agricultural Land and Tenant Act |
| AP | Affected Person |
| BSM | Benefit Sharing Mechanism |
| BSP | Benefit Sharing Plan |
| CRA | Community REDD+ Agreement |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation |
| DFA | Divisional Forest Office |
| DMS | Detailed Measurement Survey |
| DP | Displaced Person |
| DPIU | Divisional Program Implementation Unit |
| DRWG | Divisional REDD+ Working Groups |
| ER | Emission Reduction |
| ER-P | Emission Reduction Program (area) |
| ER-PD | Emissions Reduction Program Document |
| ER-PIN | Emissions Reduction Program Identification Note |
| ERPA | Emission Reduction Payment Agreement |
| ESIA | Environmental and Social Impact Assessment |
| ESMF | Environmental Social Management Framework |
| FCPF | Forest Carbon Partnership Facility |
| FGRM/ GRM | Feedback grievance redress mechanism |
| GAP | Gender Action Plan |
| GOF | Government of Fiji |
| GRS | Grievance Redress Service |
| HHs/hhs | Households |
| IAG | Independent Assessment Group |
| IOL | Inventory of Loss |
| LOU | Land-owning units (LOU) of a Matagali |
| LUP | Land use planning |
| Matagali | A Matagali is one clan made up of several Tokatoka (a family unit), several Mataqali will make up the larger tribe or Yavusa |
| MLMR | Ministry of Lands and the Mineral Resources |
| MOA | Ministry of Agriculture |
| MOE | Ministry of Economy |
| MOF | Ministry of Forestry |
| MOIA | Ministry of iTaukei Affairs |
| MRV | Measurement reporting and verification system |
| NGO | Non-Government Organisation |
| NLTB | Native Land Trust Board |
| NPIU | National Program Implementation Unit |
| NR | Nature Reserve |
| NTFP | Non- timber forest product |

| | Acronyms and Abbreviations |
|----------------|--|
| OP/BP | Operational Policy/Bank Policy of the World Bank |
| PA | Protected areas |
| PAP | Program Affected person/ people |
| PLR | Policy, Laws and Regulations |
| PPIU | Provincial Program Implementation Unit |
| R-PP | Readiness-Preparation Proposal for the FCPF REDD Readiness Funding |
| REDD+ Unit | ER-Program Management Unit |
| REDD+WG | Reduction in Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation Working Group |
| RP | Resettlement Plan |
| SALA | State Acquisition of Land Act |
| SESA | Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment |
| Tikina | District |
| TLTB | iTaukei Land Trust Board |
| Tokatoka | Patrilineal Groups at Village Level smaller than Mataqali |
| TORs | Terms of Reference |
| Turaga iTaukei | Leader of Vanua that typically consists of several Yavusa |
| Turaga Ni Koro | Village Headperson (typically a male) |
| TWG | Technical working group |
| UNCCD | United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |
| WB | World Bank |
| Yavusa | Collectivity of Several Mataqali |
| YMST | Yaubula Management Support Teams |
| | Weights and Measures m = meters; ha = hectares |
| | Currency |
| | M = million; k = thousand Currency Unit = US Dollar USD1 = 2.099 Fiji Dollar |

Executive Summary

The Process Framework (PF) addresses the eventuality that the program objectives of REDD+ as reflected in the ER-P might result in some restrictions on access to and use of existing forest land that belongs to the State rather than customary land that belongs to the iTaukei people who will be impacted upon by the ER-P. It also addresses the possible eventuality that non-iTaukei people who the iTaukei or the State permit access to and use of forest resources may also results in restrictions as the ER-P program objectives are implanted.

The purpose of the PF is to establish a process by which communities or households potentially affected by restricted natural resource access to forest which are under the management authority of the Ministry of Forestry (MoF) engage in a process of informed and meaningful consultations and negotiations to identify and implement means of reducing or mitigating the impact of restricted resource access. This will involve a REDD+ Needs Assessment and Social Screening Report, known as the SERNA (Socio-Economic and Environmental REDD+ Needs Assessment) or similar to be undertaken by the Yaubula Management Support Teams (YMST) in conjunction with voluntary community groups and the MoF Forest Wardens at the village level.

The PF is prepared to comply with the World Bank policy on involuntary resettlement (OP/BP 4.12) and Government of Fiji's (GOF) laws and regulations. The PF provides guidelines for the development of Action Plans during project implementation that:

- Define the restrictions of access to natural resources in protected areas;
- Identify and quantify the impacts that those restrictions may have on different segments of the local communities;
- Propose, implement and monitor remedial measures to compensate for the loss of those assets and the income associated with them;
- Provide grievance redress mechanisms in order to resolve any issues that may arise due to restrictions of access to resources over the course of the program.

The PF includes those laws relevant to the ER-P as follows – Constitution of the Republic of Fiji (2013), iTaukei Land Trust Act (Amended 2019), Forest Decree (1992, Land Conservation and Improvement Act (1953), Agricultural Landlord and Tenant Act (1967), National Trust of Fiji Act (1978), Land Use Decree (2010) – and of central relevance to this PF the State Acquisition of Lands Act (1998). As per the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) this PF identifies the legal framework (both GoF and WB); principles and policies for resettlement, compensation and entitlement (importantly that program affected people should be no worse off and ideally better off); eligibility, criteria and entitlements (it differentiates between legally eligible APs in the Fiji context but that based on OP4.12 legally ineligible APs also are entitled to some forms of compensation); consultation with PAPs (and especially women and non-iTaukei APs); the importance of information disclosure (this also to be in a culturally appropriate manner); implementation arrangements (importantly there is a role for the YMSTs); the grievance and redress mechanism (for involuntary resettlement purposes the existing FGRM of the GoF has been retained); and monitoring and evaluation (this includes not only the utilization of an independent monitoring consultant but also APs).

As iTaukei own more than 84 per cent of the land in this ER-P Accounting Area it is they who can decide to do as they please with this land. This includes logging in all forests with the exception of

the closed forests that constitute 30.47% of the total land area in the ER-P Accounting. If the ER-P is going to encourage the iTaukei to log less and accrue carbon financial benefits from reducing carbon emissions then there will need to be more sustainable approaches to forest management. This in the short-term will affect the incomes of those communities who rely for part of their livelihoods on the sale of logged trees from the forests. Negative impacts that may have to be mitigated include the following:

- The existing Forest Law explicitly restricts access to nature reserves and forest reserves¹ under the management of the Ministry of Forestry that impacts negatively on at least some of the villages in the ER-P districts but the law will be amended to ensure an agreed upon sustainable approach of resources in these forests by local villagers dependent on these nature reserves and forests for at least a portion of their livelihoods;
- Plantation forestry companies such as Fiji Pine Limited have recently imposed total restrictions on access to forest plantations and more specifically the collection of NTFPs² under their management by virtue of their leasing of the land use for such purposes creating hardships for both iTaukei and non-iTaukei who may collect NTFPs and the ER-P will require these companies to enter into negotiations with affected communities;
- The longer harvesting cycle will result in deferred income but the costs of deferment may be overcome through micro-financing if that becomes available (but is not included in the EP-P). These longer harvesting cycles may also impact negatively on community income and local waged employment and reduced incomes but specific measures to offset these impacts and related such as change to land use through land use planning will be introduced in the improved climate smart agriculture;
- Disenfranchisement of those customary landowners who disagree with the legally stipulated 60% of customary landowners who choose interventions will be overcome by requiring a significantly higher threshold that more closely responds to the principles of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)³;
- Because the patrilocal nature of typical post-marital residential practices among the iTaukei and the negative impacts this might have on women in the context of carbon title and the right to receive carbon benefits the Gender Action Plan includes measures to ensure that women also benefit;
- Changes or foreclosures to existing leases to meet the objectives of the ER-P that would create hardship for existing leaseholders will not be permitted unless the ER-P can find land of equivalent productivity in the same district which is affected leaseholders agree with.

¹ Forest Decree 1992 Section 6 allows for the declaration of a forest reserve or nature reserve, Section 7 allows for the management of the forest reserve or nature reserve and under Part IV utilisation of Forest Resources Section 8 access to and use of forest resources can - in theory at least be restricted.

² Fiji Pine Public Notices: "According to the Draft Planted Forestry Policy Statement 2015 the guiding principles 4.3.2 state no natural forest or minor forest produce will be harvested removed or damaged in the development of a new plantation". Fiji Pine prohibits the logging or removal of minor forest products "under any circumstance" from its leases.

³ A particular issue for consultation and decision-making is that the TLTB recognizes (TLTB has control over the administration of native land by law), that for agreement only 60% of a Matagali need to agree Land Use Regulations, r5, Land-owning units (LOUs) are required to elect up to five qualifying members who, after approval by the Prime Minister, are to act as trustees for their respective LOU Land Use Regulations, r2: Qualifying Member means a member of an LOU as verified by the Native Land and Fisheries Commission, who is a permanent resident of Fiji over the age of 18 years

The PF describes how these impacts will be mitigated if and when OP4.12 is triggered although in the first instance the PF will attempt to ascertain via the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) where issues surrounding such impacts can be mitigated without having to rely on OP4.12.

The PF identifies the eligibility of the targeted groups, who for the most part will be iTaukei villagers living in the villages of the ER-P Provinces. However, non-iTaukei persons (primarily Fijian-Indian) will also be targeted if the ER-P are also because of their close proximity, especially the plantation forestry land, impacts upon them. The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and Gender Action Plan (GAP) also specifies how poorer and more vulnerable women and men will benefit from the ER-P.

Actions associated with livelihoods restoration include ensuring as per OP4.12 that APs have their livelihoods restored to at least pre-ER-P levels and preferably they should be better off as a result. To ensure this outcome materializes the ER-P will undertake if necessary, a detailed Inventory of Loss (IOL) and Detailed Measurement Survey (DMS). Other alternative livelihoods will be based on interventions such as climate-smart agriculture that are designed to mitigate and where possible reverse the negative environmental impacts of deforestation and degradation. The Benefit Sharing Plans (BSPs) includes not only the processes about how local communities will reach consensus on activities associated with the BSP whether it be seasonal restrictions of Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) of forest and grassland fire protection activities but also how carbon benefits will be distributed. Based on the SESA most villagers prefer to see such benefits distributed on a collective rather than individual basis but there are some different priorities between women and men. The PF outlines the actions necessary to ensure that these differences are reflected in the BSPs.

The PF provides an outline of the implementation arrangements at the national, divisional, province, district and village level. Specifically, in relation to activities that may trigger OP4.12 the Conservator of Forests within the Ministry of Forestry after consulting with the REDD+ Steering Committee (and here the iTaukei Trust Land Board: TLTB also plays a significant role) will decide what REDD+ ER-P projects identified by the Yaubula Management Support Groups (YMST) should be implemented. If the Conservator of Forests decides that the resettlement impacts are more extensive than is envisaged for this ER-P, such as the physical dislocation of village households or excessive restrictions on access to and use of forest resources, these projects will be rejected. If submitted Resettlement Plans (RP) are approved they will have to be implemented by a District Resettlement Committee or similar. The PF also reiterates the point made in the ESMF, RPF and Emissions Reduction-Program Document (ERPD) that the GoF and not the ER-P is responsible for the payment of compensation and any other allowances. The EMPF and RPF identify the limited scope of involuntary resettlement actions.

The Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) that deals with APs directly or indirectly impacted by actions that trigger OP4.12 according to WB and GoF policies. The steps involved based on existing practices in Fiji and agreed upon by the WB and GoF are included in the PF. However, specifically for the UN-REDD FGRM that deals with actions that may cause grievances specifically related to the ER-P, such as the modalities for BSP or exclusion from climate-smart agricultural activities or training courses, the PF based on the ESMF outlines how such aggrieved persons can seek redress. The PF also highlights the fact that OP4.10 dealing with Indigenous Persons (also with ethnic minorities in the case of Fiji: the non-iTaukei Fijian-Indians) is very likely to be triggered and the principles of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) will be utilized. But the PF in both instances argues that where possible and practical grievances should be resolved locally.

The PF outlines the monitoring and evaluation activities, both internally and externally associated with the ER-P. Internal monitoring will be undertaken by the MoF assisted by divisional, provincial and district forestry officials associated with the ER-P and the APs themselves. At present the MoF has this capacity at the national level but not at other levels. It will need to engage M&E specialists which is indicated in this PF. The PF also identifies the need for external monitoring because OP4.12 requires a combination of internal and external monitoring of OP4.12 triggered activities to ensure that APs are safeguarded and receive all entitlements due to them as per the RPF.

1 Overview

1.1 *Purpose and Principles*

The Process Framework (PF) addresses the eventuality that the program objectives of REDD+ as reflected in the ER-P might result in some restrictions on access to and use of existing forest land that belongs to the State rather than customary land that belongs to the iTaukei people who will be impacted upon by the ER-P. It also addresses the possible eventuality that non-iTaukei people who the iTaukei or the State permit access to and use of forest resources may also results in restrictions as the ER-P program objectives are implanted.

The purpose of the PF is to establish a process by which communities or households potentially affected by restricted natural resource access to forest which are under the management authority of the Ministry of Forestry (MoF) engage in a process of informed and meaningful consultations and negotiations to identify and implement means of reducing or mitigating the impact of restricted resource access. This will involve a REDD+ Needs Assessment and Social Screening Report, known as the SERNA (Socio-Economic and Environmental REDD+ Needs Assessment) or similar to be undertaken by the Yaubula Management Support Teams (YMST) in conjunction with voluntary community groups and the MoF Forest Wardens at the village level.

The PF is prepared to comply with the World Bank policy on involuntary resettlement (OP/BP 4.12) and Government of Fiji's (GoF) laws and regulations. The PF provides guidelines for the development of Action Plans during project implementation that:

- Define the restrictions of access to natural resources in protected areas;
- Identify and quantify the impacts that those restrictions may have on different segments of the local communities;
- Propose, implement and monitor remedial measures to compensate for the loss of those assets and the income associated with them;
- Provide grievance redress mechanisms in order to resolve any issues that may arise due to restrictions of access to resources over the course of the program.

The PF includes those laws relevant to the ER-P as follows – Constitution of the Republic of Fiji (2013), iTaukei Land Trust Act (Amended 2019), Forest Decree (1992, Land Conservation and Improvement Act (1953), Agricultural Landlord and Tenant Act (1967), National Trust of Fiji Act (1978), Land Use Decree (2010) – and of central relevance to this PF the State Acquisition of Lands Act (1998). As per the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) this PF identifies the legal framework (both GoF and WB); principles and policies for resettlement, compensation and entitlement (importantly that program affected people should be no worse off and ideally better off); eligibility, criteria and entitlements (it differentiates between legally eligible APs in the Fiji context but that based on OP4.12 legally ineligible APs also are entitled to some forms of compensation); consultation with PAPs (and especially women and non-iTaukie APs); the importance of information disclosure (this also to be in a culturally appropriate manner); implementation arrangements (importantly there is a role for the YMSTs); the grievance and redress mechanism (for involuntary resettlement purposes the existing FGRM of the GoF has been retained); and

monitoring and evaluation (this includes not only the utilization of an independent monitoring consultant but also APs).

1.2 Fiji Legal and Policy Framework

The Constitution of the Republic of Fiji (2013) in its preamble recognizes the following *inter alia* which is of relevance to this PF:

- The indigenous people or the iTaukei, their ownership of iTaukei Lands, their unique culture, customs, traditions and languages;
- The descendants of the indentured laborers from British India and the Pacific Islands, their culture, customs, traditions and language;
- The descendants of the settlers and immigrants to Fiji, their culture, customs, traditions and language;
- Declaration that all Fijians united by common and equal citizenry;
- The Constitution is recognized as the supreme law of our country that provides the framework for the conduct of Government and all Fijians; and.
- Declaration of a commitment to justice, national sovereignty and security, social and economic wellbeing, and safeguarding the environment.

Also, of relevance to this PF the Constitution recognizes three official languages – Fijian, Hindi and English – and the right of citizens in Fiji to use whichever of these languages they choose to do so. The Constitution also recognizes gender equality between women and men but not explicitly but rather by mention of the quality of life of men, women and boys and girls and common and equal citizenry and equality for all.

The GoF has two major National Development Plans – the 20 Year (2016-2036) and 5 Year (2017-2021) – designed to promote inclusive socio-economic development (ranging from a fourfold increase in GDP per person to protection of culture, heritage and national security) and eradicate both rural and urban poverty. Specifically, in relation to the forestry sector there are programs targeted at sustainable forest development, plantation development and product development that have been included in the ER-PD. This translates to a 20-year vision for sustainable development and management of Fiji’s forest to realize the full potential of the forest sector through support to reducing deforestation and forest degradation, promoting sustainable forest management, conservation, and afforestation and reforestation to contribute to climate mitigation while meeting the demands of timber and non-timber forest products and maintaining and enhancing ecosystem services.

Customary land tenure in Fiji is based on a variety of legal instruments and as per the SESA the two relevant instruments are the Native Lands Act of 1905 and iTaukei Land Trust Act of 1940. The key difference between iTaukei land and other land types is its inalienability. iTaukei land cannot be sold, transferred, mortgaged or otherwise encumbered. Land under this category can be leased long term for a maximum of 99 years for commercial purposes. From the NLTB there are 5,746 land owning units in the ER-P Provinces and 31,8820 leases on record for all of the ER-P. However, not

all landowning units have lands that are currently leased and in some of the more remote interior villages of the ER-P Provinces no land is leased. Similarly, agriculture leases have maximum tenure of 50 years. Crown land also cannot be bought or sold. An important issue for iTaukei land, a portion of each area is set aside for a village site where the community builds its houses. The remainder is reserve land that can be developed by the community or can be made available to others through leasing arrangements. Part of land available to villages may not be usable and in some villages the best land may have been leased to a range of ventures from resorts to large commercial farms as well as non-iTaukei smallholders.

Customary rights are legal land rights and are inconsistently treated under current leasing arrangements. Evidence suggests that legal land rights borne out of the customary property register are treated with different value considerations within the legal framework of the leasing regime in Fiji. Currently, customary landowning units' revenue is capped by legislative sanction to avail land resources at no more than 6% of the unimproved capital value in all agricultural leases. This valuation methodology not only undermines the operation of market forces in a situation of willing seller-willing buyer consensus, but is fundamentally flawed. Further, its operationalisation, by implication, perpetuates inequality as other land typologies are priced comparatively higher. iTaukei land ownership is very strongly held and both enshrined in law and custom. Possibility that rationale and reasonable land use policies, plans and restrictions of Government will be ignored by land owners. Reservation of ownership to standing forest and products is implicit in all TLTB leases. Herein, forest base carbon credits as a product, are clarified by association to standing trees. Thus, the valuation of all losses should be undertaken in line with OP4.12.

The Agricultural Landlord and Tenant Act (ALTA) governs all agricultural leases of more than 1 ha and the relations between landlords and agricultural tenants. Minimum 30-year and maximum 99-year leases are allowed with no right of renewal. In practice, most leases are for 30 years. In the event of non-renewal, the tenant must vacate the land after a set grace period. The maximum annual rental is 6% of the unimproved capital value. In theory, the rental rate is reviewed every five years. The tenant can claim compensation for all development and improvements of the property with claims determined by the Agricultural Tribunal. Tenants can, however, only be compensated for improvements if the TLTB has granted prior approval to these improvements. In practice, there is a fixed schedule of lease rental rates under the ALTA, which has not been updated since 1997. The TLTB, however, has introduced a lump sum payment to induce landowners to lease their land for an additional 30-year period.

The ALTA was supplemented by the 2009 Land Use Decree No.36 (2010) in recognition that the requirement for tenants to vacate land once the fixed lease and grace period had expired causes both social and economic hardship. Government therefore amended the land laws to increase the flexibility of leases and to facilitate leasing of lands, which are currently idle or unutilized, under terms and conditions intended to be attractive to both the landowners and tenants. The Decree provides for longer tenure leases (up to 99 years) for agricultural and commercial development. Reserve land is not leased but reserved by *Mataqali* or government for future use.

Table 1.1 Comparison of Government of Fiji and World Bank’s Policies Related to Involuntary Resettlement

| WB Requirements on Involuntary Resettlement | Fiji Laws on Land Acquisition/ Resettlement | Gaps | Gap-filling Measures |
|---|---|--|--|
| Avoid and/or minimize involuntary resettlement wherever possible by exploring project and design alternatives. | The Constitution and the State Acquisition of Land Act (SALA) set out the conditions under which land may be compulsory acquired. The property can only be acquired for the public good, and with the payment of reasonable compensation. | No explicit reference to the need for minimizing resettlement impacts by exploring alternatives. | The RPF includes measures on avoiding/ minimizing land acquisition and resettlement impacts. It provides principles on compensation and entitlements. |
| Enhance, or at least restore, the livelihoods of all displaced persons in real terms relative to pre-project levels. Particular attention to be paid to the needs of vulnerable groups among those displaced who may not be protected through national land compensation legislation. | General principles of compensation for land and assets are set out in the Constitution and SALA. | Fiji Laws do not prescribe measures to restore/ improve standard of living. | The RPF and each subproject RP includes measures on compensation at replacement cost for affected land/assets and to minimize and mitigate adverse social and economic impacts. It is recommended for the Government to undertake a social assessment of the impacts, particularly for the poor and vulnerable groups. |
| Screen the project early on to identify past, present, and future involuntary resettlement impacts and risks. Determine the scope of resettlement planning through a survey and/or census of displaced persons, including a gender analysis, specifically related to resettlement impacts and risks. | SALA sets out the process for land investigation which includes identification of affected landowners and their assets. | No specific requirements for census, cutoff date, impact assessment and scoping of resettlement planning. | The RPF includes measures on survey/census, cut-off-date, assessment of impacts and resettlement planning. |
| Carry out meaningful consultations with APs, host communities, and concerned NGOs. Inform all displaced persons of their entitlements and resettlement options. Ensure their participation in planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of resettlement programs. Pay particular attention to the needs of vulnerable groups, especially those below the poverty line, the landless, the elderly, women and children, and Indigenous Peoples, and those without legal title to land, and ensure their participation in consultations. | SALA sets out the process of notification of the land acquisition. | No specific provisions for preparing and implementing LARP based on meaningful consultations with DPs, including the poor, the landless, elderly, women, and other vulnerable groups | The RPF includes measures on consultations with DPs, including vulnerable groups, during preparation and implementation of RPs. The concerns of women will be identified based on gender-disaggregated socioeconomic data, separate discussions on women’s concerns, and ensuring adequate measures and budgetary allocations in the resettlement plan to compensate and resettle them in a manner that does |

| WB Requirements on Involuntary Resettlement | Fiji Laws on Land Acquisition/ Resettlement | Gaps | Gap-filling Measures |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | not disadvantage them. In this effort the assistance of national NGOs currently engaged in women's welfare will be sought; |
| Establish a grievance redress mechanism to receive and facilitate resolution of the affected persons' concerns. Support the social and cultural institutions of displaced persons and their host population. | SALA provides for appeal against a declaration of public purpose for compulsory acquisition and amount of compensation. | No requirements for a project specific grievance redress mechanism. | The RPF includes measures on project-specific grievance redress mechanism. |
| Improve, or at least restore, the livelihoods of all displaced persons through (i) land-based resettlement strategies when affected livelihoods are land based where possible or cash compensation at replacement value for land when the loss of land does not undermine livelihoods, (ii) prompt replacement of assets with access to assets of equal or higher value, (iii) prompt compensation at full replacement cost for assets that cannot be restored, and (iv) additional revenues and services through benefit sharing schemes where possible. | SALA sets out the process that any person who claims to be entitled to an interest in compulsory acquired land may make a claim for compensation (within 3 months). SALA also sets out the requirements for payment and the provisions for assessing compensation. | No specific requirement for land-based resettlement, replacement of assets, compensation at replacement cost, and benefit sharing. | The RPF includes measures of on-site relocation, replacement of affected structures, compensation at replacement cost and priority of project employment to DPs. |
| Provide physically and economically displaced persons with needed assistance, including the following: (i) if there is relocation, secured tenure to relocation land, better housing at resettlement sites with comparable access to employment and production opportunities, integration of resettled persons economically and socially into their host communities, and extension of project benefits to host communities; (ii) transitional support and development assistance, such as land development, credit facilities, training, or employment opportunities; and (iii) civic infrastructure and community services, as required. | No equivalent provision. | FIJI laws have no specific provisions on relocation, transitional support and civic infrastructure and services. | The RPF includes measures on-site relocation of affected structures, transitional allowances and restoration of civic infrastructure. |

| WB Requirements on Involuntary Resettlement | Fiji Laws on Land Acquisition/ Resettlement | Gaps | Gap-filling Measures |
|---|---|---|---|
| Develop procedures in a transparent, consistent, and equitable manner if land acquisition is through negotiated settlement to ensure that those people who enter into negotiated settlements will maintain the same or better income and livelihood status. | DOL has Procedures for Land Acquisition through negotiated settlement or purchase. | No provision of maintaining the same or better income and livelihood status for APs. | The RPF describes measures on maintaining or improving livelihoods of APs through paying compensation at replacement cost and other assistance. |
| Ensure that displaced persons without titles to land or any recognizable legal rights to land are eligible for resettlement assistance and compensation for loss of non-land assets | Customary rights for Fijian people/ Indigenous People stipulate that individuals without formal title are also protected. | There is nothing in the FIJI Laws to address the issue of displaced persons without land title or legal land rights. | The entitlement matrix for the project provides for resettlement assistance and compensation for non-land assets to non-titled DPs as well. |
| Prepare a resettlement plan elaborating on displaced persons' entitlements, the income and livelihood restoration strategy, institutional arrangements, monitoring and reporting framework, budget, and time-bound implementation schedule. | | FIJI Laws have no provision of preparing LARP. | The RPF includes measures on preparation of RPs for subprojects involving land acquisition/resettlement impacts. |
| Disclose a draft resettlement plan, including documentation of the consultation process in a timely manner, before project appraisal, in an accessible place and a form and language(s) understandable to affected persons and other stakeholders. Disclose the final resettlement plan and its updates to affected persons and other stakeholders. | SALA sets procedures in notification of landowners at different stages of land acquisition steps. | No requirements on disclosure of an LARP. | The RPF includes disclosure measures, including posting of documents on website as well as providing information to DPs. |
| Conceive and execute involuntary resettlement as part of a development project or program. Include the full costs of resettlement in the presentation of project's costs and benefits. For a project with significant involuntary resettlement impacts, consider implementing the involuntary resettlement component of the project as a stand-alone operation. | No explicit provision | | Land acquisition/resettlement costs will be included and financed out of the project cost. |
| Pay compensation and provide other resettlement entitlements before physical or economic displacement. Implement the resettlement plan under close supervision throughout project implementation. | SALA sets timing for payment of compensation. | SALA states within 30 days of notification, but does not specifically state before displacement. DOL Procedure provides for 75% | The RPF includes measures on full payment of compensation for affected assets before start of civil works on affected land. |

| WB Requirements on Involuntary Resettlement | Fiji Laws on Land Acquisition/ Resettlement | Gaps | Gap-filling Measures |
|---|--|---|---|
| | | before construction and 25% after construction. | |
| Monitor and assess resettlement outcomes, their impacts on the standards of living of displaced persons, and whether the objectives of the resettlement plan have been achieved by taking into account the baseline conditions and the results of resettlement monitoring. Disclose monitoring reports. | No equivalent provision | | The RPF includes monitoring measures, including requirements of semi-annual safeguard monitoring report. Arrangements for monitoring of resettlement activities will be done by implementing agency, supplemented by independent consultant if sub-project is considered high risk. |

In terms of major gaps, the Fiji State and Land Acquisition of Lands Act (SALA) and its regulations do not require compensation payments to affected persons who have no recognized legal right or interest in the land, and only require compensation on a depreciated/book value basis for structures. Informal sharecroppers and squatters (non-titled) are, therefore, not entitled to any kind of compensation for the land they use. However, to comply fully with WB resettlement requirements, any non-titled people affected by the Project at the time of the land survey to determine the cut-off date for eligibility for compensation and rehabilitation assistance will be entitled to compensation for loss of structures, crops, trees, or incomes they derive from land, regardless of whether they have formal title to the land or not. And, all compensation including for structures will be at replacement cost without any deduction of depreciation.

The SALA does not provide relocation sites (in the case of resettlement) and there is no provision for assistance for the rehabilitation of adversely affected people. However, the project seeks to avoid resettlement where possible and otherwise minimize through alternative project designs. In case resettlement cannot be avoided, mitigation measures to restore livelihoods and standards of DPs/APs to pre-project levels are described in the LARF, including how resettlement should be conceived and executed with the need for APs/ DPs to be meaningfully consulted and involved in the planning and implementation of any sub-project resettlement plan.

GoF law does not provide for any special assistance for vulnerable groups or the poorest section of those adversely affected, but it does not prevent Government from providing assistance to adversely project affected people including vulnerable groups. The RPF includes provisions to ensure that affected people particularly vulnerable and disadvantaged people are assisted to improve their living standards.

The recognition of customary land is in the process of leading to a robust legal mechanism to facilitate the distribution of benefits from leasing or exploitation of land resources. The five types of benefit sharing models - iTaukei Land Trust Board, Land Bank, Charitable Trust, Private Trust

Deeds and Company models with legal frameworks and operational in the country have been analysed. A summary of the comparison of existing BSM frameworks, their relevance to REDD+ framework, and their advantages and disadvantages are discussed in Annex 15.1 of the ER-PD. The Benefit Sharing Mechanism (BSM) of the ER-P is being designed embracing the principles of the existing BSM between TLTB, iTaukei customary landowners and emerging mechanism such as the Land Bank. A key point of departure from existing BSM is the performance-based payment system of the ER-P as opposed to lease benefits currently distributed by TLTB and Land Bank. The BSM of the ER-P includes sharing of monetary and non-monetary benefits. The program performance in generating emission reductions assessed through independent verification forms the basis for monetary benefits from the program. The ER-P is also expected to generate several types of non-monetary benefits. Some examples of the non-monetary benefits include:

- Improvements to community forestry and sustainable forest management including planting native species, adopting longer harvest cycles, restoring ecosystems, and promoting agroforestry and alternative livelihoods;
- Improvements to agricultural crop productivity and diversification to reduce the risk of deforestation; and
- Improvements in the quality of NTFPs to reduce the risk of forest degradation.

Direct beneficiaries of monetary and non-monetary benefits include landowners and tenant farmers, freehold landowners, government, statutory and civil societies, research and academic institutions and private sector. Indirect beneficiaries include communities living in the ER program accounting area and markets that receive products resulting from climate smart agriculture.

1.3 Program Impacts

A full social impact assessment has been carried out during program preparation under the responsibility of the MoF through the development of a strategic environmental and social assessment (SESA). Two teams of independent national and international consultants have assessed the positive and negative social impacts of the main components of the project. The purpose of the social assessment was to address the World Bank's social safeguard policies and other social and gender development issues and to recommend related improvements in the program design. The social assessments have identified local people, both the indigenous iTaukei and non-indigenous Fijian-Indian people, including vulnerable groups, who live in the upland and mountainous forested areas and the lower altitude and coastal areas of the twenty ER-P Provinces. It has been confirmed that some minor land acquisition activities might occur, there are likely to be restricted access to both forest and NTFPs, there could be issues if there are changes to existing leases held by the non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian leaseholders including possible foreclosure, and issues associated with carbon title and carbon benefits for iTaukei women customary landowners. The detailed impacts are presented in Table 1.2 of the RPF.

The PF has been prepared with how affected communities or if not all of the community affected households deal with ER-P impacts. For instance, and this is a central issue, if 60% of households in a community agree to restrictions on access to and use of forests which under existing law is considered binding on the other 40% who do not agree this 60% will be required to seek out measures that will satisfy the other 40%. The latter will have recourse via the FGRM to ensure their grievances are heard and resolved to their satisfaction. In such instances a significant higher level of

agreement based on the broadest possible FPIC principles will need to be reached. However, where individual households are adversely affected – losing more than 10% of their livelihood income or its equivalent – they will need to be fully compensated in accordance with the RPF and the RP prepared for that specific project.

Some of the possible social impacts include:

Restriction of Access: The activities for strengthening and implementing policies controlling conversion of natural forests and forest governance and law enforcement may have the potential for reduced access to forest and NTFP resources for forest dependent communities through improvements to forest governance; possible short term reduction in volume of NTFPs collected may result in some food insecurity or less income for NTFPs that are sold; some possible impacts on livelihoods i.e. improved governance may not include unfettered or continued access to all forest areas. OP4.12 is triggered and a Process Framework is prepared to mitigate any potential access restrictions.

Land Tenure Insecurity: ER-P conservation and reforestation interventions are most unlikely to lead to land tenure insecurity among the iTaukei because they own the customary land. However, non-indigenous iTaukei leasing land could be subject to changes of leases or foreclosures on their leases if these interventions result in a change in land use practices.

Livelihoods and Forest Dependency: Food security is becoming increasingly problematic for poorer indigenous iTaukei households. There is also a high degree of cash income poverty among such households. Their livelihoods are highly land/sea resource-dependent, which is exacerbated by limited access to forest land resources (this can include mangroves). There is no system of compensation payable for restricting people's access to forest land resources. Firewood from the forests (including mangroves) is still a major source of fuel for both indigenous and non-indigenous people in the ER-P villages. OP 4.10 is triggered and this PF explains how such impacts are mitigated.

Cultural Heritage: ER-P activities proposed in the ER-P could indirectly affect areas containing sites with physical cultural resources. Many of the iTaukei people often have close connection with forest areas, including spiritual connections, and it is possible that in isolated cases REDD+ activities could interfere with villager defined sacred forest sites. OP4.11 is triggered and mitigation measure are in place to address impacts.

Effective Consultation and Outreach: lack of meaningful consultation and outreach could seriously impact negatively on the active participation of at least poorer and more vulnerable indigenous iTaukei in ER-P implementation, and monitoring. There is no legal provision for BDC/FPIC with adequate numbers of local people for this ER-P. REDD is a high risk program and people are worried that any payments based on results may or not be paid and are therefore difficult to convince that participation in the ER-P is worthwhile. There has been a lack of "clarity" and while the CSOs do include indigenous iTaukei persons because they are largely managed by the iTaukei the same does not apply to the non-indigenous iTaukei who by-and-large are not represented in REDD+ based activities. OP4.10 is triggered and the PF explains how such impacts are mitigated.

Gender/Social Exclusion: ER-P activities implementation could impact negatively on women in terms of: access to NTFP, access to and use of land, participation in ER-P implementation, and lack of consultations. Women are disadvantaged on access to and use of forest land and their land rights are less secure than those of men's; iTaukei women because patrilocality and non-iTaukei women because generally their names are not included on either land leases or freehold property titles. They also have a greater reliance on common property resources than men, especially related to

forests. Their access to information is less than men's and are less likely to be actively involved in consultations. Poor persons irrespective of gender or ethnicity are less likely to receive adequate information. OP 4.10 is triggered and the GAP and this PF reflect measures consistent with this safeguard.

2 Restrictions on Resource Use

2.1 *Restrictions on Resource Use*

There can be no restrictions on resource use until the SERNA has been undertaken and it has been established that there is broad community support for the establishment of the local management entity based on the collaborative principles embedded in the YMST. As part of the establishment of the establishment of this local management entity a BSM consistent with the ER-P will become the lynchpin of the entity and BSPs will be prepared based on the BSM. Activities that result in restricted access to natural resources are covered in Section 3 of this RPF, complaints and grievances in Section 5.3 of the RPF and activities that impact upon the non-indigenous Fijian-Indian ethnic minority will be consistent with the policies of OP4.10. The steps involved are spelt out in more detail in the PF.

2.2 *Potential Relocation*

Efforts will need to be made to avoid resettlement wherever possible, and local people are allowed to remain inside the protected areas (forest reserves or nature reserves) if in fact there are living inside such protected areas unless they themselves decide to leave. The ER-P does not fund any relocation and relocation and this should only be supported in extreme circumstances. If there are local people living in the protected areas, they are likely to be the indigenous iTaukei people and to mitigate any negative impacts that would require potential relocation then the process would need to follow both OP4.10 and OP4.12. It needs to be noted that at this juncture it is unknown just how many households reside inside protected areas, but based on local knowledge there are not too many households living in these protected areas because the indigenous iTaukei people (i.e. the land owners) would have provided their consent in the first instance to the MoF establishing the reserves and would more than likely had access to sufficient forest land even after allowing for the alienation of such forest land for this purpose. However, as a precautionary principle given that iTaukei land could be alienated with only 60% of customary landowners needing to agree to a change in land use etc. there may have been poorer and more vulnerable households who were more negatively impacted than other households. The actual circumstances can only be fully understood as a result of the SERNA, which requires the active participation of all village households who agree to participate including and especially poorer and more vulnerable households and those headed by women. However, if it is agreed that physical or economic displacement is necessary then a Social Screening Report (SSR) is necessary. Thus, the SERNA is quite different to the SSR: the latter is only undertaken if OP4.12 is likely to be triggered for a specific project whereas the former is required in all villages as per the ER-P.

Step 1: Applying to the Emissions Reduction Program

- 1.1. The SERNA that forms the basis of an application to the ER-P must fulfill the social criteria of the project. These criteria are:
 - a) Information in the SERNA on current uses of natural resources in the land-owning unit whether it be customary land that has not been alienated or customary land that has been

alienated for forest protection purposes or nature reserves, customary land that has been leased out, and freehold land where relevant will be derived from consultation with the local communities whose lives are affected by the different land-owning units;

- b) The SERNA will be reviewed and revised with direct input from these local communities and their representatives; and
- c) For any activities that restrict local communities' access to resources that are integral to their cultural practices or that they rely on for their subsistence, management authorities via the management entities that are designed to be the outcome of the SERNA will collaborate to reach any necessary agreement but as part of this collaborative negotiated agreement on restricted access to natural resources those affected households that will be negatively affected by these restrictions are entitled to be compensated for such impacts.

A BSP including a natural resource use agreement will need to be developed prior to applying for funding through the ER-P or can be part of the program activities if the SERNA identifies that as a priority need.

A Social Screening Report is completed and submitted with the grant proposal by the management authority. A standard format is provided in Annex 1. The leaders of the relevant land-owning units (such as the *Turaga Ni Koro* with the consent of all *Tokatoka*) and the Forest Wardens are all required to endorse the social information of the assessment. However, based on the SESA investigations most of these leaders and the Forest Wardens lack the capacity to assess such information and a CSO or NGO familiar with local land-owning units and villages will more than likely be required to assist with this endorsement.

- 1.2. The needs for restrictions on local resource use will be identified by the management entity and identified as accurately as possible. They will be limited to those types of restrictions identified in the initial SERNA or subsequent updates approved by the ER-P. The SERNA provides the technical justification for each of these proposed restrictions with a reasonable degree of detail.

Forest Wardens, especially because they will be in collaboration with local villagers and other stakeholders impacted upon by the ER-PD will pay particular attention to land tenure issues, including traditional land rights and obligations and use of natural resources by local villages. Specifically, NTFP collection and shifting cultivation, whereby land officially classified as "forest land" or "unused land" could in fact be kept fallow under the traditional farming system practiced by farming households, will not be prohibited unless this is necessary for the conservation of important biodiversity. If they are to be restricted those that do not benefit from such restrictions are entitled to be compensated for restricted access. Likewise, access to sacred sites (to include watershed protection forests, sacred forests and burial forests), if any, will not be restricted under any circumstances.

Step 2: Launching participatory activities

- 2.1. When a BSM or a form of natural resource use agreement already exists, participatory activities are undertaken to implement and monitor this agreement. When no such Natural Resource Use Agreement exists yet, consultations and negotiations are undertaken to reach

such an agreement. These activities must start no later than 6 months after the ER-P application has been declared successful.

- 2.2. Whether a BSM or a form of natural resource use agreement already exists or not, a baseline survey must be undertaken to identify people who reside within areas of improved management and who are affected by them. This survey is to be completed no later than 12 months after the application has been declared successful. The objective of this exercise is to identify the differential impacts on the restrictions on local people, and to be able to monitor its implementation.

Step 3a: General implementation

In cases where restrictions of access to natural resource use has been or will be planned by the relevant management authority, the following provisions shall apply:

- 3.1 Activities that require restricted access to natural resources are dealt with in Section 3 of the Resettlement Policy Framework.
- 3.2 Complaints and grievances related to these restrictions that will result in some form of involuntary resettlement action are addressed in accordance with section 5.3 of the Resettlement Policy Framework.

Step 3b: Implementation in Non iTaukei Communities

In cases where ethnic minorities are users of natural resources, defined here as non-iTaukei Indian-Fijians, who are largely less significant forest users in the ER-P but must nevertheless be considered, the additional provisions will apply:

- 3.3 Elected representatives of the affected ethnic groups and communities (but the GAP has identified that women from these ethnic groups should also be included as representatives even if not formally elected) will participate as voting members of the management entity that will be established and will be entitled to also decide if activities likely to lead to involuntary resettlement should be supported or not and as elected representatives they are also required to reflect the consensus reached by village level stakeholders who they represent.
- 3.4 The baseline survey identifies with care the ethnicity, population numbers and location of all ethnic communities in and around the land-owning unit, which is more likely to either Forest Reserve or Nature Reserve land Coastal Mangrove Land or a combination thereof, but may also include Plantation Forest Land. Land use inside the land-owning unit should also be described in relation to customary rights, sacred sites, and specific areas for non-timber forest product and mangrove harvesting.
- 3.5 It is required that improved management initiatives of the management entities do not create risks of reduced food security among either indigenous or ethnic minority communities.
- 3.6 Information and training activities as well as consultation and participatory activities are carried out using the communication guidelines recommended are to be recommended in this PF.

- 3.7 In areas with both the original communities and recent migrants, which are more likely in the lowland ER-P villagers participatory activities aim to ensure that original communities will achieve at least the same level of participation as recent migrants.

Step 4: Monitoring and Dissemination of Lessons Learnt

- 4.1 Supervision is carried out by the ER-P Social Safeguards Specialist in accordance with Section 5.4 of the Resettlement Policy Framework.
- 3.13 Lessons learnt will be disseminated to other management entities that decide to other management entities that join the ER-P at a later date, which is permitted according to the overall design of the ER-P that seeks to include all existing management entities in the Accounting Areas of the twenty ER-P Provinces.

3 Livelihoods Restoration and Development

3.1 *Benefit Sharing Mechanisms*

The overall aim of the restoration and mitigation measures is to compensate for and diversify the livelihoods of the affected persons of the forest resources restriction. The program will support the development of modalities that provide an alternative livelihood opportunity for Program Affected People (PAPs). The process of developing these alternative livelihoods will be participatory and will be underlined by equity and community driven decision-making as per the collaborative processes embedded in the YMST.

In some local management entities, based on SESA investigations, informal local-level agreements exist on what communities can and cannot collect from the protected areas, although this is not encouraged by the current legislation. This provides opportunities to develop improved methods to protect the important biodiversity resources that are the target of the ER-P support, while fostering participation and sustainable resource use instead of prohibiting traditional forest uses that local forest-dependent communities have relied upon in the past and still to varying degrees still rely on.

Since the fund will provide grants of a limited amount (final amount yet to be agreed upon and subject to agreement with the Carbon Fund on 10% advance) to individual management entities the ER-P will generally not be in a position to fund large scale alternative income generation activities out of these small grants, although via the Benefit Sharing Program (BSP) there is the possibility that forestry-related alternative income generation activities might be funded on a community-wide basis. The Process Framework therefore focuses on alternative mitigation means that must utilize the provisions of OP4.12 as incorporated in the ER-P RPF.

The primary mitigation measure will derive from a formal Benefit Sharing Mechanism (effectively a Natural Resource Use Agreement based on the SERNA) relating to permissible levels of natural resource use within the existing management entities. These agreements are a minimum requirement under the Process Framework. If an agreement on acceptable levels of resource use cannot be reached by year 3 (i.e. before the benefits from the Carbon Fund through the ERPA become available) of the program in these management entities supported by ER-P restrictions will not be supported by the program and a Resettlement Plan will have to be prepared by ER-P for a households that are affected by involuntary resettlement impacts, whether restrictions on access to NTFPs in existing management entities or other impacts such as extending the production cycle of commercially harvested tree species in order to compensate for the loss of access to resources. No compensation is payable to existing management entities, but only villagers who are facing restrictions on the harvesting of NTFPs agreed upon by the existing management entities of which villagers who use the forests are directly represented.

Restrictions on resource use will not be enforced prior to the finalization of Benefit Sharing Mechanisms (including a Natural Resource Use agreement relating to use of forest resources based on the SERNA). But they can only be enforced based on the agreement reached via the existing management entity. It needs to be noted that all villagers have the option of neither participating in the SERNA and the YSMT. However, this non-participation will impact upon any carbon benefits payable based on quantifiable restrictions in carbon emissions.

The benefit-sharing arrangements of the ER program build on customary land ownership of the indigenous people (the iTauaki) that have ownership to most of the forestland and coastal

mangrove land, although not the actual foreshore, is recognized by the Government of Fiji. In designing the benefit-sharing arrangements of the ER program, existing institutional, legal and operational aspects of benefit-sharing and priorities for ER program benefit-sharing have been considered.

There are five types of benefit sharing models that exist in the country. All are institutionalised with strong legal frameworks, functional institutional support ensuring efficient delivery of each mechanism. A study on benefit sharing is under way and is assessing the five existing mechanisms outlined below. Through wide stakeholder consultation, it will make recommendations on the most appropriate mechanism relevant for Fiji. A summary of the comparison between existing BSM frameworks in Fiji focusing on its relevance to REDD+ framework, advantages and disadvantages is outlined in the Annexes 1-15 of the ER-PD.

The iTaueki Lands Trust Board (the Board) Model: The TLTB is responsible to protect and manage land ownership rights assigned to iTaueki landowners and to facilitate the commercial transactions that revolve around its use through a process of leasing and licenses. Under the iTaueki Lands Trust Act, the control of iTaueki land is vested in the Board and administered by the Board for the benefit of the iTaueki owners. TLTB collects the premiums, lease rentals and other fees derived from land resource transactions. Lease rental money is distributed according to the provisions of section 14 of the TLTA and the iTaueki Land Trust (Leases and Licenses) (Amendment) Regulations 2010. All benefit payments to TLTB are expressly stated in the terms and conditions of the lease agreement, clearly stating the amount to be paid. Usually, lessees are expected to make two payments in a financial year. These are received and distributed to the landowning units by TLTB. Upon receipt of rental payments and after deduction of poundage on leases (administration fee), TLTB is legally mandated to remit the payments to all individual members' bank accounts (above 18 years) in equal parts. The register of all living members from the record of the VKB (register of all living members), housed at the offices of the iTaueki Lands and Fisheries Commission, is cross-referenced to ensure currency of members. Member deaths and births are recorded through periodic updates.

The Land Bank: The Land Use Decree offered iTaueki owners the option to have their lands administered by government through a system commonly referred to as the Land Bank. Despite the provisions of the Land Use Decree, the iTaueki lands that remain in the control of the TLTB continue to be administered under the provisions of the TLTA. Under this model land-owning units (LOUs) are required to elect up to five qualifying members who, after approval by the Prime Minister, are to act as trustees for their respective LOU. Trustees receive lease rental payments and are then responsible for their distribution according to specifications as articulated in the deed of trust. Unlike the TLTB model, the Land Bank Model distributes 100% payment of lease rentals to the LOUs. The state guarantees the payment and the methodology of the distribution of lease monies amongst members of the LOUs.

Charitable trusts: The Charitable Trusts Act makes particular provision for charities. Significantly, it also makes provision for the incorporation of charitable trusts. For the operation of the system, it is important that a charitable purpose is being fulfilled by the trust. In addition to the four traditional purposes of charity – relief of poverty, advancement of education, advancement of religion, and other similar purposes of a public nature; the Act provides for the application of the Act to other purposes declared charitable by the Attorney-General. Many attempts have been made to make this trust operational, but none has been for environmental purposes, although international practice has, in many cases, extended charity to cover environmental purposes. In the case of its use for REDD+ benefit distribution purposes, Attorney-General should accede to a request to declare an environmentally oriented trust charitable.

Companies benefit sharing mechanism: A company limited by guarantee is incorporated under the Companies Act 2015 and may provide a suitable option for non-profit organization. Instead of shareholders (company limited by shares), there are members who agree to subscribe a certain (typically nominal) amount in the event of the company being wound up. Registering a company limited by guarantee provides an alternative company registration process and, once registered; the company can apply to FRCA for not-for-profit-status, giving it the same tax exemptions as would normally be associated with a charitable trust.

Benefit-sharing mechanisms – incorporation as a co-operative: The Co-operatives Act 1996 provides that a co-operative is an association of persons who have voluntarily joined together to achieve a common end through the formation of a democratically controlled organization which makes equitable contributions to the capital required and accepting a fair share of the risks and benefits of the undertaking. Members of the co-operative actively participate in the running of the co-operative, which is provisionally or fully registered under the Co-operative Act. A co-operative aim at promoting the economic and social interests of its members by providing effective services that the members need and can make use of. The Co-operative may function as a primary or secondary cooperative, apex organization or the National Co-operative Federation registered according to the provisions of the Act. Often, the main purpose of a co-operative is to maximize profit, ensure inclusivity and to ensure long-term sustenance of business operations. The co-operative must operate according to sound business principles. A registered co-operative is also a body corporate and, once registered, it may apply for a tax holiday for up to eight years. Co-operatives have by-laws or internal regulations and must hold an annual general meeting once every financial year. It is run by a board of directors, and delivers a dividend and bonus, being a share of the surplus.

The TLTB model is the most commonly applied in Fiji with clearly acknowledged laws and regulations that have stood the test of time and well-known processes, benefits and challenges. Cooperatives have also been applied across sectors and common in rural areas in support of small enterprises that are collectively pursued. The least applied are the Charitable Fund and creation of Companies. The Land Bank model and Trust Deed model have recently gained popularity as land owners continue to assess benefits from registering their land under the initiative.

A fundamental requirement of both TLTB and Land Bank model is the requirement for collective discussion and consensus of no less than 60 percent of the registered landowning units to agree to all transactions pertaining to iTaukei Lands. Consensus gathering adopts the FPIC process which involves a mix of community and Mataqali consultation. Mataqali member in the village and urban areas are approached either collectively or individually to discuss and gain consensus to move ahead with land development. However, this poses problems for the FPIC processes acceptable to the WB and will need to be modified to take into account what is an acceptable FPIC for the WB.

A Benefit Sharing Mechanism for the ER-P is being designed that will address specific REDD+ issues rather than simply being a facsimile of the existing BSM that is widely used in Fiji even though it will embrace the principles of the existing BSM between TLTB, iTaukei customary landowners and emerging mechanisms such as the Land Bank. Perhaps key points of departure from existing BSM practices is associated with the performance-based payment system of the ER-P as opposed to lease benefits that are distributed by TLTB where all lease holders irrespective of status are paid on an equal basis. However, existing lease payments are based on the lease of the terms and not results thereby the modalities are dissimilar.

3.2 *Participatory Process*

The program is totally contingent upon the systemic development of participatory approaches to natural resource management. This includes, but is not limited to, permissible levels of resource use. The Process Framework ensures that such a participatory approach is fostered under the program by setting up a set of steps and conditions that apply to each existing management entity taking part in the project and to villages either contiguous with these management entities and/or are systematically accessing forested areas to harvest NTFPs or who are physically residing in boundaries (however imprecise) delimited during the establishment of these management entities.

This will be done through the YMST approach with establishment of joint management entities following the participatory processes associated with the SERNA. As such, the affected community members with access restriction will be supported to mobilize themselves in order to identify viable livelihoods activities in a participatory manner. The approach will help to ensure that there is equity in the process and that all affected users including vulnerable groups, such as women, elderly and the poor, have the opportunity to become involved in and benefit from alternative livelihoods assistance being provided by the project.

All communities, irrespective of their ethnicity, will be fully engaged and their participation promoted to define alternative livelihoods that are culturally appropriate and economically and environmentally sustainable. The project will consider their agreements reached with the participation of their local leaders supporting the preparation of appropriated material for project communication. However, to reiterate the point where restrictions on access to forest resources or extending the production cycle of commercial tree species are involved those APs must be compensated for loss of access to and use via the provisions of the RPF. If in the event they choose to decline compensation, perhaps because they think that ER-P components such as those associated with climate-smart agriculture might benefit them then this must be clearly documented. It would be unacceptable to simply state that such APs have agreed in principle without documentary evidence in the public domain. Moreover, if these APs realize at a later date that the restrictions have had a negative impact on their livelihoods the ER-P will be required to compensate them according to the RPF.

3.3 *Other Alternative Livelihoods*

The ER-P has proposed the livelihood activities under Component 2. Promotion of climate smart agriculture and sustainable livelihoods for forest dependent people. Based on the empirical evidence from the SESA the ER-P will target a yet to be determined number of households in each management entity (although this will also vary on the size of the management bearing in mind that in some of the ER-P villages, especially in lowland areas there are a significantly greater number of households than in upland and mountainous areas) who during the SERNA have been identified as being responsible to a larger extent for deforestation and degradation activities than other forest-dependent households and who will be identified for initial support (it needs to be remembered that despite the fact that most of the targeted villages will be indigenous iTaukei villages individual *Tokatoka* that are patrilineal groups smaller than the *Mataqali* do use land that other *Tokatoka* cannot use by common agreement and the SESA has confirmed there are some *Tokatoka* that are responsible for greater levels of deforestation and degradation than others for a variety of reasons including greater levels of poverty). The restrictions that will be applied by agreement with the affected households will be mitigated via this component.

The interventions under this component will focus on the adoption of improved agricultural practices and diversification livelihoods of forest dependent people. These two sub-components

will address the key agricultural drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and support the adoption of climate-smart and deforestation free agricultural practices in those villages, especially those that are responding to significantly increased market demand for high value crops such as kava or where there has been the conversion of hitherto forest land into agricultural cropping land in the ER-P provinces. It includes the promotion of climate-smart agricultural practices on a yet to be quantified area of agricultural land through improved extension services and training of households in proximity to the deforestation and forest degradation hotspots and strengthening villages and households that agree to engage in deforestation free commodity value chains. There are, for instance, at least 50% of known kava varieties that can be successfully cultivated and for which can realize higher market prices both domestically and internationally in the ER-P Accounting Area but they require a higher degree of crop husbandry than is currently evident.

Climate Smart Agricultural (CSA) interventions, such as the need to address the presently non-climate smart activities of primarily smallholder farming households that are cultivating kava, cassava, banana, coconut and more recently ginger. Cassava and taro are crops that are cultivated for household use. Banana and coconut, especially the latter are grown because significant value can be added to take advantage of a rejection of “synthetic” beauty products for the international market. But it is the kava and to an increasing extent ginger cultivation that meets both domestic and international demand. In terms of deforestation and degradation, the production data from the Ministry of Agriculture in 2017 indicates that the high levels of semi-commercial cultivation of kava (but also taro, and cassava cultivation and more recently ginger) are leading to encroachment into the native forests, as confirmed by the deforestation and forest degradation community consultation sites in Naitasiri and Ra provinces. Small patches of forest are cleared and planted with kava (as it requires shade in its first three years of growth), after which the kava is thinned and a greater patch of forest cleared to expose it to direct sunlight. Kava is followed by taro and cassava. By the time these crops are harvested, the soil is depleted of its fertility, causing farmers to continue to seek new farmlands in the native forests.

The informants from Rewasau and Nabukelevu stressed that newly cleared forest is the best location for new kava crop. While kava has a production cycle of three to five years depending on the variety, high market demand is driving local farmers to plant the varieties with a shorter life cycle. However, it is possible to plant one or more of the thirteen varieties of kava currently cultivated in the ER-P Accounting Area and thereby avoid or significantly reduce deforestation and degradation. It has been demonstrated that the varieties with the highest market-value are actually planted in shaded areas under the forest canopy using inter-cropping with crops such as dalo (taro), which is also an important food crop for iTaukei households. This coupled with better propagation and planting techniques, weed, pest and disease management are what constitutes a very good example of CSA in the context of the ER-P.

The participatory SERNA will identify the most vulnerable and forest dependent actors that need to be targeted to reduce deforestation and forest degradation. Based on that, a collaborative management activity will be developed. A grant mechanism will support diversifying and sustaining livelihoods for forest dependent people of vulnerable and forest dependent communities. These efforts will be complimented with funds from current government programs targeting poorer communes (see Table 4.7 of the ER-PD) It is anticipated that this can contribute, albeit modestly, to improving the socio-economic conditions of poorer iTaukei villages including and especially poorer households within these villages, while reducing deforestation and forest degradation.

Alternative livelihood and livelihood restoration programs will be developed based on the participatory processes embedded in the YMSTs through the management entities. To appropriately and adequately compensate for households that will be adversely affected by access restrictions, the project will develop alternative livelihoods to mitigate negative impacts on their livelihoods. However, successful implementation of the program in a long-run relies heavily on the cooperation with local communities and existing forest management entities. Measures to develop alternative community and individual livelihoods will be identified with the participation of the affected communities, which will focus on establishing alternative livelihood and livelihood restoration activities that are environmentally sustainable and culturally appropriate. However, once more if there are impacts that result in a loss of existing livelihoods or diminished livelihoods the provisions of OP4.12 as per the RFP will apply.

4 Implementation Arrangement

The institutions for forestry are arranged from the national down to Divisional/provincial and district level. At the national level, Ministry of Forestry, as implementing agency will be responsible for the preparation and supervision of ESMF implementation. There is already a national level program implementation unit in place (REDD+ Unit) responsible for implementing readiness activities, including SESA/ESMF. During ER-P implementation, the national REDD+ Unit will coordinate and oversee the safeguards work of the provincial level. Provincial and district levels management units will be set up and they will be responsible for preparing and ensuring the effective implementation of environmental and social safeguard measures (such as EMPs, social assessments/screen and codes of practice) and regularly liaising with local authorities and communities.

The national level REDD+ Unit will coordinate and oversee the safeguards work of the provincial level units. The ER-P will support social assessments and EIA. The social assessment process would ensure consultation and disclosure of activities and investments and would identify any safeguard instruments which would apply. In addition, it would identify activities likely to address those threats and would establish a baseline for monitoring the impacts of activities supported by ER. Since implementation of safeguards is the sole responsibility of REDD+ unit and the provincial units qualified social and environment specialists need to be hired and placed in the provincial units within the ER program areas. These specialists would be responsible for supporting the implementation and monitoring of safeguards. The Specialists will support the development of safeguards documents (RP, ESMP) based on the social assessment/EIA, which will include community consultations. The communities at villages level need to be further consulted during the development of site-specific ER Program activities. Furthermore, the specialists will work in close collaboration with the provincial management units and will collate all monitoring safeguards reports to be fed into the national monitoring system within the national REDD+ Unit. Technical assistance and capacity building on safeguards instruments will be provided to management units at all levels.

The Ministry of Forestry is the lead agency and national REDD+ focal point responsible to coordinate and implement REDD+ activities. The Conservator of Forests approves all REDD+ ER Project proposals and activities after consulting with the REDD+ Steering Committee.

The REDD+ Steering Committee provides the administrative oversight for REDD+ activities, including the ER Program. Members of the REDD+ Steering Committee at the national level include:

- **The Ministry of Economy** is the national focal point for UNFCCC and lead negotiator in international climate change meetings and coordinates with the Ministry of Forestry in representing Fiji's REDD+ agenda at international meetings.
- **The Ministry of iTaukei Affairs** is responsible for developing and promoting policies to ensure good governance and welfare of the *iTaukei*. This Ministry strives to ensure that the rights and interests of the iTaukei are safeguarded in the REDD+ process.

- **The iTaukei Land Trust Board** is the custodian of iTaukei land in the country. Almost 90% of land in Fiji is customary owned. The Board provides guidance on the use of iTaukei land and represents the interests of iTaukei landowners.
- **The Ministry of Local Government, Housing and Environment (Department of Environment)** is the national focal point for the Convention on Biological Diversity. This is the lead agency in ensuring biodiversity is protected and monitored at the national level.
- **The Ministry of Lands and Mineral Resources** looks after State land including mangroves. This Department hosts the Land Bank where landowners can “deposit” their land to be invested on their behalf. The Ministry provides guidance on the use of State land and on land deposited in the Land Bank. The Ministry is also responsible for regulating the exploration and development of Fiji’s mineral, petroleum and other related non-living resources of the country.
- **The Ministry of Agriculture** is the lead agency for the agricultural sector and is the national focal point for UNCCD. The department guides the development and implementation of agriculture policies and incentives to support REDD+ strategies. Given that agriculture is the main cause for deforestation in Fiji, the department plays an important role in addressing this issue.
- **The Ministry of Rural and Maritime Development, Natural Disaster and Meteorological Services** is responsible for administering government activities at the rural, provincial level. The Provincial Administrators (PA) are close to the ground and support coordination and monitoring of REDD+ pilot site activities. The office of the PA reports directly to the Commissioner in each subregion (Commissioner Northern, Central and Eastern Divisions).
- **The Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation** is responsible for providing support to the establishment of Women’s Groups in local communities, assisting in the identification of women living in poverty, and coordination with other ministries and agencies to ensure that as the Focal Point for the National Gender Policy gender issues are addressed in all programs.
- **The Ministry of Youth and Sports** ensures the representation of youth interests and coordinates the country’s largest network of youth groups in rural and urban areas.
- **Representatives of Non-Governmental Organizations** carrying out REDD+ activities contribute to the development of national-scale M&E, provide inputs to guidelines on safeguards, ensure compliance of national procedures, exchange of experience and lessons learned, facilitate community engagement, ensure good governance and transparency and represent the interests of various social groups. The NGOs in the committee are Conservation International and Live and Learn Environmental Education.
- **Private Forestry Sector (timber industry)** plays an important role in reducing forest degradation and in the implementation of the Fiji Harvesting Code of Practice.
- **Fiji Pine Limited** is a public enterprise and one of the largest plantation industries in Fiji. The company will support and identify opportunities for REDD+ activities pertaining to plantations.

- **Fiji Hardwood Corporation Limited** owns majority of the mahogany plantations in Fiji. The company will support and identify opportunities for REDD+ activities pertaining to plantations.
- **REDD+ iTaukei Resource Owner Representatives** ensure that landowner rights and interests are addressed as most of Fiji's forests are owned by indigenous communities.

Divisional Oversight

The program will be under the management of the Ministry of Forestry through direct oversight of the REDD+ Unit. The REDD+ Unit will oversee the ER Program implementation. The REDD+ Unit is a part of the Management Services Division (see Section 9.2) or the ER-PD.

The unit is supported at sub-regional level by REDD+ Divisional Working Groups. Members of the REDD+ Divisional Working Group consist of:

- **Chair Person:** Commissioner – designated officer responsible for oversight of public and private interventions across administrative boundary of North, Central/Eastern and Western Divisions.
- **Members:**
 1. Senior Administrators of all Government Agencies, private entities and participating NGOs of the REDD+ SC through their offices at Divisional level.
 2. Conservation Officers at Provincial Council Offices
 3. Forest Wardens from the village
 4. Representatives of Land Care Groups such as relevant Commodity Clusters (kava, taro, livestock and others)
 5. Representatives of Forest Care Groups

A schematic representation of the hierarchy of relationships between the national, divisional, district and village level administration are presented in Figure 6-1; Governance and Implementation Arrangements of ER Program activities at different levels are presented in Figure 6-2 in the ER-PD.

Site Level Implementation

At the site level, the Forestry Beat Officer will be assisted by the Forest Warden (FW) to lead site-level implementation of activities and will be supported by the Agriculture Extension Officers. Community monitoring will be led by the Provincial Council Chief Executive Officer or *Roko Tui* and/or Conservation Officer.

The FW will be the point of contact at the village level and will work closely with the *Yaubula Management Support Teams (YMST)* as well as other voluntary community groups such as the Forest Care Group, Land Care Groups, the Commodity Cluster Groups, and Women's Groups.

The FW will be required to report on (a) the progress of implementation of ER-P activities at site level, (b) landowner grievances and issues that require immediate intervention and redress; (c) on opportunities that may arise to strengthen ER-P national position, and (d) advice on options for efficient and effective implementation and delivery of ER products and services with the widest

coverage and greatest impact. Reports are submitted monthly to the District Divisional Forest Officer who will collate and present to the REDD+ Divisional Working Group.

Implementation of Benefit Sharing Plan and Relevant Safeguard Plan

Successful implementation of the benefit sharing plan will depend solid assessment of existing mechanisms and the development of strong legal frameworks with clear definitions of carbon rights and ownership. It is anticipated that carbon rights, once defined will be enshrined in a policy and linked to strong legislative framework that would support and guide implementation of safeguards. At present a safeguards committee at the provincial or district level does not exist and this or similar will need to be developed prior to the ERPA being signed.

The Process Framework starts when the management authorities of the existing management entities and/or their partners (within the YMST structure this will also include members of local forest-dependent communities) prepare to apply for funding from ER-P and BSP with the preparation of specific forest management activities that result in a reduction in carbon emissions. The ER-P is not simply a forest conservation project and must not be depicted as such.

Any application to the ER-P indicates that owners or managers and users of forest resources agree to the principles of the collaborative management and the establishment of the ensuring management entity. This PF is designed to ensure that these processes are broadly followed and without clear buy in from all stakeholder groups the ER-P will not support other approaches. Thus, unequivocally successful application to the ER-P requires a commitment by the existing management entity and other stakeholders, including and especially at the village level to buy into the YMST and associated activities including the preparation of locality specific BSPs. This process consists of a series of four steps (preparation and application, activity launch, implementation, and monitoring and dissemination of lessons learnt) with a number of conditions to be fulfilled at each stage. These steps and conditions can be adjusted during program implementation as new problems and opportunities arise, but any adjustment must be agreed upon in advance by the World Bank Emissions Reduction Program Agreement (WB ERPA).

5 Grievance Redress Mechanism

The FGRM proposes the inclusion of both project/implementer-led and national-led activities in a conflict resolution approach for REDD+. Implementer led activities should follow a similar process as the REDD+ FGRM in that there is strong preference for conflicts to be resolved at the informal-level, where possible. Outside of the customary system, conflicts that are on implementer-led sites should try to resolve complaints through their own GRM if possible. However, if the issue is between the implementer and a forest-user or if the forest-user wishes to use the REDD+ FGRM they should be permitted to do so, following the process as outlined in Section 4. Should a grievance be submitted to the FGRM from a forest-user located in an implementer-led site (that was unresolved through the program's GRM or by informal means) then the dispute will be submitted directly to the REDD+LOU for possible mediation, as a first step. If the REDD+LOU is unable to help the Complainant and parties reach a resolution then the grievance will continue to follow the process, elevating to the next step of a third-party evaluation, until a resolution is reached.

It will be important for the scope of the FGRM to be inclusive and not divisive between ER-P participants to not create confusion on when they can engage in the FGRM, who is handling the grievances and resolutions, who is accountable, and what outcomes they might expect. Outcomes need to be in alignment or else conflict may arise from the preference or perceived benefit of using one GRM over another and creditability of the mechanisms will be impacted. While it is useful for individual sub projects to have their own dedicated GRM (as is the case in the Drawa Block Forest Community Cooperative that served as a case study during the preparation of this FGRM) multiple sub projects in the ER-P Accounting Area can centralize certain FGRM functions to reduce costs and enhance overall effectiveness.

Possible synergies between the multiple GRMs with the ER-P FGRM include:

- The ER-P FGRM will host an internet-based grievance monitoring system with a centralized database that is accessible by all REDD+ projects, national and implementer led. This database can be used as a repository for all grievances related to ER-P and will aid the ER-P FGRM Team in tracking disputes within and outside the national system as they relate to.
- All projects should replicate a common system to acknowledge the receipt of users' grievances and keep them updated on the progress of investigations. To the extent that there is any inconsistency, all implementer-led projects will be asked to align their GRM processes with the national FGRM and to use similar forms. Maintaining a uniform system in place will alleviate confusion on behalf of forest-users and a shared system for reporting and monitoring or grievances on all ER-P sites.
- Consistent communication and coordination between all ER-P activities can manifest in using the REDD+LOU as a hub for any issues and concerns that may arise from

mainstreaming of grievance processes. As part of this coordination, implementer-led activities should initiate a monthly check-in with the REDD+LOU to discuss pertinent issues, challenges, or opportunities for improved FGRM processes. All ER-P grievances should be entered into the central database of recorded ER-P grievances, managed by the REDD+LOU. When an ER-P grievance is entered in the database it should note whether the grievance was initiated and initially recorded as a FGRM grievance or a GRM grievance (as part of an implementer-led project.) Recording all ER-P grievances in one database should help centralize valuable data and create a system where precedents can be accessed in one place.

As the FGRM is new there will be limited understanding of the process initially especially in relation as to how it will be used during the implementation of the ER-P and it will be important to allow the mechanism to grow organically as awareness increases. Putting in place a system that is too comprehensive when understanding and experience is limited will be neither effective nor sustainable. Therefore, it is best to start with a FGRM that is focused on a few issues and is simplistic in how it receives and resolves conflicts for ER-P. After the FGRM becomes more entrenched and has established credibility it will be easier to scale-up and convince the government to provide additional resources (human and fiscal) towards conflict resolution processes.

Therefore, it is proposed in line with the joint FCPF/UNREDD+ Program for Fiji that taking into account FGRM processes that are commonly understood in the Fiji context that there should be four relatively simple steps as summarized in the following table that has been extracted from Section 14 of the ER-PD.

Table 5.1 Steps in the FGRM

| FGRM Step | Process | Agency | FGRM Representative | Roles |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Receive and Register Grievance | The step is designed to be simple, convenient and familiar for forest users, considering cultural preferences for communication as well as illiteracy barriers and, if desired, anonymity. The submission, or uptake, of a grievance is comparable to other traditional GRMs in Fiji, which are initially embedded in village governance processes, to build on existing practice and familiarity of users that wish to engage in the REDD+ mechanisms associated with the ER-P. Where the person seeking grievance, redress wants to use a Forest Officer, in part because at the village level the structures of governance cannot deal with complex ER-P issues they may lodge by email, social media, verbally or in writing the nature of their grievance and a response acknowledging receipt should be notified within 5 working days. | Ministry of iTaukei Affairs; Ministry of Forestry | iTaukei Village Headma; Roko Tui (Provincial Office); Forest Officer | Mediator, Facilitator, Decision Maker |
| Evaluate And Screen for Eligibility and Assign Responsibility | This involves an evaluation of the following principles: 1) Has the ER-P activity caused a negative economic, social or environmental impact or has it the potential to cause such an impact; 2) Specification of the type of impact that has occurred or may occur and how the ER-P activity has or may cause the impact; 3) Does the grievance indicate that the aggrieved filing the grievance indicate that those filing the grievance are the ones who have been impacted or are the ones who are likely to be impacted; 4) Can the FGRM handle the dispute in terms of complexity, multiple parties and loyalty?; and, 5) Does the grievance fall within the scope of issues that the FGRM is authorized to address? | Ministry of Forestry | REDD+ Safeguards Officer (under the MSD see Figure 9.3) | Mediator, Facilitator, Manager, Decision Maker |

| FGRM Step | Process | Agency | FGRM Representative | Roles |
|--|--|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Respond | If a grievance is deemed eligible for the FGRM during screening and if it cannot be resolved through a relatively simple action at the local level, then is considered complex enough to require additional investigation and engagement with the Complainant and other stakeholders how best to respond. Turnaround period should be within 5 working days. The possible approaches are: 1) Informal resolution with the community deciding itself (the preferred option); 2) Self-Proposed resolution where if a Forestry Officer is involved s/he resolves it with the Complainant or sends back to the community to resolve informally; 3) Joint problem solving approach involving the designated Forest Officer of the FGRM acting as the mediator; 4) Third party resolution whereby facilitation offered through a third party assessment (IAG); and, 5) Board Resolution whereby the External Review Board decides. | External Party appointed by REDD+ SC | Independent Assessment Group (IAG) | Mediator, |
| Proposed Resolution, Approach and Agreement | | Subcommittee of REDD+ SC to verify outcome of IAG and recommend to REDD+ SC | Safeguards Working Group | Investigator |

| FGRM Step | Process | Agency | FGRM Representative | Roles |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Implement Problem Solving and Grievance Resolution | <p>If the Complainant agrees to the proposed approach the response can be implemented collaboratively. For informal, self-proposed, or joint problem-solving resolutions the approach and close-out of the grievance is completed that satisfies both the Complainant and the community. All self-proposed and joint problem-solving results should be uploaded to the FGRM database and communicated to the Complainant. More simple cases involving an IGA undertaking evaluation but if it is too complex or the Complainant seeks an appeal, the grievance is elevated to the RSC who may request additional information or a new IGA. Categorization of seriousness ranges from low, medium and high seriousness based on the potential to 1) gravity or seriousness of the grievance; 2) potential on an individual or group's welfare and safety; 3) potential impact on the environment; 4) Risks posed, whether current or future; and, 5) Impact of the seriousness of the allegation on the processing timetable. Proposed resolutions include informal resolution, self-proposed resolution, and joint problem-solving. The turnaround period should be no more than 15 working days.</p> | <p>Ministry of Forestry; Ministry of iTaukei Affairs</p> <p>Ministry of iTaukei Affairs</p> <p>Ministry of iTaukei Affairs</p> | <p>Forest Officer</p> <p>iTaukei Village Turaga ni Koro</p> <p>Roko Tui (Provincial Office)</p> | <p>Mediator, Facilitator,</p> <p>Investigator, Decision Maker</p> <p>Mediator, Facilitator, Decision Maker</p> |
| Closure | <p>The process for monitoring and tracking should cover the duration of the grievance redress in alignment with UN-REDD/FCPF guiding principles that include transparency, accessibility, predictability, engagement and dialogue, Legitimacy, equity, rights-compatibility and enabling continuous learning.</p> | <p>Subcommittee of REDD+ SC to verify outcome of IAG and recommend to REDD+ SC</p> | | |
| Monitoring and Tracking Results | | | <p>Safeguards Working Group</p> | <p>Investigator</p> |

However, in instances where APs livelihoods are directly or indirectly impacted upon by ER-P interventions and OP4.12 is triggered the FGRM will be required to directly follow the established FGRM in Fiji that follows the steps outlined in the RPF and are based on the steps that the WB has been following in agreement with the GoF on other projects it is wholly or partially financing in Fiji such as the Fiji Transport Infrastructure Investment Project or Integrated Flood Management Nadi Basin Project:

Table 5.2 Example of an FGRM from ADB Transport Infrastructure Investment Project

| Steps | Process | Duration |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Aggrieved Affected Person/Turaga ni Koro (for iTaukei villages) or Elected Head in non-iTaukei villages submits grievance to the MoF's Social Safeguards Management Specialist | Any time |
| 2 | MoF's Social Safeguards Management Specialist and finds solution to the problem in consultation with Turaga ni Koro or Elected Head and relevant agencies | 2 weeks |
| 3 | MoF's Social Safeguards Management Specialist reports back an outcome to the Turaga ni Koro, Elected Head/Aggrieved Affected Person | 1 week |
| If unresolved or not satisfied with the outcome by MoF's Social Safeguards Management Specialist | | |
| 4 | DP/Turaga ni Koro or Elected Head submits grievance to the MoF Minister. | Within 2 weeks of receipt of decision in step 3 |
| 5 | MoF Minister reviews and find a solution in coordination with relevant agencies | 4 weeks |
| 6 | MoF Minister reports back the solution/decision to Aggrieved Affected Person/Turaga ni Koro or Elected Head of Village | 1 week |
| If unresolved or at any stage if DP is not satisfied | | |
| | Aggrieved Affected Person/Turaga ni Koro or Elected Village Head can take the matter to an appropriate court | As per judicial system |

It needs to be noted as per the SESA, ESMF and RPF that the MoF, whether at the national, divisional, provincial or district level has little or no experience with projects that trigger OP4.12 and will need sustained capacity building to meet the requirements of both the WB and GoF. The Social Safeguards Management Specialist will play a key role in developing this capacity and will have to work closely with the Forest Wardens and YSMT and community level groups. Although this would be an impossible task in each of the 155 ER-P districts let alone the 982 villages. Thus, it will be in the interest of all stakeholders to avoid where possible activities that trigger OP4.12 where possible and where not possible to ensure that at least the PPIUs are able to develop a working knowledge of the RPF and how the FGRM would be utilized in the event that aggrieved affected people could resolve their grievances.

Communities and individuals who believe that they are adversely affected by a World Bank supported project may submit complaints to existing project-level grievance redress mechanisms or the WB's Grievance Redress Service (GRS). The GRS ensures that complaints received are

promptly reviewed to address project-related concerns. Program affected communities and individuals may submit their complaint to the WB's independent Inspection Panel that determines whether harm occurred, or could occur, as a result of WB non-compliance with its policies and procedures. Complaints may be submitted at any time after concerns have been brought directly to the World Bank's attention, and Bank Management has been given an opportunity to respond. For information on how to submit complaints to the World Bank's corporate GRS, visit <http://www.worldbank.org/GRS>.

6 Monitoring and Evaluation

Responsibility of overall monitoring and implementing the PF rests with the DPIU with oversight by the NPIU through progress reports and internal monitoring. The implementation and results of the PF and integrated activities on village level participants whether iTaukei or non-iTaukei will be monitored regularly, and internally by DPIU. These statements and recommendations relating to village level participants will be included in the periodic reports of DPIU that must be sent to DPIU. The DPIU will set and submit monitoring reports to NPIU on a quarterly basis and these will be combined into semi-annual and annual reports.

Implementing the PF will also be subjected to external independent monitoring by a qualified consultant, which could also be an NGO or CSO. The external independent monitoring consultant will be hired by NPIU. This service could be integrated into the contract for independent monitoring of the implementation of RPF and RPs.

The World Bank retain the responsibility to determine that the safeguards system which applies to the ER Program and ERPA is sufficient to result in program implementation that complies with World Bank safeguard policies. Specifically, this entails providing appropriate advisory services, conducting quality assurance and compliance reviews, and oversight of the systems to implement environmental and social management frameworks and/or plans which are formulated at the ER P appraisal and ERPA signing stages of the FCPF process. The World Bank has the responsibility for monitoring and ensuring effective implementation and compliance of the program entity with agreed management measures. The Bank's primary responsibility for oversight is to ensure that the Program implements all aspects of the Safeguard Plans that apply to the ERPA Operation. This does not imply that the Bank will conduct specific site-visits or spot-checks of individual ER Program activities, nor does it imply that the Bank will troubleshoot any issue of safeguards non-compliance in individual activities. The Bank's focus is not to resolve individual ER P activity issues but to take steps to ensure that the Safeguards Plans continue to function at the systems level. In addition to self-monitoring and World Bank oversight, an important aspect of performance and compliance monitoring is the use of Third-Party monitors.

Review, Approval, and Oversight of Specific Program Activities

- For the Bank-financed projects contributing to the ER-P, the Bank will retain full responsibility for safeguards compliance and oversight as it would for any other Bank financed activity;
- For the ER-P activities financed by others, the MoF as the Program Entity, together with financiers, would be responsible for ensuring that requirements of applicable safeguards frameworks and plans are addressed and respected. The World Bank would not be responsible for any prior review, clearance, or supervision of such activities. The World Bank's role would be to undertake periodic assessments to determine whether the agreed safeguards systems are being implemented in accordance with agreements and that these systems are effective in addressing safeguards risks and impacts. This includes confirming aspects such as, adequacy of budgets and staffing to support the implementation of the Safeguards Plans; that the PF can demonstrate credibly that environmental and social assessments and management plans are prepared in accordance with the safeguard frameworks; mechanisms for self-reporting and Third Party monitoring are in place and

functional; grievance redress and dispute resolution mechanisms are established and functional; the implementing entities have demonstrated ability to solve issues of non-compliance and so on.

- The Bank will establish a clear time-table for supervision and implementation support missions. In the early years of an ERPA Operation, oversight would typically need to be robust and conducted regularly to verify that systems are functioning as agreed. For activities in the ERPA accounting area which may in some way contribute to emissions reductions but are not part of the ER Program, the World Bank would bear no responsibility for review or oversight either at the transaction or program level.

6.1 Internal monitoring

The Program NPIU on behalf of MoF is required to self-report on compliance of ER-P activities with WB safeguards. The FCPF Methodological Framework requires (Criterion 25) that (i) the Safeguards Plans for an ER Program include “appropriate monitoring arrangements” for safeguard information; and (ii) self-reported information on the implementation of the Safeguards will be provided as a separate annex to each ER Monitoring Report and this is regularly compiled (semi-annually and annually, reported and publicly disclosed. The NPIU is also encouraged to make information available to relevant stakeholders. Currently, verification of emission reductions (volume generated under the ER-P) is expected every 2-3 years (due to high cost of related monitoring and verification efforts). The NPIU will be responsible for the overall implementation of the PF.

Monitoring and evaluation will cover both program performance monitoring and effectiveness monitoring. Program performance monitoring will determine the progress in program implementation against established benchmarks and milestones indicated in the program document and work plans.

To encourage broad-based participation and to particularly target the poor and vulnerable, participation will be monitored and disaggregated in terms of gender, ethnicity, and household socio-economic status. The following guidelines will be considered when developing the full M&E system and for identifying potential indicators:

- Disaggregate information by gender, ethnic group, and household socio-economic status;
- Involve villagers in designing the monitoring program, collecting data, and drawing conclusions from the data, based on the SERNA and the establishment of an appropriate management entity;
- Continue feedback meetings after fieldwork and incorporate recommendations into systems development;
- Biodiversity monitoring will include using the Management Effectiveness Management Tool (METT);
- Keep disaggregated records of involvement and participation in different activities at village level and also in the databases;
- Note successful and unsuccessful strategies for future reference in curriculum development, field implementation, and other project areas; and
- Identify indicators and tools to measure the project’s impacts on women, ethnic minority groups (primarily people of Fijian-Indian ethnicity), and the poor.

As the implementation of the ER-P may lead to a change in access to forest resources in areas as a result of protection activities, building capacity for improved monitoring activities is essential. Monitoring should be participatory and include the monitoring of beneficial and adverse impacts on persons within project impact areas.

The PF will require that key performance indicators be developed in relation to related activities. Indicators can be grouped as those that: (i) will demonstrate whether or not the PF is meeting performance expectations; and (ii) demonstrate the status of livelihoods in communities (through household-level indicators). The following indicator groups are suggested as a basis to measure the success and weakness of activities related to affected groups.

Process Framework Indicators to measure the effectiveness of the PF include:

Number of participants in consultation process

Number and types of vulnerable groups participating in consultation process

Number of affected communities included relative to total number of affected communities

Number of grievances or conflicts recorded

Number of remedial activities implemented in response to recorded grievances

Time taken to resolve grievances

Number of individuals with a positive perception over the level of empowerment in natural resources management

Number of individuals with a positive perception over the level of empowerment in natural resources management, disaggregated by vulnerable group and user sub-group categories

Community livelihood Indicators to measure status of households and changes in forest resource use and access restriction:

Change in type of natural resources use, and substitute activities

Changes livelihood activities of households, by type of activity and amount

Change in livelihood activities of households, by type of activity and amount, disaggregated by vulnerable group and user sub-group categories.

6.2 External Monitoring

An independent monitoring consultant (IMC) or Independent Third Party monitors will be contracted to monitor the implementation of social safeguards of the program, including the PFs. The monitoring report will be submitted to the World Bank for review and comments. External monitoring should be conducted twice a year during the implementation of the Program to timely identify issues that might need immediate action from NPIU and DPIU.

Third Party monitoring would involve a combination of independent verification of self-reporting data provided by the Program Entity and annual audits of a sample of ER-P activities to confirm procedural compliance as well as timely preparation of key documents, post-review of the quality review of safeguards documentation which has been prepared, consultation processes, effectiveness of management measures specified in the Safeguards Plans, and disclosure of information, among other important aspects. Third Party monitoring can serve at least three purposes.

First, to provide timely information to the Program Entity on specific issues of non-compliance or significant implementation problems so that the Program Entity can take corrective actions, if needed. At present it is difficult with any degree of certainty to quantify specific issues of non-compliance but given the very limited knowledge of safeguard issues among all stakeholders this will be a challenge for the IMC. Likewise the MoF as per the SESA has quite limited experience with the implementation of programs and this also presents a challenge for the IMC.

Second, Third Party monitors provide information to the NPIU and the World Bank on systemic safeguard performance issues which may require changes in management approach and/or additional financial or human resources. Third, the disclosing the results of monitoring will inform concerned stakeholders about implementation experience under the ERPA Operation. In practice, Third Party monitors will typically be private consulting firms, individuals or teams recruited from universities or colleges, government institutes not affiliated with the operation, or NGOs with knowledge and experience in safeguards but not NGOs, international or national that have played a significant role in designing the ER-PD.

Third party monitoring is expected to be undertaken at least twice per year provision for this is included in the draft budget for supporting the ESMF implementation (See Section 8 of the ESMF).

7 Appendix

Table 7.1 Possible Restriction on Access to and Use of Resources

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks | Socio-Economic Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impacts | Mitigation Measures |
| Component 1: Strengthen enabling conditions for emission reduction | | | |
| <p>Subcomponent 1.1 Integrated District Land Use Planning (IDLUP)</p> <p>(To promote more sustainable long-term integrated landscape management)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Improved land use planning, objective is to reduce conversion of natural forest or reduce degradation of natural forest -The participatory planning process envisaged, may encourage the recording and sharing and handing down of local land and forest knowledge between generations. The reduction or even loss of this transfer between generations is seen as a concern in some communities. -Opportunity to take account of and integrate with the NBSAP objectives and action plans -Expected to cross cut sectors, MOF, MoEnv, MOA, land use, TLTB, Provincial Councils, District REDD+, NGOs, CSO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential for reduced access to forest and NTFP resources for forest dependent communities through improvements or changes to forest access through changes in boundaries or access rights - Possible exclusion of poor, remote or vulnerable and potential for gender exclusion issues. - Possible change or impact on livelihood issues due to introduction of a land use plan or changes in current land use and plan that may not follow existing agricultural crop production, i.e. may require investment and change increasing risk to hhs - Possible FGRM issues - Potential for changes to land leasing arrangements with non-iTaukei | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Socio-economic screening collaborative management used to help resolve any boundary issues and ensure access to forest; helps resolve the potential exclusion and gender issues. - If there are any disputes the FGRM process may be used by iTaukei, and non-iTaukei to resolve grievances. - Awareness raising and training on land use planning and involvement of the community and adopting a fully participatory approach - In the unlikely instance where the FGRM process is not successful and where a land use plan is enforced for activities that are inconsistent with the new land use plan, OP4.12 will be triggered. - The assessment of environmental and social risks and any necessary consultations on policy reforms will be undertaken. If any households are affected by being forced to desist from using land for other purposes (e.g. traditional agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) they will be compensated for loss of production and OP4.12 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts - Free prior and informed consultations need to include iTaukei and non-iTaukei to achieve broad support with all affected parties, with emphasis on inclusion of vulnerable (poor households and communities, remote communities, lease holders (non-landowning households), women and men, youth. - The provisions of OP 4.10 may also |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks | Socio-Economic Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impacts | Mitigation Measures |
| | | | apply where necessary and a Process Framework would be followed. -Training on improved crop production and crop diversification |
| 1.1.1 Development of Integrated District Land use plans (IDLUP) | - Plans in 20 Districts over life of the program | - As above | - As above |
| 1.1.2 Develop integrated community management plan | - 40 community consultation workshops over life of program as above | - As above | - As above |
| Subcomponent 1.2. Strengthening forest governance and law enforcement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved protection and conservation of the natural forest - Awareness raising and training on the sustainable use of forest, improved management and forest laws - Improved social awareness of the importance of forests and that they are finite - Awareness training on FFHCOP, SFM, Fire management - Expected to cross cut across sectors MOF and MOA land use, TLTB, Provincial councils, District REDD+ NGOs, CSO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Similar to above, possible impacts on livelihoods due to changes in crops or land use - Improved governance may not include unfettered or continued access to all forest areas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FGRM would be introduced and used to help resolve any disputes - Improve transparency, encourage the participation of community in discussing and improving forest management. Ensure that people who agree to participate in the Yaubula Management Support Teams (YMST) are in broad agreement with on the need to improve the management of forests as to whether it is necessary to restrict access to the forests and if necessary, no household should be worse off as a result. In such instances OP 4.12 will apply. - Identification of conservation orientated livelihood and sustainable forest use models designed not to impact on natural forest in Protected Areas. However, where households that are negatively impacted are able to secure livelihoods by being offered alternative livelihoods within the provisions of OP 4.12 |
| 1.2.1. Raise awareness on revised legal and regulatory framework, strengthen forest law enforcement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As above; - Establish Forest Care Groups in 20 districts over the life of program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This activity may result in some risks associated access restrictions - Could result in livestock (horse, goats, cows) not having access to forest - May also result in restrictions on collection of firewood, logging, hunting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Depends if the laws are more strictly enforced and the status of the forest i.e. a reserve or a protected area. In some circumstance (unlikely) FGRM followed and final option would be OP 4.12 |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks | Socio-Economic Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impacts | Mitigation Measures |
| 1.2.2 Capacity building on forest laws, enforcement and governance at community level | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness raising at District level via three trainings per year on carbon enhancement, application of the FFHCOP and land leasing processes - Improved social awareness of the importance of forests | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Women may be excluded - Exclusion of poor, and vulnerable hhs - Possible elite capture - Possible particular problems in coastal economic zone where high value land leases are to be found | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use FPIC and need to ensure community consultations with iTaukei and non iTaukei - Matagali and TLTB need to continue to ensure transparency - FGRM would be introduced and used to help resolve any disputes as above final option would be use of OP4.12 |
| 1.2.3. Capacity building on forest law enforcement at industry and trade level | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two inter agency training per year on forest law - Two trainings per year on reporting process for non-compliance of forest related legislations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Similar to above at the village level | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness raising and training on proposed processes to be used i.e. FPIC, FGRM and OP4.12 |
| Subcomponent 1.3 Forest information system | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved information on status of the forest - Improved forest monitoring providing feedback into planning and management process - Training for MOF staff - Potential to provide linking feedback to the communities managing protecting and using the forests | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible gender and poverty issues related to access to forest; - Possible livelihood issues through changes in land use and increased governance - Similar to 1.2 above - Possible miss use of information system leading to elite capture of remaining forest resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Similar to 1.2 above - Socio-economic screening, collaborative management helps resolve any boundary issues and ensure access to forest - Improved forest monitoring providing feedback into planning and management process and discussion with local communities through the YMST to improve forest protection and management and agree to designate areas for livelihood related activities including NTFP collection. OP 4.12 will apply. - Aim for forest management plans to improve local ownership, and sustainable approaches to reduce pressure on timber harvesting. Introduce more sustainable management approaches to NTFP collection. |
| 1.3.1. Upgrade Forest information & data base systems | Data and equipment purchase activities | - Not applicable | - Not applicable |
| 1.3.2 improved monitoring and reporting to feed forest information system | - As above in 1.3 | - As above in 1.3 | - As above in 1.3 |
| Component 2: Promoting integrated landscape management | | | |
| Subcomponent 2.1. | - Generally positive, some | - Some possible impacts | - Matagali self-select to be part of a public |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks | Socio-Economic Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impacts | Mitigation Measures |
| Sustainable natural forest management | <p>clarifications of forest natural forest boundaries</p> <p>- Potential for increased transparency where necessary on management of remaining natural forest</p> <p>- Lead Agency: MOF Collaborators: Ministry of iTaukei Affairs iTaukei Lands Trust Board Saw-millers Association NGO, CSOs</p> | <p>on livelihoods, i.e. improved conservation of natural forest may not include unfettered or continued access to all forest areas.</p> <p>-This activity may result in some risks associated access restrictions to Forest Management License areas by non-Matagali.</p> <p>- Matagali self-select but may depend of 60% agreement legal principle and this may also be more problematic where different Matagali do not agree on boundaries between the Matagali especially if the boundaries are still imprecise.</p> <p>(Note that TLTB has long experience of resolving boundary disputes and these are normally resolved amicably)</p> | <p>private partnership for Forest Management Licenses. Their involvement is voluntary.</p> <p>-Where a problem occurs first recourse would be through the FGRM</p> <p>- Implement collaborative management of natural forests between communities through the YMST improved forest planning and management process and discussion with local communities through the YMST to improve forest protection and management and agree to designate areas for livelihood related activities to reduce pressure on critical forest areas.</p> <p>- If FGRM outcome is not satisfactory OP 4.12 will apply to ensure that involuntary resettlement impacts, such as when boundaries between core and buffer zones are not resolved by the Forest Division and YMST, will be mitigated.</p> <p>- If any non-Matagali households (leaseholders, tenants, squatters) are affected by being forced to desist from using land for other purposes as a result of Forest Management Licenses (e.g. traditional agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) they will be compensated for loss of production and OP4.01 and OP4.10 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts</p> |
| 2.1.1 Land tenure clarification and SFM management planning | <p>-5 agreements between landowners and logging operators approved per year</p> <p>-3 Forest Leases secured per year</p> <p>- Social and economic benefits of having clearer boundary and tenure</p> <p>-Forest owners/ landowners more aware of socio-economic benefits of SFM</p> | - As above | - As above |
| 2.1.2 Activity Missing | | | |
| 2.1.3 Implement and Monitor logging aligned to FFHCOP | <p>-10 sites monitored quarterly</p> <p>-Awareness raising</p> <p>- Results disseminated widely to all stakeholders through newsletter and social media</p> | <p>- Potential in remoter upland areas that dissemination of results awareness (SESA fieldwork showed that</p> | <p>- A clear communication strategy to ensure dissemination go information etc. (currently not an activity in the ER-P)</p> <p>- Use other cultural appropriate means, i.e. social media may not work or may</p> |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks | Socio-Economic Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impacts | Mitigation Measures |
| | -Forest owners/ landowners more aware of socio-economic benefits of SFM | there is limited dissemination of information in remote upland areas) | not be appropriate with some vulnerable hhs -Where a problem occurs first recourse would be through the FGRM |
| Subcomponent 2.2 Enhancement of Carbon Stocks | -Generally positive, some clarifications of forest natural forest boundaries -Lead Agency: MOF Collaborators: Fiji Pine Ltd For pine Fiji Mahogany Trust for mahogany | - Generally minor socio-economic impacts expected see review of various models below - Possible gender and poverty issues related to access to forest; - Possible change or impact on livelihoods if restrictions placed on accessing forest for NTFP collection - Possible health and safety issues related to plantation harvesting | - Implement collaborative management of natural forests and plantation areas with communities (through the YMST). OP4.12 may apply but this is specific to communities who may face a change in legal or legalisable access to plantation forestland. - To ensure women or other poor and vulnerable groups are not excluded the GAP highlights how it is necessary to ensure full gender inclusion. However, where restrictions are to be imposed restricting access to forests to collect NTFPs and this negatively impacts on women and their households then the provisions of OP4.12 will apply because the impact results in loss of livelihoods. - Provide training on health and safety related to timber harvesting ⁴ |
| 2.2.1 Investments in reforestation, short and long rotation plantation - pine plantations | -Restocking of pine plantation with 2500ha/yr. - Continued economic benefits of land leases - Continued or improved fire watch/ control -Improved monitoring report by the MOF once a year - Expected to be on existing or extended pine lease | - Access issues on pine leases for NTFPs (already occurring Vanua Levu in some areas ⁵) | - Where a problem occurs first recourse would be through the FGRM - If FGRM process fails, OP4.12 will be triggered |
| 2.2.2. Investments in reforestation, short and long rotation plantation investments - mahogany plantation | -Restocking of logged over mahogany forest plantation at 780 ha/yr. between 2020-2022 -Improved monitoring report by MOF | - Possible health and safety issues if herbicides are used | - Provide training on safe use of herbicides etc. |
| Subcomponent 2.3. Afforestation and reforestation - | - Matagali should self-select for activities - Detailed below | - As above | - Where a problem occurs first recourse would be through the FGRM - If FGRM process fails, OP4.12 will be |

⁴ Health and Safety at work Act (1996)

⁵ Fiji Pine Public Notices: “According to the Draft Planted Forestry Policy Statement 2015 the guiding principles 4.3.2 state no natural forest or minor forest produce will be harvested removed or damaged in the development of a new plantation”. Fiji Pine prohibits the logging or removal of minor forest products “under any circumstance” from its leases.

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks | Socio-Economic Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impacts | Mitigation Measures |
| restoration of ecosystem services | | | triggered |
| 2.3.1. Implement land owner engagement through Fiji Pine Trust Extension Scheme | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Matagali should self-select for activities - Fiji Pine Trust facilitate registration of at least 4 groups in ER-P per year (each group with at least 25ha) -Establishment of 200ha pine woodlot per year | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where a problem occurs first recourse would be through the FGRM - If FGRM process fails, OP4.12 will be triggered |
| 2.3.2 Activity missing | | | |
| 2.3.3. Community based restoration for 4 million Trees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Matagali will self-select for activities, encourage community decisions and decision-making involving women. - Establish an incremental 400ha per year from 2020 at the baseline of 300ha. -Establishment of 4000ha by year 3 - At least 100 communities/ Mataqali register for intervention - Socio-economics benefits of afforestation/ reforestation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible gender and poverty issues | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where a problem occurs first recourse would be through the FGRM - If FGRM process fails, OP4.12 will be triggered |
| Subcomponent 2.4 Promotion of climate-smart agriculture and sustainable livelihoods | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Matagali will self-select for activities - Socio-economic benefits of risk/ and awareness raising of climate change issues - Lead Agency: MOF Collaborators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Agriculture, Kava Commodity Clusters, Fiji Crop and Livestock Association, Kava Association, Famers, NGOS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible gender and poverty issues; - Possible access to forest issues; - Possible changes in land use - Possible social impacts from changes in land use (with some land users no longer able to farm / harvest / collect NTFP). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Activities should be voluntary and OP4.12 would not be expected to apply provided that the land use plan (or similar) is not enforced or restrictions imposed. In first instance of a dispute FGRM would be used if this fails OP4.12 applies - Benefit sharing still under discussion, Matagali would be expected to benefit in one form or another - Selection of the livelihood support should be targeted to contribute to reduce forest dependency; Similar to above discussions through the YMST to design best approach that fits with local forest dependency and use and climate smart agriculture that best suits the local area and market conditions - Training on improved crop production and crop diversification, where crops are not agreed to FGRM for example if |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks | Socio-Economic Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impacts | Mitigation Measures |
| | | | communities want crops that do not confirm to the land use plan would be used to resolve issues. Depending on the crops and detailed activities or possible enforcement of the land use plan OP4.09, and OP4.12 may apply |
| 2.4.1 Implementation of Riparian restoration to mitigate flash floods | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish at least 6 sites annually at 300ha per site - 6 Reports of community consultation on traditional species used and preferred species for restoration. - At least 3 field schools for farmer-to-farmer exchange per year - Socio-economics benefits of mitigation of floods | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible changes (minor) in land use in some riparian area which could have socio-economic impacts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Matagali will self-select for activities and therefore their involvement is voluntary - Land will not be acquired for this activity, as it will be land already being used by forest-dependent households. If any households are affected by being forced to desist from using land for other purposes the FGRM will be followed (e.g. traditional agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) and where they will be compensated for loss of production and OP4.12 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts |
| 2.4.2. Afforestation and restoration for ecosystem services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish at least 5 sites annually at 100ha per site - 6 Reports of community consultation on traditional species used and preferred species for restoration. - At least 3 field schools for farmer-to-farmer exchange per year - Socio-economic benefits of afforestation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As above | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As above |
| 2.4.3 Enhanced alternative livelihood and restoration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As above, could include incentivized climate-smart agriculture and agroforestry - Establish at 200ha of alternative intervention per year - 6 Reports of District alternative livelihood intervention - At least 3 field schools for farmer-to-farmer exchange per year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Climate smart crops” could add to the burden of the community and especially women farmers if proposed crops (such as vanilla) require extra time and resources or technical training | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This type of activity is unlikely to have any negative impact if a consensus can be achieved at the local level and the program is able to assist impacted or targeted households seek financial assistance. - Land will not be acquired for this activity as it will be land already being used by forest-dependent households - Careful selection of “climate smart crops” is required to avoid negative impacts and ensure uptake. Particular attention needs to be taken of impact on women. |
| Subcomponent 2.5 Promotion of | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure 60% community consensus at each priority site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible changes in land use | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Similar to above, in the first instance FGRM applies and OP 4.12 will apply if |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks | Socio-Economic Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impacts | Mitigation Measures |
| forest protection to conserve existing natural forest carbon stocks. | <p>through FPIC process by 2023</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community awareness raised on the importance of PAs - Socio-economic benefits of watershed protection - These activities unlikely to result in any risk of relocation, land acquisition. - Lead Agency: MOF - Collaborators: Ministry of Environment, iTaukei Lands Trust Board, Department of Lands NGOs, CSOs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible gender and poverty issues; - Possible access to forest issues; - Access restrictions by local communities to natural forest may happen if the legal framework is strengthened and forest turned into conservation area | <p>issues cannot be resolved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If any households are affected by being forced to desist from using land for other purposes (e.g. traditional agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) they will be compensated for loss of production and OP4.12 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts - Biodiversity surveys could be used to refine potential areas - Careful planning and consideration of resources is required for communities |
| 2.5.1. Implementation of natural forest conservation agreement (at the deforestation frontier) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure 60% community consensus at each priority site via FPIC process by 2023 - Socio-economic benefits from the reduction in risk of land degradation or soil erosion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As above. - This activity may result in some FGRM risks associated with disenfranchisement and access restrictions - Potential to result in changes in levels of income | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Similar to above, in the first instance FGRM applies and OP 4.12 will apply if issues cannot be resolved - If any households are affected by being forced to desist from using this land for other purposes (e.g. traditional agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) they will be compensated for loss of production and OP4.12 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts |
| 2.5.2 Formalise protection of forest area under the Forest Decree 1992 and other instruments such as the TLTB Act | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Improvements to policy at least 2 Discussion Papers drafted and submitted to Forestry Board per year -Endorse and enforce PA status at least one site per year -Secure at least 1 REDD+ Conservation Lease per year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As above. This activity may result in some risks associated access restrictions and changes in levels of income | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If any households are affected by being forced to desist from using this land for other purposes (e.g. traditional swidden agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) they will be compensated for loss of production and OP4.12 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts |
| 2.5.3 Develop and Implement community-based Forest Protection Management Plan based on co-management regime between the Forest Management Enterprise and management body of the Protected Area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -At least 3 Community consultation using Open Standards and other tools to identify target species, key threat and management strategy for protection -2 Forest Protection Management Plan formulated per year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible changes in land use - Possible gender and poverty issues; - Possible access to forest issues; - Access restrictions by local communities to natural forest may occur | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Similar to above, in the first instance FGRM applies and OP 4.12 will apply if issues cannot be resolved |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks | Socio-Economic Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impacts | Mitigation Measures |
| 2.5.4 Secure sustainable financing to support the long-term maintenance and upkeep of the forest protected area | -2 Community and Stakeholder consultation develop - Business Plan -Secure “seed fund” for sustainable financing of ER-P priorities by 2023 | | |
| Component 3: Program Management and Emission monitoring | | | |
| 3.1 Program coordination and management | -Support for capacity building and at central Province and District levels, -Improved coordination across sectors and ministries | - Facilitate institutional setup, coordination mechanisms, program implementation manual; - Training programs and Financial Management | |
| 3.2 Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) includes monitoring of safeguards | -MRV plan implemented at national, divisional and provincial levels | Development of effective M&E system that includes training on data collection and reporting on safeguards information | - It is requirement that the RPF be monitored and evaluated to ensure all measures to mitigate the negative impacts of involuntary resettlement are adequately documented |
| 3.3 MRV - Management and processing of MRV activities | -M&E Guidelines, Verification Reports, Communication Materials and Report | - Development of effective MRV data and forest cover information. - No negative impacts expected | |

Table 7.2 Main ER-Program Interventions Potential Environmental Impacts and Mitigations

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks (ha) | Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impact | Mitigation Measures |
| Component 1: Strengthen enabling conditions for emission reduction | | | |
| Subcomponent 1.1 Integrated District Land Use Planning (IDLUP) to promote more sustainable long-term integrated landscape management | - Improved land use planning is expected to help control the expansion of agricultural land, i.e. reduced conversion of forest - Contributes to improved planning of land use, this would include avoidance of use of steeply sloping land and improved crop | - Possible disturbance of forest/ forest re-growth that could lead to invasive species - Possible changes in land use - Possible gender exclusion in planning process (see socio-economic impacts and mitigation) | - Awareness raising and training on land use planning and involvement of the community adopting a fully participatory approach and ensure that land use planning involves women - Training on improved crop production techniques and crop diversification - In the instance of a dispute the FGRM would be used, however, |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks (ha) | Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impact | Mitigation Measures |
| | <p>selection, and improved planning related to infrastructure planning and development.</p> <p>-Expected to cross cut across sectors, MOF, MoEnv MOA land use, TLTB, Provincial councils, District REDD+, NGOs, CSO</p> | | <p>unlikely that a land use plan would be legally regulated, i.e. adoption of any land use plan would be voluntary and should be beneficial to the community</p> |
| 1.1.1 Development of Integrated District Land use plans (IDLUP) | <p>- Plans in 20 Districts over life of program</p> <p>- As above</p> | - As above | - As above |
| 1.1.2 Develop integrated community management plan | <p>- 40 community consultation workshops over life of program</p> <p>- As above</p> | - As above | - As above |
| Subcomponent 1.2. Strengthening forest governance and law enforcement | <p>- Improved forest governance should eventually be generally positive and contribute to protection and maintenance of biodiversity</p> <p>- Development/revision of forest policy and regulation might result in negative outcomes during implementation</p> <p>- Expected to cross cut across sectors MOF and MOA land use, TLTB, Provincial councils, District REDD+ NGOs CSO</p> <p>- Apply FFHCOP</p> <p>- Less forest conversion</p> | <p>- Possible gender and poverty issues related to access to forest</p> <p>- Possible change in access to forest or impact on livelihood issues</p> | <p>- Thorough review of the TORs and outputs of these policy and regulation activities to ensure that potential impacts and mitigation measures are addressed</p> <p>- Improve transparency, encourage the participation of community in discussing and improving forest management;</p> <p>- Improve forest monitoring providing feedback into planning and management process and discussion and local communities through the YMST to improve forest protection and management and agree and designate areas for livelihood related activities</p> <p>- Similar to above on the use and sustainable management of NTFPs</p> <p>- Training on and applying the FFHCOP</p> |
| 1.2.1. Raise awareness on | <p>-Awareness training on FFHCOP, SFM, Fire</p> | - Potential for access to forest issues or impact on livelihood | - In the instance of a dispute the FGRM would be used |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks (ha) | Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impact | Mitigation Measures |
| revised legal and regulatory framework, strengthen forest law enforcement | management -Establish Forest Care Groups in 20 districts over life of program - Improved sustainable forest management less forest conversion | issues | |
| 1.2.2 Capacity building on forest laws enforcement and governance at community level | -Awareness raising at 3 District level training per year on carbon enhancement, application of the FFHCOP and land leasing processes - Less forest conversion | - Potential for access to forest issues or impact on livelihood issues | - In the instance of a dispute the FGRM would be used |
| 1.2.3. Capacity building on forest laws enforcement at industry and trade level | -2 inter agency training per year on forest law -2 training per year on reporting process for non-compliance of forest related legislations | | |
| Subcomponent 1.3 Forest information system | - Similar to above - Improved information on status of the forest providing feedback into planning and management process -Training for staff at MOF | - Possible miss use of information system leading to elite capture and exploitation of remaining forest resources | -Develop data collection and use protocols that ensure information is available and transparent |
| 1.3.1. Upgrade Forest information & data base systems | - Improved information on forest resources and use | - None foreseen | |
| 1.3.2 improved monitoring and reporting to feed forest information system | - Improved information on forest resources and use | - None foreseen | |
| Component 2: Promoting Integrated Landscape Management | | | |
| Subcomponent 2.1. Sustainable natural forest management | - Improved landscape management and SFM; - Generally positive, some clarifications of forest natural forest boundaries, some possible impacts on | - May impact on high conservation value forest i.e. untouched or high conservation value forest may be brought under a sustainable/ reduced impact | - Biodiversity values should be assessed prior to Forest Management Licences being issues - Strengthen forest governance (law enforcement for forest |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks (ha) | Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impact | Mitigation Measures |
| | <p>livelihoods, i.e. improved conservation of natural forest, may not include unfettered or continued access to all forest areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NTFP over collection should decrease and lead to improved management and should see an increase in the volume and availability - Lead Agency: MOF Collaborators: Ministry of iTaukei Affairs iTaukei Lands Trust Board Saw-millers Association NGO, CSOs | logging approach to SFM | <p>protection and management (propaganda, patrol, control)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve dissemination of forest conversion policy and improvements to land use planning, and policies related to the community as the regulation was developed. - Improve forest monitoring providing feedback into planning and management process and discussion with local communities through the YMST to improve forest protection and management and agree to designate areas for livelihood related activities including NTFP collection and introduce more sustainable management approaches to NTFP collection |
| 2.1.1 Land tenure clarification and SFM management planning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5 agreements between landowners and logging operators approved per year - 3 Forest Leases secured per year - Improved SFM | - As above | - Biodiversity values should be assessed prior any logging if that is included in the SFM plan |
| 2.1.2 Activity Missing | | | |
| 2.1.3 Implement and Monitor logging aligned to FFHCOP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10 sites monitored quarterly - awareness raising - results disseminated widely to all stakeholders through newsletters and social media | - As above | - Biodiversity values should be assessed prior any logging if that is included in the SFM plan |
| Subcomponent 2.2. Afforestation and reforestation - timber and biomass plantation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally positive, longer-term benefits to habitat improvements if native species are used for afforestation leading to improved biodiversity - Possibility of increasing land under forest cover | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential for reduction or impact on biodiversity if exotic mono-culture fast growing plantation trees i.e. if <i>Acacia</i> or <i>Acacia</i> hybrid spp. are used for the biomass plantations - Possible minor habitat damage where enrichment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Follow plantation management recommendations conforming to OP 4.36 - Biodiversity surveys could assist with identifying values prior to replanting - Careful design of planting to avoid any loss of native spp. |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks (ha) | Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impact | Mitigation Measures |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible of regeneration of heavily degraded land/ stabilisation of eroded areas/ reduce soil erosion/ leguminous spp. may be used - Lead Agency: MOF Collaborators: Fiji Pine Ltd for pine, Fiji Mahogany Trust for mahogany | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> planting occurs; - Impacts would be location dependent, possible minor habitat damage or in exceptional circumstances minor loss of poor-quality remnant natural forest. - Possible increased and or overuse of pesticides/ herbicides for seedling and unintended introduction of invasive species in disturbed areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mixed planting of native species with biomass plantations would help mitigate the biodiversity issues. - Training on the safe use of herbicides etc. |
| 2.2.1 Investments in reforestation, short and long rotation plantation - pine plantation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Restocking of pine plantation with 2500ha/yr. - Monitoring report by the Ministry of Forestry once a year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Short rotation plantains need to be managed carefully to avoid undue impact and disturbance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Careful design of planting to avoid any loss of native spp. - Mixed planting of native species with biomass plantations would help alleviate the biodiversity issues - Encourage longer rotations where possible |
| 2.2.2. Investments in reforestation, short and long rotation plantation investments - mahogany | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Restocking of logged over mahogany forest plantation at 780 ha/yr. between 2020-2022 - Monitoring report by the Ministry of Forestry once a year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Old method used to develop a mahogany “plantation” was inside logged natural forest where there would be biodiversity and environmental impacts. However, this approach has now been replaced by a more normal approach of replanting in existing or old plantations or on degraded land, where the mahogany would eventually have a beneficial impact. - Potential health and safety measures if herbicides are used to protect young seedlings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Careful design of planting to avoid any loss of native spp. - As previous method no longer used mitigation is similar to any plantation. - Training on safe use of herbicides etc. - The assessment of environmental and social risks may be required if there is a change in land use for example where planting is on degraded land, however, most degraded land is used for new plantations is a grass fire climax with limited biodiversity. - Consultations would be required with local Matagali where any new plantation land is leased. |
| Subcomponent 2.3. Afforestation and reforestation - restoration of ecosystem services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally positive, few impacts expected as the activity mainly focuses on existing plantations (i.e. no new plantations, enrichment planting with | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible increased and or overuse of pesticides/ herbicides for seedling and unintended introduction of invasive species in disturbed areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Follow plantation management recommendations conforming to OP 4.36 -Implement collaborative management conforming to OP 4.36 and OP 4.04 of natural |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks (ha) | Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impact | Mitigation Measures |
| | <p>native spp. included) and extending and improving management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential to improve biodiversity - Possibility of increasing land under forest cover - Possible of regeneration of heavily degraded land/ stabilisation of eroded areas/ reduce soil erosion/ leguminous spp. may be used | | <p>forests and plantation areas between YMST and communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Careful design of planting to avoid any loss of native spp. - Depending on the proposed location the activity may require biodiversity assessments as part of process to ensure that there are no impacts on critical natural habitats |
| 2.3.1. Implement land owner engagement through Fiji Pine Trust Extension Scheme | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fiji Pine Trust facilitate registration of at least 4 groups in ER-P per year (each group with at least 25ha) - Establishment of 200ha pine woodlot per year | - As above | - As above |
| 2.3.2 Activity missing | | | |
| 2.3.3. Community based restoration for 4 million Trees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish an incremental 400ha per year from 2020 at the baseline of 300ha. - Establishment of 4000ha by year 3 - At least 100 communities/ Mataqali register for intervention | - As above | - As above |
| Subcomponent 2.4 Promotion of climate-smart agriculture and sustainable livelihoods | <p>- Lead Agency: MOF</p> <p>Collaborators: Ministry of Agriculture, Kava Commodity Clusters, Fiji Crop and Livestock Association, Kava Association, Famers, NGOS</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited possibility of negative environmental impacts, for example, not all activities chosen by communities and forest management entities may not be rigorously forest or biodiversity conservation supportive; - Identification of conservation orientated livelihood models designed not to impact on natural forest in PAs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification of livelihood and sustainable forest use models designed not to impact on natural forest in PAs. Example of livelihood activities will be developed and provided in the PIM - Promotion of sustainable use and development of NTFPs in the forest areas - Mitigation measures to be developed and included in the ESMP for implementation Provide training on use of herbicides and pesticides |
| 2.4.1 | - Establish at least 6 sites | - Unintended introduction of | - Careful design of planting to |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks (ha) | Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impact | Mitigation Measures |
| Implementation of Riparian restoration to mitigate flash floods | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> annually at 300ha per site - 6 Reports of community consultation on traditional species used and preferred species for restoration. - At least 3 field schools for farmer-to-farmer exchange per year | invasive species in disturbed areas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> avoid any loss of native spp. - Depending on the proposed location the activity may require biodiversity assessments as part of process to ensure that there are no impacts on critical natural habitats |
| 2.4.2. Afforestation and restoration for ecosystem services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish at least 5 sites annually at 00ha per site - 6 Reports of community consultation on traditional species used and preferred species for restoration. - At least 3 field schools for farmer-to-farmer exchange per year | - As above | - As above |
| 2.4.3 Enhanced alternative livelihood and restoration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could include Incentivized climate-smart agriculture and agroforestry - Establish at 200ha of alternative intervention per year - 6 Reports of District alternative livelihood intervention - At least 3 field schools for farmer-to-farmer exchange per year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unintended introduction of invasive species in disturbed areas - Possible increased and or overuse of pesticides/herbicides for crop protection - “Climate smart crops” could add to the burden of the community if they require specific site locations, or increased levels of in puts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Careful selection of location specific “climate smart crops” suggests that the program will need a range of different crops for the wide variety of locations found in the ER-P area - Training on the safe use of herbicides etc. |
| Subcomponent 2.5 Promotion of forest protection to conserve existing natural forest carbon stocks. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved protection of natural forest through conservation agreements - Secure 60% community consensus at each priority site via FPIC process by 2023 - Improved conservation of natural forest | - Mainly socio-economic issues, potential to lead to increased impact on alternative areas of forest | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Biodiversity surveys could be used to refine potential areas - Careful planning and consideration of resources required for communities - The METT process could be used to help in the management but usefulness is questionable unless there is a management unit for a PA - Similar socio-economic issues, in the first instance FGRM applies and OP 4.12 will apply if issues cannot be resolved - If any households are affected by being forced to desist from using land for other purposes |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks (ha) | Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impact | Mitigation Measures |
| | | | (e.g. traditional agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) they could be compensated for loss of production and OP4.12 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts |
| 2.5.1. Implementation of natural forest conservation agreement (at the deforestation frontier) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure 60% community consensus at each priority site via FPIC process by 2023 - Improved conservation of natural forest | - As above as one area of forest is closed off this may result in increased use or access to alternatives | - As above |
| 2.5.2 Formalise protection of forest area under the Forest Decree 1992 and other instruments such as the TLTB Act | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Improvements to policy at least 2 Discussion Papers drafted and submitted to Forestry Board per year -Endorse and enforce PA status at least one site per year -Secure at least 1 REDD+ Conservation Lease per year | - As above | - As above |
| 2.5.3 Develop and Implement community-based Forest Protection Management Plan based on co-management regime between the Forest Management Enterprise and management body of the Protected Area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -At least 3 Community consultation using Open Standards and other tools to identify target species, key threat and management strategy for protection -2 Forest Protection Management Plan formulated per year | - As above | - As above |
| 2.5.4 Secure sustainable financing to support the long-term maintenance and upkeep of the forest protected area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -2 Community and Stakeholder consultation develop - Business Plan Secure “seed fund” for sustainable financing of ER-P priorities by 2023 | - None foreseen | |

| ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks (ha) | Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|---------------------|
| | Activities and Potential Positive impacts | Potential Negative Impact | Mitigation Measures |
| Component 3: Program management and emission monitoring | | | |
| 3.1 Program coordination and management | - Support for capacity building and at central Province and District levels, - Improved coordination across sectors and ministries | - None foreseen | |
| 3.2 Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) includes monitoring of safeguards | -MRV plan implemented at national, divisional and provincial levels - Improved environmental management | - None foreseen | |
| 3.3 MRV - Management and processing of MRV activities | -M&E Guidelines, Verification Reports, Communication Materials and Report - Improved information on forest resources and use | - None foreseen | |