

ON-LINE APPENDIX ON THE IMPLICATIONS OF REDD+ PROJECTS FOR INDIGENOUS AND COMMUNITY RIGHTS IN INDONESIA AND TANZANIA

Sébastien Jodoin & Kathryn Hansen
June 2016

This document provides a brief overview of the data collected on the implications of 38 REDD+ projects for the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in Indonesia and Tanzania.

1. Notes on the Collection of Data

Through a review of projects design documents, independent third-party evaluations of the impacts and outcomes of projects, and secondary sources retrieved on-line, we compiled information on 38 REDD+ projects pursued in Indonesia and Tanzania. We independently coded each project in light of three criteria: the extent to which a project had delivered economic benefits and strengthened the livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and local communities or aimed to do so; whether or not a project had clarified and resolved the land tenure and forest rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities or aimed to do so; and the extent to which a project had sought to empower Indigenous Peoples and local communities through a participatory approach to the design and implementation of projects and the explicit recognition of their right to free, prior, and informed consent or aimed to do so.

2. Data Collected on the Implications of REDD+ Projects for Indigenous and Community Rights in Indonesia

We collected data on 28 REDD+ projects pursued in Indonesia.¹ The following table provides an overview of the purpose of these REDD+ projects and their actual or potential implications for the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

Project Title & Proponent	Project Purpose	Implications for Indigenous and Community Rights
“Berau Forest Carbon Program” (The Nature Conservancy)	<p>The project aimed “to enable Berau to meet its development goals while sustainably managing its forests by developing a carbon finance mechanism that delivers effective incentives to reduce emissions from forest loss.”²</p> <p>In particular, the goal “is to develop a district-wide carbon accounting framework that captures emissions from a range of strategies and land types, which will dramatically reduce concerns about leakage (shifting activities to other locations). By 2015 the project aims to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bring at least 800,000 hectares under effective management; 2. Avoid emissions of 10 million tons of carbon dioxide over five years; 3. Protect critical watersheds and areas of high biodiversity value (including habitat of 1,500 orang-utans); 4. Create improved economic outcomes and opportunities for communities living near forests.”³ 	<p>This project intended to: “(1) [Establish] governance structures and consultative mechanisms to include communities in overall program decisions; (2) [Strengthen] community institutions to facilitate effective participation; (3) [Invest] in alternative livelihoods programs in target areas to support low-carbon development strategies.”⁴</p> <p>As of 2012, the project had implemented a strategy for engaging with local communities, supported village mapping, introduced alternative livelihoods,⁵ and facilitated the process for obtaining a <i>butan desa</i> license, which “has enhanced tenure clarity over village forests.”⁶</p> <p>In 2015, “community development work” had begun to scale across the district of Berau, with other strategies “expected to begin scaling by 2016.”⁷</p>
“Berbak Carbon Initiative” (Zoological Society of London (ZSL))	<p>The Berbak Carbon Initiative aimed “to reduce deforestation in this 240,000 ha peat swamp forest, where approximately 1500 hectares of forest is being lost each year with associated emissions of 5 million tonnes of CO2.”⁸ The Initiative was intended to be “the first</p>	<p>The project has “Completed community surveys to provide baseline information regarding local perception of their role in park management, conservation and economic development,” as well as a “community needs assessment”.¹⁰</p>

	<p>Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) project that focuses specifically on conservation forest on Sumatra and thus to be a model for protecting further conservation forests in the future.”⁹</p>	<p>“Community, local government and BNP staff trained in participatory rural development planning to assess community needs and facilitated inclusive, active participation.”¹¹</p> <p>“Despite BCI work to date there is still a disassociation between the communities and the BNP that needs to be addressed. BCI is exploring potential ways to do this including community reforestation schemes, and community involvement in the MRV process such as Plan Vivo while determining the true costs of providing alternative livelihoods, rather than one that is just compensatory.”¹²</p> <p>The project plans to “determine the best pathways by which community stakeholders are integrated into the decision making for the BCI REDD+ project as well as the management of the project.”¹³</p>
<p>“Gunung Palung – Sungai Putri Ecological Corridor” (Fauna & Flora International Indonesia)</p>	<p>This project aimed “at investigating the potential to leverage payments for ecosystem services as a way of sustainably protecting and conserving the important large scale ecological corridor between Sungai Putri and Gunung Palung National Park in West Kalimantan, Indonesia.”¹⁴</p>	<p>This project intended to impact the rights of local communities through a focus on community forests, “work[ing] with local communities to develop viable community carbon forestry projects.”¹⁵</p>
<p>“Biodiversity Conservation through Preparatory Measures for</p>	<p>This project aimed “to conserve the peat forests in the project area. [...] Restoration and conservation of the forests will also preserve one of the last refuges for endangered animal species in southern Sumatra. The project thus also contributes to biodiversity conservation</p>	<p>The “project has developed an approach and strategy of promoting sustainable natural resource management that includes active community participation. Community participation is expected particularly in the fields of forest protection (from illegal logging to fire threats),</p>

<p>Avoided Deforestation” (International Climate Initiative)</p>	<p>and complements the REDD initiative of the Indonesian government.”¹⁶</p>	<p>conservation and rehabilitation [...]. To achieve active community participation, capacity and competency interventions from the project as well as from related stakeholders are essential. Training (forestry techniques, appropriate agricultural technologies, etc.), public awareness raising, facilitation and provision of alternative income generating activities, and strengthening ground institutional capacities are essential. These activities have been, and are to be provided, as part of capacity and competence development under the project.”¹⁷</p> <p>Upon completion, the project was successful in establishing and managing forest enterprise –“creating a legal framework” and providing “further training for district staff”, reforesting “degraded areas with the participation of the local people”, establishing and training “14 village groups to implement small loan programmes”, providing further training “for community foresters” and strengthened the “newly established women’s group” through measures such as “training and advisory support on issues like small animal husbandry, production of tofu and snacks, establishment of stores, and production of charcoal from waste wood”.¹⁸</p>
<p>“Promoting partnership efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation of tropical peatland in south</p>	<p>This project “is intended to enhance sustainable management of tropical peatland forest to reduce emissions and increase carbon stocking through the involvement of local communities in the conservation and rehabilitation of degraded peatland forest in South Sumatra.”¹⁹</p>	<p>The project facilitated the development of a new farming system in OKI District that “aims to enhance carbon sequestration and generate income from non wood forest product (latex of jelutung) for local people.”²⁰</p>

Sumatra through the enhancement of conservation and restoration activities” (Regional Research Center of South Sumatra)		
“Ulu Masen Ecosystem Project” (Aceh Provincial Government; Carbon Conservation; and Fauna & Flora International)	<p>This project aimed “to reduce a baseline deforestation rate of 9,500 hectares per year by 85%, achieving emissions reductions of up to 1 million tonnes of CO₂ per year. In July, an MoU on sales and marketing was signed by the Aceh government and Carbon Conservation.”²¹ The project “planned to develop and apply the mechanism of carbon finance in order to reduce GHG emissions, contribute to sustainable socioeconomic development, improve forest management, protect watersheds and conserve biodiversity.”²²</p>	<p>“The project will provide financial support to villages in exchange for the stewardship and activities that will conserve forest through deposition accounts that are planned to support community development (for example, small infrastructure, agroforestry, and agriculture projects), as well as funds aimed at promoting alternative livelihoods and community-based forestry. By working directly with communities and fostering conservation with carbon finance, the project is predicting overall net-positive benefits.”²³</p> <p>The project “was also expected to alleviate poverty and empower local communities. Several interventions or activities were planned, including introducing the use of steel material for housing as an alternative to wood. The most significant planned intervention was the reexamination of tenure rights. This intervention was expected to be carried out in areas under central government logging licenses that were no longer active and were currently being used by communities. The aim was to clarify tenure and ensure that the rent from the</p>

		<p>management of these forests accrued to the provincial government.”²⁴</p> <p>“[Only a few undertakings have actually been implemented. They include livelihood enhancement activities, forest patrols, pilot MRVs and FPIC at the <i>kemukiman</i> level. Livelihood enhancement activities were carried out [and] included the development of low-impact, community-based agroforestry, and commodity crops within areas zoned for such activities and with the participation of communities. One intervention was the distribution of cocoa seedlings as an alternative livelihood to steer people away from illegal logging activities.”²⁵</p> <p>“Similarly, there were not yet any specific arrangements or mechanisms for benefit-sharing among stakeholders. Although the GoA elaborated several benefit sharing mechanism options in their PDD, none of them were applied in practice because the REDD+ initiative has not been implemented beyond the preparatory phase.”²⁶</p>
<p>“Poigar Forest, North Sulawesi” (ONF International and Green Synergies)</p>	<p>“This project is one of fourteen Forest Management Units (KPH) which are created to ensure sustainable forest management.”²⁷</p>	<p>“As they are the main deforestation agents, local communities are also the key to deforestation alleviation. To guarantee project permanence and efficiency, they should be involved in project design, in collaboration with all levels of authority. Thanks to the establishment of the KPH, a strong network of all local communities concerned with the forest has been developed and socialized to REDD initiatives.”²⁸</p> <p>In 2009, it was reported that “[f]irst contact with local communities shows a very positive context which is</p>

		<p>welcoming environmentally friendly projects for the Poignar forest.”²⁹</p> <p>The project expects to engage in reforestation within the project area “with productive species to develop alternative livelihoods for local communities.”³⁰ Moreover, “[t]he establishment of KPHs could offer new land tenure opportunities that ONF-I and its local partners are currently studying.”³¹</p>
<p>“Mawas Peatland Conservation Project” (Winrock International)</p>	<p>Located in southern Borneo in Central Kalimantan, the aim of the project “is the achievement of protected status of valuable peatlands through collaboration with the Central and Local Governments and the local communities.”³²</p>	<p>This program is “designed to improve livelihoods for local communities and there are no significant adverse impacts anticipated. The expected positive impacts include: direct project-related employment, economic gains through micro credit and livelihoods enhancement programs; reduced air pollution and respiratory problems from fires, improved public services that should reduce child and maternal mortality, better stream flow regulation, improved downstream water quality, improved conditions for downstream fisheries integrity, and transfer of carbon benefit measurement technology/techniques to Central and Provincial governments.</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Mawas promotes sustainable development by creating opportunities for improving the quality of life of project-affected and neighbouring communities [...]. [L]ocal communities receive economic benefits through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employment for fire training to prevent and control fires. [...] 2. Employment for forest regeneration activities. 3. Opportunity to participate in sustainable agricultural and livelihoods diversification programs.

		<p>4. Added value to non-timber forest products (NTFPs) as a result of training provided by artisans.</p> <p>5. Improved availability and scope of health services.</p> <p>6. Improved understanding of environmental issues and their significance for quality of life and sustainable livelihood opportunities.”³³</p>
<p>“Adaptive and Carbon-Financed Forest Management in Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra” (International Climate Initiative (IKI))</p>	<p>This project aimed “to increase the adaptive capacity of the highly biodiverse ecosystem in the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (covering around 26,000 km² in three national parks) in order to more readily accommodate the impacts of climate change.”³⁴ It also established a “carbon-financed forest management system.”³⁵</p>	<p>Collaborative forest management in the Kerinci Seblat National Park aimed “to increase the capacity of forest edge communities to protect and manage their customary forest estate in perpetuity, and secure legally-recognized rights to these areas to reduce threat of forest conversion.”³⁶</p> <p>Upon completion, the project had conducted training “for park staff and community members on introducing the methodology [for monitoring effect of climate change], conducting data collection, and promoting cooperation,” and had completed a “draft of statutory roadmap developed for initiating carbon-financed projects; potential locations identified for such projects.”³⁷</p>
<p>“REDD and Enhancing Carbon Stocks in Meru Betiri National Park, Java” (Indonesian Ministry of Forestry, the MBBP, IITTO, Seven & i Holdings and</p>	<p>The aims of this project were:</p> <p>“(1) To raise awareness and improve the livelihoods of local communities living in and around the MBBP [Meru Betiri National Park] through active participation in efforts to prevent deforestation, forest degradation and loss of biodiversity</p> <p>(2) To develop a robust measurable, reportable and verifiable (MRV) system for monitoring reductions in greenhouse gas emissions caused by deforestation and</p>	<p>Amongst the objectives of this project is the aim “[t]o ensure the effective empowerment of local communities related to the MBBP in conservation and forest management practices, the objective of this activity is to review the existing schemes and lessons learnt on how local communities are involved in conservation and forest management that provide benefits and balance between the objective of conservation and the needs of the local communities.”</p> <p>In addition, “[a]ll potential economic activities will be</p>

others)	forest degradation and increases in forest carbon stocks in the MBNP.” ³⁸	further explored and developed to improve livelihood of local communities and to reduce the pressure on the MBNP,” and “specific training and other types of community empowerment will be conducted” for forest management practices. ³⁹
“REDD Project in Kutai Barat, West Kalimantan” (WWF-Indonesia)	This project covers an “area of 114,000 ha located outside of the forest zoning in the HOB [Heart of Borneo] project area.” ⁴⁰ The project will “establish a sub-national model that demonstrates effective involvement of local and indigenous communities in decision making and equitable benefit sharing. The aim of these activities is to demonstrate how REDD+ could be used as a tool to advance sustainable development while conserving biodiversity and tackling climate change.” ⁴¹	<p>This project aims “to establish a sub-national model that demonstrates effective involvement of local and indigenous communities in decision making and equitable benefit sharing.”⁴²</p> <p>Project goals included awareness building “of different types and uses of land”, developing “accurate inventories and maps of customary land areas and their resources, and collaboratively craft plans for their future use” and creating “a basis for benefit-sharing through payment for ecosystem services and for government recognition and support of customary rights to the land”.⁴³</p> <p>“Three villages (Batu Majang, Penarung and Linggang Melapeh) developed three-dimensional maps of their land use that recorded and reinforced traditional knowledge and practices [...] [t]heir participatory mapping exercises were coupled with a discussion of the economic value of different land use categories [...] [v]illagers then drew and projected from these processes to create community land use plans for five to ten years into the future.”⁴⁴</p> <p>However, “WWF efforts to build capacities and facilitate participatory village planning processes in Kutai Barat are very limited—only three of more than 200 villages have</p>

		<p>taken part.”⁴⁵</p> <p>The project further noted that the “legal framework that offers inadequate recognition or protection for customary rights and traditional land uses limits the effectiveness of participatory land use mapping and planning.”⁴⁶</p>
<p>“Towards Enabling Mitigation of Climate Change Through Promotion of Community Based Economic Growth (TEBE)” (The KYEEMA Foundation)</p>	<p>The aim of this project is “to develop a REDD activity concept that will enable communities to better manage the Mutis-Timau forest and materially benefit from REDD. The TEBE Project (“Towards Enabling Mitigation of Climate Change Through Promotion of Community-Based Economic Growth”) is based on the introduction of community forest management concessions to resolve forest tenure issues and enable communities to assess, and access, carbon market funding.”⁴⁷</p>	<p>Working closely with two local NGOs, this project’s “emphasis will be on establishing village forest concessions and building local capacity to manage them.”⁴⁸</p> <p>Project proponents “have begun consulting with stakeholders about the TEBE Project and training staff in Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and Community-Based Assessment (CBA) in preparation for baseline data collection.”⁴⁹</p>
<p>“Leuser Ecosystem REDD Project” (Global Eco Rescue (GER))</p>	<p>This project “aims to address the root cause of deforestation: unsustainable approaches to economic development” and “to refocus communities neighboring forests away from inefficient forest utilization and agricultural practices and employ them in higher value added and ecologically balanced economic activities.”⁵⁰</p>	<p>“Involvement [of] local community in the project is one of crucial aspects to ensure the successful of credit generation. The project has been designed to ensure involvement of community from the planning stage, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project. The project proponent through a community development program will facilitate community involvement, in accordance with Climate, Community and Biodiversity standard.”⁵¹</p> <p>With respect to local communities, “sustainable timber plantations, community agro-forestry, renewable energy, and ecotourism are considered low carbon investment opportunities. Specific development activities are targeted</p>

		<p>on the basis of their ability to support development goals while at the same time providing incentives to local stakeholders to value conservation.”⁵²</p> <p>As of 2010, the project had established a “[c]ommunity working group”, “Initiated free, prior and informed consent with local communities”, established a “[f]eedback and complaints hotline”, developed “[i]nformation and education materials/visuals” and asses the “[c]ommunity social baseline”.⁵³</p>
<p>“Kampar Peninsula Carbon Reserve, Riau” (Sinar Mas Group - subsidiary Asia Pulp and Paper (APP) & Carbon Conservation)</p>	<p>This project “aims to be a world class REDD+ project that preserves valuable peatland forest leveraging through innovative carbon financing.”⁵⁴</p>	<p>A number of concerns have been raised about the impact of this project on local communities, including:</p> <p>“I. PT. RAPP’s concession area overlapping with the customary lands of the village of Teluk Binjai: About 11,750 hectares. Almost all of this area has been converted to its projected use (e.g. plantations, jetties/ ports, workers’ camps);</p> <p>II. The size of land for community gardens: The agreement calls for PT. RAPP to establish 1,222 hectares of community gardens: 600 hectares to be planted in 2010 and 622 hectares in 2011. By the end of 2010, only 400 hectares had been established;</p> <p>III. Community demands, as expressed to the NGO Scale Up:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renegotiation of the agreement 2. The exclusion of 700 hectares of community agricultural lands from the concession;

		<p>IV. Community position on the implementation of the agreement: PT. RAPP has not implemented its side of the agreement with Teluk Binjai. For example, it agreed to develop 600 hectares of community gardens (tanaman kehidupan) during 2010 but only 400 hectares were established.</p> <p>V. Threats to the community</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The loss of the agricultural land that supports the community's economy. 2. The loss of vital sources of livelihood (i.e. peat forests).⁵⁵
“Sulbar Habitat, West Sulawesi” (Keep the Habitat)	This project is “about creating sustainable forest landscapes in Sulawesi Barat and using the natural capital of the province as a foundation for equitable economic development.” ⁵⁶	<p>The project aims to “improve the livelihoods of more than 1 million people.”⁵⁷</p> <p>“The Community plan’ as defined by the project, includes the provision of “expert assessment of locations, populations and profiles of affected communities, community consultation to establish the needs and priorities including health, education and the environment, support for local business development and employment to stimulate a sustainable local economy, e.g. ecotourism, non timber forest products such as rattan, flowers, forest fruits and medicinal products etc., support for education, skills development, training and scholarships, support for research to improve project designs and outcomes, local employment in implementation of the Habitat Protection and Habitat Rehabilitation Plans, and regular reports on implementation of the Community Plan.”⁵⁸</p>
“Tesso Nilo	This project aimed to “connect the forests between the	A number of concerns regarding the impact of the project

Bukit Tigapuluh REDD Project” (WWF)	five protected areas of the Tesso Nilo Bukit Tigapuluh (INBT) Landscape (including a future Tesso Nilo Conservation Area) to provide sufficient habitat for elephants and tigers and thus to be a safe haven also for other threatened and rare species.” ⁵⁹	on local communities have been raised; it has been reported that as a result of preventing access to local communities, “impoverished communities have encroached on the national park; local populations have turned to illegal land clearing in order to establish settlements and in some cases small crop plantations [and] Illegal logging remains a significant problem.” ⁶⁰
“Avoided Deforestation Project in Malinau, East Kalimantan” (Global Eco Rescue)	This project “is designed to address the number one cause of deforestation in Indonesia – illegal logging. It will also combat agricultural encroachment and test new Reduced Impact Logging techniques.” ⁶¹	In this project, “[f]orest dwellers will be receiving a minimum of 20% of the project revenues to be used on health, education and welfare improvements. Forest dwellers in the project area will receive alternative livelihood training so that they can turn away from illegal logging and develop other skills. Farmers will be taught new techniques to increase crop yields so that forest will not have to be cut down to make room for agricultural fields.” ⁶² “The project has been designed to ensure involvement of community from the planning stage, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project. The project proponent through a community development program will facilitate community involvement, in accordance with Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard.” ⁶³
“Community Carbon Measurement in Kutai Barat” (WWF-Indonesia & University of	The aims of this project include the development of “community conservation through community training in forest management.” ⁶⁴	As of December 2011, WWF Indonesia had conducted community carbon accounting training with a local village. ⁶⁵ This project recognized “the importance of Free Informed Consent in the communities,” which “means that before starting any project there is an obligation to engage the community and gain permission to proceed.” ⁶⁶

Copenhagen)		<p>By 2013, two communities took “part in community carbon accounting training conducted through a collaboration between WWF, the University of Copenhagen, Mulawarman University and ICRAF.”⁶⁷ Moreover, “[v]illagers in two communities were able to quickly learn new techniques and develop accurate carbon measurements, proving that community-based carbon monitoring can be effective, efficient and reliable.”⁶⁸</p> <p>“The training process and the implementation of a community-based carbon measurement and monitoring system empowered villagers by establishing them as experts on their own lands. Community members became more engaged and invested in forest management and protection, and gained a better understanding of the forest’s growth and life cycle.”⁶⁹</p>
“Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project” (InfiniteEARTH)	<p>This project is designed to protect 64,000 hectares of land in Central Kalimantan, “thus avoiding the loss of forest from conversion to palm oil plantations.”⁷⁰</p>	<p>As of January 2014, “the community benefits of project activities clearly represent a net positive impact on local communities compared to the without project scenario.”⁷¹ In particular, the “PIR provides a list of 9 community related activities that are planned or in progress for the project. All represent positive benefits for the communities.”⁷²</p> <p>The project has also demonstrated that it has not encroached on property rights, that it will not lead to involuntary relocations, and that “[n]on-destructive use of the land (fishing, small-scale forest product gathering) by local communities will continue.”⁷³</p>

<p>“Katingan Peat Forest Restoration Project, Central Kalimantan” (PT Rimba Makmur Utama Katingan)</p>	<p>This project “aims to conserve forest and prevent the expansion of oil palm plantations in the area by the generation of carbon credits through an Ecological Restoration Concession, and by providing income-generating opportunities for local communities.”⁷⁴</p>	<p>In 2009, the project “conducted participatory mapping in three villages [...] to clarify village borders and establish village land-use plans, with funding from the Packard Foundation.”⁷⁵ Funding from USAID enabled the project to undertake participatory mapping in an additional twelve villages in 2012 and 2013.⁷⁶</p> <p>The project continues to create “spatially accurate maps that define the agreed extent of village land and the agreed boundary of the project area” and [are] signing a memorandum of understanding (MoU) with each of the project zone village authorities.”⁷⁷ To date 13 villages have signed MoU’s.⁷⁸</p> <p>Some tenure issues do remain in the area, “particularly within those areas lying between the project area and the rivers, which remains designated as commercial conversion forest” as well as “within the wider project zone [...] sparked by progressive waves of transmigration”⁷⁹ but “[t]he Katingan Project is designed and implemented to fully recognize customary rights and community land tenure, and hence there are currently no conflicts over land between the project and the project zone communities.”⁸⁰</p> <p>In addition, as of 2015, community consultations have been based on FPIC principles.⁸¹ The project “conducted a systematic FPIC process starting in early 2010. The field team works with local communities by reviewing literature on FPIC and existing legislations, developing the FPIC training module, conducting two-day FPIC trainings in</p>
--	--	--

		<p>key villages, disseminating information on the FPIC process to additional villages, and finalizing the FPIC module.</p> <p>The final FPIC module incorporated feedback from the communities, such as the need to simplify the module so as to be easily understood by community member with little formal education.”⁸²</p> <p>The project “delivers significant well-being benefits to smallholders/community members [...] through a variety of socio-economic activities” such as “microfinance, women’s empowerment, sustainable agroforestry, renewable energy development, and NTFPs [non-timber forest products].”⁸³</p>
<p>“Ketapang Community Carbon Pools” (Fauna & Flora International)</p>	<p>This project aims is based on four elements: “increased clarity and security of tenure over communities’ village forests; contributing to achieving Indonesia’s GHG emissions reduction targets; conserving forests for endangered orangutan and other threatened species; and securing long-term funding for these conservation efforts through carbon financing.”⁸⁴</p>	<p>The main strategy pursued by this project is the facilitation of <i>hutan desa</i> licensing for communities in the project area.⁸⁵ As a result, “community engagement is a core element, not only in the process of obtaining HD licenses but because a community-owned initiative is essential to ensuring the establishment, support and continuity of KCCP. Community commitment is also important because forest threats come from both external and internal actors. FFI and communities are also involved at the local, subnational and national institutional arena of addressing deforestation, REDD+ and forestry policy consultation processes.”⁸⁶</p> <p>As of September 2014, six villages have been awarded a <i>hutan desa</i> license by the Ministry of Forestry and are awaiting final approval from the governor of West Kalimantan.⁸⁷ The project has adopted varying approaches</p>

		to benefit-sharing across the different villages. In one of the more advanced villages in the project area, a benefit-sharing scheme whereby FFI provides about USD 10,000/year to the village is being piloted: “The benefit-sharing agreement of this support is as follows: 10% will be used for social activities (orphanage, disabled people, religious activities), 10% for landowners/managers (farmers’ groups), 5% for health services, 70% for operational management of HD (training in capacity building and income generating activities, women’s activities, forest patrols, nurseries for reforestation, the HD team), and 5% for preserving traditional culture and customary systems.” ⁸⁸
“REDD Pilot Project in Central Lombok, Nusa Tenggara Barat” (KOICA)	“The project aims to build capacity in forestry and contribute to community development in Indonesia through a REDD project.” ⁸⁹	Upon implementation, the project will consider ‘[f]ollowing Indonesia [r]egulation’, community involvement, ‘[C]ommunity Forestry Programmes’ and harmonization ‘between forest protection & economic benefits’. ⁹⁰
“Forest Resources Management for Carbon Sequestration” (CARE International Indonesia)	“The FORMACS Project aims to help local people establish use rights over their traditional lands, and develop the economic potential of the land, while maintaining carbon stocks.” ⁹¹	<p>The project aimed to promote “sustainable livelihoods through sustainable agriculture, agroforestry and sustainable forest management practices for the maintenance of existing carbon stocks and for the sequestration of atmospheric carbon.”⁹²</p> <p>In addition, the project planned to promote CBNRM and resolve land tenure issues “through building the capacity of local government and people on land use planning and</p>

		<p>institutional capacity as well as facilitating dialogue between the two parties”.⁹³</p> <p>The project was able to achieve many expected outputs benefiting local communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- “Village profiles, from baseline survey and participatory rural appraisal (PRA), used to identify priority livelihood needs and for the preparation of land use plans for communities, including CBNRM and Agroforestry/LEISA, and active CBOs for project activities.- Village boundaries defined, mapped and officially recognized for villages, based on traditional concepts of land ownership, and used as the basis for village land use maps.- Increased institutional and local capacity leading to the development of a management system for key forest resources, which is officially recognized by national, provincial and district governments, and that improves livelihood security and increases carbon sequestration.- Increased institutional and local capacity leading to the identification and adoption of suitable agroforestry/LEISA technologies through participatory technology development (PTD), that results in improved household livelihoods and increased carbon sequestration.”⁹⁴
--	--	---

<p>“Kapas Hulu” (FORCLIME)⁹⁵</p>	<p>The Project “to create effective nature conservation, natural resource management and the improvement of the basic conditions of life for poor communities dependent on forests in selected districts in the Heart of Borneo are implemented by relevant stakeholders”⁹⁶</p>	<p>Proposed project activities include “the reclassification of forest conversion areas, the mapping of customary forest rights, the development of a multi-stakeholder forest management system, capacity building and the development of local benefit sharing mechanisms.”⁹⁷</p> <p>As of 2015, the project had facilitated the “[t]he process of village management plan, conducted “[c]apacity building for village forest management board including support for the legal drafting of village regulations”, supported “[o]fficial acknowledgement of village forest management areas [...] by national and local government” in the Manua Sadap and Nanga Lauk village.⁹⁸</p> <p>“Forest land use conflicts based on overlapping claims between communities and public as well as private sector actors have been analyzed in 5 villages in Kapuas Hulu [...] and conflict mediation and resolution mechanisms have been initiated in cooperation with the GIZ Forest Governance Programme and NGOs.”⁹⁹</p> <p>The project has also participated in the analysis of the “socio-economic vulnerability for forest dependent communities towards climate change impacts” conducted in “64 villages in the districts of Kapuas Hulu, Malinau and Berau.”¹⁰⁰</p> <p>In the future, the project expects to support the “finalization of village forest long term management plan and the annual workplan”, “[s]upport PES initiatives through ecotourism development within village forest”</p>
---	--	---

		and support “the capacity building of honey associations in Nanga Lauk village forest”, as well as support communities “in forest land conflict mediation processes via specific trainings and by setting up a conflict resolution forum”. ¹⁰¹
“Malinau Project” (FORCLIME)	The project’s aim is to “create effective nature conservation, natural resource management and the improvement of the basic conditions of life for poor communities dependent on forests in selected districts in the Heart of Borneo are implemented by relevant stakeholders.” ¹⁰²	<p>As of 2015, the project had introduced and discussed a CBFM model with community representatives, facilitated the “[t]he process of village management plan, conducted “[c]apacity building for village forest management board including support for the legal drafting of village regulations”, supported “[o]fficial acknowledgement of village forest management areas [...] by national and local government”, in the Setuland village, Malinau.¹⁰³</p> <p>The project has also participated in the analysis of the “socio-economic vulnerability for forest dependent communities towards climate change impacts” conducted in “64 villages in the districts of Kapuas Hulu, Malinau and Berau.”¹⁰⁴</p> <p>In the future, the project expects to support the “finalization of village forest long term management plan and the annual workplan” and “[s]upport PES initiatives through ecotourism development within village forest” in Setuland village.¹⁰⁵</p>
“Berau Project” (FORCLIME)	The project “to create effective nature conservation, natural resource management and the improvement of the basic conditions of life for poor communities dependent on forests in selected districts in the Heart of Borneo are	As of 2015, the project had initiated “[s]ustainable harvesting schemes for honey and the development of Trigona honey [...] for several villages [...] in Berau.” ¹⁰⁷

	implemented by relevant stakeholders.” ¹⁰⁶	<p>The project has also participated in the analysis of the “socio-economic vulnerability for forest dependent communities towards climate change impacts” conducted in “64 villages in the districts of Kapuas Hulu, Malinau and Berau,” and “[f]orest land use conflicts based on overlapping claims between communities and public as well as private sector actors have been analyzed in [...] 5 villages in Berau and conflict mediation and resolution mechanisms have been initiated in cooperation with the GIZ Forest Governance Programme and NGOs.”¹⁰⁸</p> <p>In the future the project expects to support “business incubators on NTFP development in selected villages within pilot FMUs – such as [...] wild honey in FMU Berau Barat.”¹⁰⁹</p>
“Jayapura REDD Pilot Project” (WWF-Indonesia, Jayapura District Government	Project is aiming to “[d]evelop low carbon development Program plan”, conduct “[c]ommunity tenure mapping”, “[p]reliminary assessment of land users and “[c]arbon accounting”, as well as influence community livelihoods. ¹¹⁰	<p>“The project will be based on the principles of customary community forest management rights and operate under the legal framework of a watershed based forest management unit (KPH) and/or ecological restoration concession.”¹¹¹</p> <p>As of 2011, project results included mapping of the “land rights of two community’s groups”, assessment of legal and tenure rights at Kabupaten level, mapping of “[p]reliminary carbon stock distribution and some trees equations” and setting up a “community cooperative and some income generation (cacao and community logging).”¹¹²</p> <p>In the future the project expected to “[f]acilitate to develop agreement between legal and community right</p>

		holders”, [a]ssist the provincial government to develop Perdasí on Forestry” and “[a]ssist the operation of community reduce impact logging.” ¹¹³
“REDD Project in Papua” (New Forests)	“The long-term aim of the project is to establish a model for forest conservation which delivers both conservation and local economic development, thus providing an alternative to agribusiness conversion of forests, which is happening in other parts of the province.” ¹¹⁴	<p>The project aims to “ensure community benefits, including maintenance of customary land tenure, access to forest resources, participatory project design and sharing of carbon revenue via an endowed charitable foundation.”¹¹⁵</p> <p>“These objectives will be pursued throughout the Free, Prior and Informed Consent process and project implementation. [...] Community mapping will also reinforce customary land tenure. A portion of carbon revenues will endow a local charitable foundation, which will be created to administer ongoing conservation and social programs under the guidance of an Advisory Committee, including local community members.”¹¹⁶</p>

3. Data Collected on the Implications of REDD+ Projects for Indigenous and Community Rights in Tanzania

We collected data on ten REDD+ projects pursued in Tanzania.¹¹⁷ The following table provides an overview of the purpose of these REDD+ projects and their actual or potential implications for the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

Project Title & Proponent	Project Purpose	Implications for Indigenous and Community Rights
“Advancing REDD in the Kolo Hills Forests,” (African Wildlife Foundation)	The project aimed to “support targeted communities and district government partners in the Kondo District, Tanzania, to prepare for participation in voluntary and (when available) official REDD markets based on high-value, well conserved forest resources, and effective joint forestry management.” ¹¹⁸	<p>As a result of the project, village land use plans were “registered” and “completed in 19 villages.”¹¹⁹</p> <p>The project had the impact of “strengthening the rights of local people and including them in the management plans of nearby forests owned by the government and by assisting communities to obtain access and management rights of forests located on village land.”¹²⁰</p> <p>The project “had a positive impact on livelihoods through sustainable agriculture in all of the project villages.”¹²¹ However, the project “has a negative short-term impact on cattle-owners as well as on the poorest, most forest dependent people in the Kolo Hills Villages.”¹²²</p>
“HIMA-Piloting REDD in Zanzibar through Community Forest Management” (Care International in	The project aimed to “promote a pro-poor and gender equitable approach to community forest management in Zanzibar, including piloting of carbon financing for Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD), which provides forest-dependent communities with secure property rights, equitable rewards for ecosystem services and other livelihood benefits (...).” ¹²³	<p>The project led to the development of 21 new community forestry management agreements,¹²⁴ and has introduced “some alternative livelihoods to compensate income loss from forestry” but “the number of participants is very low.”¹²⁵</p> <p>Overall the project has “not yet managed to reduce dependency on forests” but has “produced important co-benefits: [...] the improvement of land tenure through</p>

Tanzania)		<p>COFMAs, the improvement of biodiversity through protection of critical habitats [...] and the testing of local governance structures in COFMA planning and distribution of financial benefits in communities.”¹²⁶</p> <p>Upon completion, no carbon credits had been generated and the project has yet to finalise VCS and CCB validation.¹²⁷</p>
<p>“Building REDD Readiness in the Masito Ugalla Ecosystem Pilot Area in Support of Tanzania’s National REDD Strategy” (Jane Goodall Institute)</p>	<p>The project aimed to “build awareness and enhance capacity and governance mechanisms for local communities and government institutions to administer and benefit from REDD-related obligations and opportunities in the Masito Ugalla ecosystem in support of national REDD readiness.”¹²⁸</p>	<p>“The project achieved important outputs that demonstrated positive impacts on the livelihood of the participating communities by creating opportunities for income generation from alternative activities other than those that cause deforestation and forest degradation.”¹²⁹</p> <p>The project “facilitated the establishment of a community-based forest conservation organisation (JUWAMMA) to manage benefit-sharing with the communities and take responsibility for the initiative in the long run. UWAMMA meets and collaborates with village leaders and the district council and has responsibility for implementing forest management plans, organizing forest patrols and distributing any REDD+ revenues earned from carbon markets or a national forest carbon fund.”¹³⁰ But it was concluded that JUWAMMA’s continued operation is doubtful “in the absence of financial support and in fact the expected revenue from carbon sale.”¹³¹</p> <p>The project was implemented on general land “which now has a participatory forest management (PFM) plan” as “part of the efforts to regulate the access to the resources in the forest.”¹³²</p>

		<p>However, “the issue of ownership and land tenure is unresolved,”¹³³ posing “a risk for the accreditation of carbon rights in the area.”¹³⁴ Thus, “the expected generation of income from carbon credits was not realized.”¹³⁵</p>
<p>“Combining REDD, PFM, and FSC Certification in South Eastern Tanzania” (Mpingo Conservation and Development Initiative)</p>	<p>The project aimed to “pilot the integration of new financial flows from carbon offsetting activities under REDD with PFM and forest certification, leveraging these revenues as a catalyst to further expand sustainable forest management and use in SE Tanzania.”¹³⁶</p> <p>“The initiative’s key goals are to promote sustainable forest management and support community development. Activities designed to achieve these goals include the establishment of village forest reserves and development of livelihood alternatives in the communities. The initiative seeks to reduce emissions from forest fires by preventive early burning (also known as prescribed burning) of the miombo woodlands, thus reducing fuel load and avoiding larger wildfires.”¹³⁷</p>	<p>As of 2012, the project had strengthened “the rights of local people by assisting communities to obtain access and management rights of forests located on village land, a component of establishing sharing agreements and forest monitoring.”¹³⁸</p> <p>Upon completion, “PFM [was] fully operational with revenue earned from timber sales in 5 villages” with “PFM expansion complete in 4 further villages” with “revenue generation [...] set to begin in 2015”.¹³⁹</p> <p>Community based forest management was fulfilled in three villages only and not all village land use plans were finalized.¹⁴⁰ Some VLOP’s showed “that village boundaries were inconsistent with those mapped by the Ministry of lands in 2006, which led to inter-village boundary disputes and further delays in finalizing VLUPs”, leading one village to drop the project all together.¹⁴¹</p> <p>Whereas “The MCDI was not designed to generate carbon payments to communities as compensation for their forest management efforts but to use the payments for the NGO to expand PFM”, the “MCDI calculated correctly that in Kilwa certified timber sales from</p>

		<p>community forests offer a greater benefit to communities than carbon markets.”¹⁴²</p> <p>Although “income distribution became more unequal in both MCDI and control villages” the “level and distribution of knowledge on forest management and overall household wealth [...] improved in MCDI supported villages.”¹⁴³ Where PFM was completed, “85% of households stated they had benefited as a result of the project”.¹⁴⁴</p>
<p>“Community-Based REDD Mechanisms for Sustainable Forest Management in Semi-Arid Areas” (Tanzania Traditional Energy Development Organisation)</p>	<p>The project aimed to “assist 6,000 Ngitili owners in ten villages of Shinyanga rural and Kahama districts to establish a robust local institutional framework that effectively manages and restores Ngitilis to capture the benefit arising from REDD.”¹⁴⁵</p> <p>“The basic strategy was to integrate REDD+ with the <i>ngitili</i> system by establishing an institutional framework for managing restored <i>ngitilis</i> to capture benefits arising from REDD+. Specifically, the initiative sought to mobilize and assist <i>ngitili</i> owners to form and legally establish <i>ngitili</i> carbon groups and associations.”¹⁴⁶</p>	<p>As of 2012, the project “engaged the sungu sungu patrol groups and the Kitongiji leadership councils as well as leaders at the village and ward level including ngitili owners and women groups in developing land use plans and management regimes. It also helped formalize customary land rights of ngitili owners in a comprehensive manner as village leadership structures, women groups, and elders councils were engaged. The project created a series of ngitili carbon associations that will implement and manage the REDD projects. To date the project has trained 341 villagers on association management which has allowed 11 ngitili groups to be registered and awarded certificates. Also land use management bylaws for 11 project villages have been developed and currently 9 have been endorsed and are being implemented.”¹⁴⁷</p> <p>“To address these challenges associated with customary tenure, the proponents helped local households to formalize their land claims by getting certificates of the customary right of occupancy. This involved surveying the villages to identify the owner of each <i>ngitili</i> and</p>

		<p>registering the <i>ngitilis</i> with the village and district councils. However, challenges remain, including both encroachment by neighbors (in SHIN1 and SHIN4) and the arrival of new mining companies operating under a different legal framework in Shinyanga.”¹⁴⁸</p> <p>“The initiative allows village governments to benefit because of their role in supporting individual households in their particular village. A benefit-sharing arrangement was proposed whereby a share of 83% goes to the individual <i>ngitili</i> (REDD+ forest) owners, 7% goes to the village government, 5% goes to the <i>ngitili</i> group in the village for operational costs and 2% goes to the <i>ngitili</i> group association. Under this proposal, the village security committee (<i>sungu sungu</i>) who are responsible for enforcing by-laws and protecting <i>ngitili</i>, would also get 3% of benefits.”¹⁴⁹</p> <p>The project “explored mechanisms for integrating REDD+ with a customary land management system. Households with <i>ngitilis</i> have customary ownership of the land and hence relatively clear ownership status, but their lands and carbon stocks are too small for them to individually sell carbon credits. The initiative has pioneered a system of aggregating them into <i>ngitili</i> groups, which could sell carbon offsets once the initiative has developed its REL and been validated. TaTEDO helped set the rules and by-laws governing these <i>ngitili</i> groups, including a detailed benefit-sharing mechanism that bases the payment amount on the performance of the <i>ngitili</i> owners. The fact that these groups are small has facilitated</p>
--	--	--

		the decision-making process.” ¹⁵⁰
<p>“Making REDD work for Communities and Forest Conservation in Tanzania” (Tanzania Forest Conservation Group)</p>	<p>The project aimed to “demonstrate, at local, national, and international levels a pro-poor approach to reducing deforestation and forest degradation by generating equitable financial incentives from the global carbon market for communities that are sustainably managing or conserving Tanzanian forests at a sub- national level.”¹⁵¹</p>	<p>As of 2012, the project had established 16 new village forest reserves and facilitated the development of village by-laws and land use plans to govern these village forest reserves.¹⁵² In Lindi, one of the two regions in which the project had been implemented, 10 new village forest reserves were found to have been established by the spring of 2014. All ten of these villages also developed village land use plans and forest by-laws. Due to its positive impacts for the land rights and security of villagers, its benefits for local livelihoods, and the participatory manner in which it was developed, this project was reported as having generated exceptional community benefits under the Gold Level Standard of the third edition of the CCB Standards.¹⁵³ As of 2015, this standard was again confirmed,¹⁵⁴ and the project continued to have a significant positive effect on village governance in participating villages.¹⁵⁵</p> <p>“The project has strengthened land and natural resource tenure security of villages through the establishment of VLFRs, demarcation of village boundaries, development of VLUPs and establishment of village land offices in all villages.”¹⁵⁶ However, “village land certificates have yet to be issued (in all but two villages), which is a necessary condition for village level land adjudication processes such as individual land titling. As such, village land registries have not yet become operational and legally mandated.”¹⁵⁷</p>

		<p>“Changes in municipal boundaries in Lindi have also impacted land tenure security for two villages within the project area, which are consequently no longer covered by the provisions of the village land act.”¹⁵⁸</p> <p>“Despite positive impacts on reducing deforestation some of the visited villages continue to struggle with managing land use within their village areas. [...] A weakness in local governance such as tension between the village natural resource committee (VNRC) and the village government in some villages has [...] contributed to the lack of effective enforcement.”¹⁵⁹</p>
“Piloting REDD in Pugu Kazimzumbwi Forests Reserves” (Wildlife Conservation Society of Tanzania)	The project aimed to ensure that “Pugu Kazimzumbwi Forest Ecosystem is properly managed, supports surrounding community livelihood and provides ecosystem services.” ¹⁶⁰	As of 2012, the project was working towards to the conclusion of Joint Forest Management agreements with the eight villages in the area. ¹⁶¹ However, the project had made little progress in resolving land tenure issues and had resulted in “[i]llegal encroachers” having been removed from forest reserve areas.” ¹⁶² Due to its inability to resolve land conflicts, the project was suspended and its management was handed over to the Tanzanian Forest Service. ¹⁶³
“Enhancing Tanzanian Capacity to Deliver Short and Long Term Data on Forest Carbon Stocks across the Country” (World	The project aimed “to contribute core data to the Tanzanian national MRV system that forms a part of the comprehensive forest carbon monitoring system for the country, and build capacity for sustainability in the future.” ¹⁶⁴	“The project was not specifically designed to address REDD Readiness at local level but focused on national level. However, there were some activities undertaken at the local level with participation of local communities on establishing Permanent Sample Plots (PSPs). In some locations, the project has established PSPs in Village Land Forest Reserves. The project has worked with District Authorities and Village Committees ensuring participation by communities during the establishment of the plots.

Wide Fund for Nature Tanzania Country Office)		<p>Specifically, field team contacted village leaders and requested them to select five villagers including women to participate in carbon assessment.”¹⁶⁵</p> <p>“[...] training was arranged on methodology for carbon assessment for district staff and villagers in two different locations in Rufiji and Mbeya regions (20 participants). Later the training became on-the-job training: the project enhanced the capacity at the local level by providing opportunity for local community members to learn by doing in the field. Three to five villagers from the nearest village to each sample plot attended this activity.”¹⁶⁶; “30 villagers and 25 district staff participated in field assessments through training and learning by doing.”¹⁶⁷</p> <p>“The project has strengthened the rights of local people by including them in the establishment of plots and carbon measurements. However, as the project has limited local level activities regarding land-use planning, forest reserve demarcation, or income generating activities, impact on rights-holders or land tenure has been minimal.”¹⁶⁸</p>
“Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) Readiness in Southwest Tanzania”	The project aimed to “design and carry out a robust baseline study to provide methods for estimating deforestation, carbon sequestration, emissions and leakage in southwest Tanzania’s four most important forests covering 52,680 hectares.” ¹⁶⁹	<p>“Local people had been involved from the very beginning where WCS officials visited the site and presented the REDD concept to the village. Village leaders were the first to receive education on REDD initiatives which later on through a village general assembly, all community members were formally informed and provided opportunity to questions.”¹⁷⁰</p> <p>“The project used a range of incentives to generate</p>

(Wildlife Conservation Society)		<p>benefits from the REDD+ project including indigenous reforestation and woodlot establishment through the distribution of free seedlings, beekeeping through provision of hives, training and marketing support, and training and pilot provision of improved firewood stoves.”¹⁷¹ Although “WCS have made substantial progress on supporting beekeeping as a profitable enterprise [...] during the REDD+ pilot this has been at limited scale. Very few of the other interventions generated significant benefits at scale while the quality of roll out was variable.”¹⁷²</p> <p>“Communities have primarily been involved in carbon monitoring as a form of employment as a “guide” rather than as a participant to learn forest inventory and carbon mensuration skills.”¹⁷³</p> <p>“The project has built on existing relationships and activities and is progressively enhancing existing forest conservation efforts, demonstrating success in reducing fires through community based fire management.”¹⁷⁴</p> <p>“There is no evidence to suggest that this project had any impact on governance and tenure and this was never a proposed impact in the original project design [...] WCS facilitated the establishment of VECs in the target villages, the focus of the project support was provided through environmental and conservation education not governance coaching per se [...] According to field interviews the WCS team did not play a role in facilitating the development of village bylaws but this was initiated by</p>
---------------------------------	--	---

		<p>the VECs themselves.”¹⁷⁵</p> <p>“WCS could consider facilitating the formalization of collaborative management arrangements with communities surrounding some of the protected areas, for which the policy framework provides opportunities [...] Current arrangements are not formalized and as such do not provide any legal basis for the engagement of communities in the protection of the resource.”¹⁷⁶</p>
<p>“Yaeda Valley Forest Carbon Project” (Carbon Tanzania)</p>	<p>The project “works with hunter-gatherer Hadzabe and pastoralist communities in Mongo Wa Mono and Domanga villages” and “strengthens land tenure, management capacity and local natural resource management, enhances and diversifies local incomes, and contributes to local, national and global environmental conservation aims.”¹⁷⁷</p>	<p>The basic approach underlying this project “is a fundamental respect for local community land rights; this approach generates significant and sustained local economic benefits that incentivize and enable communities to conserve their immediate environment on which their way of life depends. It simultaneously contributes to preserving their traditional way of life and affords local communities increased options for how they manage their land.”¹⁷⁸</p> <p>The project’s 2014-2015 monitoring results show that “[l]and use plan and associated by laws are documented and implemented. Boundaries are clear and well understood. Community rights over land is secure through Community Customary Rights of Occupancy (CCRO).”¹⁷⁹ Moreover, “[u]ser rights over forest based resources are enacted through national laws and acts governing natural resource use. Knowledge of these laws and acts is understood by participating communities.”¹⁸⁰</p> <p>As of 2015, two communities have signed plan vivos and</p>

		<p>Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) agreements and the project has made PES payments totalling 61, 173USD to these communities.¹⁸¹</p> <p>“Community participation has been on-going throughout the 2014 - 2015 project period. Carbon Tanzania has bi-annual financial planning and conflict resolution meetings with the community in May and October every year (see figure 9).”¹⁸² “This forum involves all community members and village government and allows for discussion on what money should be spent on and any problems arising from within the community.”¹⁸³</p> <p>In 2015, there were “24 individuals within the community directly employed, 2 project coordinators (one per village) who report directly to Carbon Tanzania. 20 Walinzi Wajadi (village scouts) who patrol the project area and collect data that feeds into this report (section 5) and 2 Mlezi (literally a counsellor), community elders who advise, coordinate and represent the walinzi wajadi.”¹⁸⁴</p>
--	--	--

¹ The data-set of REDD+ projects was developed on the basis of a list of REDD+ projects compiled by the REDD+ Desk: REDD+ Desk, “Database of REDD+ Countries” available at: <[http://theredddesk.org/countries/search-countries-database?f\[0\]=field_locations%3A158&f\[1\]=type%3Aactivity&f\[2\]=field_project%3A1](http://theredddesk.org/countries/search-countries-database?f[0]=field_locations%3A158&f[1]=type%3Aactivity&f[2]=field_project%3A1)> (accessed on 4 December 2014). We excluded two projects from this list because they were no longer operational (“Sumatra Forest Carbon Partnership” (Australian Department of Climate Change & AUSAID)). We also added one project that was not included in the list compiled by the REDD+ Desk, but which is discussed in a CIFOR study of REDD+ projects (see Erin Sills, Erin Myers Madeira, William D. Sunderlin, & Sheila Wertz-Kanounnikoff, “The Evolving Landscape of REDD+ Projects in Arild Angelsen, ed, *Realising REDD+. National Strategy and Policy Options* (Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR, 2009) 265 namely “Ketapang Community Carbon Pools” (Fauna & Flora International).

² The REDD Desk, “Berau Forest Carbon Program,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/berau-forest-carbon-program>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Ministry of Forestry, Government of Indonesia & The Nature Conservancy, “Berau Forest Carbon Program: Delivering Practical Solutions to Support Development of a National-level REDD Framework in Indonesia,” at 9, available at: <http://www.law.harvard.edu/programs/about/pifs/symposia/fcfs/2010-fcfs-briefing-materials/fishbein_forest_carbon.pdf> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁵ Cut Augusta Mindry Anandi *et al.*, “TNC’s initiative within the Berau Forest Carbon Program, East Kalimantan, Indonesia” in Erin O Sills *et al.*, eds, *REDD+ on the Ground. A Casebook of Subnational Initiatives across the Globe* (Bogor Barat, Indonesia: CIFOR, 2014) 362 at 368-369.

⁶ *Ibid.* at 378.

⁷ Early Lessons from Jurisdictional REDD+ and Low Emissions Development Programs, by Greg Fishbein and Donna Lee. Rep. Arlington, January 2015, available at: <http://www.nature.org/media/climatechange/REDD+_LED_Programs.pdf> (accessed on 11 June 2015)

⁸ The REDD Desk, “Berbak Carbon Initiative,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/berbak-carbon-initiative>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁹ ZSL Conservation, “Berbak Carbon Initiative: Harnessing Carbon to Conserve Biodiversity” (May 2010), available at: ZSL <<http://static.zsl.org/files/berbak-info-sheet-may-2010-1113.pdf>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

¹⁰ Darwin Initiative, “Darwin Initiative: Final Report” (July 2012) at 10, available at: <<http://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/documents/17029/23095/17-029%20FR%20-%20Edited.pdf>> (accessed on 11 June 2016).

¹¹ *Ibid.* at 4.

¹² *Ibid.* at 16.

¹³ *Ibid.* at 21.

¹⁴ The REDD Desk, “Gunung Palung – Sungai Putri Ecological Corridor,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/gunung-palung-%E2%80%93-sungai-putri-ecological-corridor>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ The REDD Desk, “Biodiversity Conservation through Preparatory Measures for Avoided Deforestation,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/biodiversity-conservation-through-preparatory-measures-avoided-deforestation>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

¹⁷ Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, “Merang REDD Pilot Project,” at 8-9, available at: <<http://redd-database.iges.or.jp/redd/download/project;jsessionid=5C0036437EDF5263732AC65CF770F8ED?id=59>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

¹⁸ International Climate Initiative, “Biodiversity Conservation Through Preparatory Measures For Avoided Deforestation (REDD+) In Merang Peat Swamp Forests,” (April 2013), available at: <<http://www.international-climate-initiative.com/en/projects/projects/details/biodiversity-conservation-through-preparatory-measures-for-avoided-deforestation-redd-in-merang-peat-swamp-forests-269/>> (accessed on 11 June 2016).

¹⁹ The REDD Desk, “Promoting Partnership Efforts to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation of Tropical Peatland in South Sumatra through the Enhancement of Conservation and Restoration Activities,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/promoting-partnership-efforts-reduce-emissions-deforestation-and-forest>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

²⁰ Ministry of Forestry & IITTO, “Promoting partnership efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation of tropical peatland in south Sumatra through the enhancement of conservation and restoration activities” (Completion Report, IITTO-RED-SPD 009/09 Rev. 2(F)) (2013), available at: <http://www.itto.int/files/itto_project_db_input/2953/Completion/Completion%20Report%20of%20the%20IITTO%20RED-SPD%20009-09%20Rev.2%28F%29.pdf> (accessed on 4 December 2014) at v

²¹ The REDD Desk, “Ulu Masen Ecosystem Project,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/ulu-masen-ecosystem-project>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

²² Anandi *et al.*, *supra* note 5 at 380.

²³ SmartWood, “Validation Audit Report for: Provincial Government of Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam – Fauna & Flora International – Carbon Conservation in Ulu Masen Ecosystem (Aceh Province, Indonesia),” (17 January 2008), available at: <http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/sites/default/files/climate_project/CarbonConservation_assessment.pdf> (accessed on 4 December 2014) at 43.

²⁴ Anandi *et al.*, *supra* note 5 at 388.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid* at 389.

²⁷ The REDD Desk, “Poigar Forest, North Sulawesi,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/poigar-forest-north-sulawesi>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

²⁸ Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, “Forest Land Use and Climate Change in North Sulawesi (FLUCC) in the Poigar Forest,” available at: <<http://redd-database.iges.or.jp/redd/download/project?id=21>> (accessed on 4 December 2014) at 4.

²⁹ ONF International, “REDD in North Sulawesi- KPH Poigar Project” (2009), available at: <[http://forestclimatecenter.org/redd/2009-03-24%20REDD%20in%20North%20Sulawesi%20-%20KPH%20Poigar%20Project%20\(by%20ONF%20International\).pdf](http://forestclimatecenter.org/redd/2009-03-24%20REDD%20in%20North%20Sulawesi%20-%20KPH%20Poigar%20Project%20(by%20ONF%20International).pdf)> (accessed on June 11, 2016) at 10.

³⁰ *Ibid* at 4.

³¹ *Ibid* at 9.

³² The REDD Desk, “Mawas Peatland Conservation Project,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/mawas-peatland-conservation-project>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

³³ Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, “Mawas Peatlands Conservation Area Project,” available at: <<http://redd-database.iges.or.jp/redd/download/project?id=13>> at 5-6 (accessed on 4 December 2014).

³⁴ The REDD Desk, “Adaptive and Carbon-Financed Forest Management in Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/adaptive-and-carbon-financed-forest-management-tropical-rainforest-heritage>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ UNESCO, “Adaptive and Carbon-Financed Forest Management in the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra” (2011), available at: <<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002198/219893E.pdf>> (accessed on 4 December 2014) at 16.

³⁷ Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety, “International Climate Initiative (IKI): Forest Management financed through emission certificates in UNESCO world heritage site “Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra” (April 2013) available at: <<http://www.international-climate-initiative.com/en/projects/projects/details/forest-management-financed-through-emission-certificates-in-unesco-world-heritage-site-tropical-rainforest-heritage-of-sumatra-270/?b=2,0,0,0,1>> (accessed on 17 June 2016).

³⁸ The REDD Desk, “REDD and Enhancing Carbon Stocks in Meru Betiri National Park, Java,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/redd-and-enhancing-carbon-stocks-meru-betiri-national-park-java>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

³⁹ Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, “Tropical Forest Conservation for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation and Enhancing Carbon Stocks in Meru Betiri National Park, Indonesia,” available at: <<http://redd-database.iges.or.jp/redd/download/project;jsessionid=5C0036437EDF5263732AC65CF770F8ED?id=86>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁴⁰ The REDD Desk, “REDD Project in Kutai Barat, West Kalimantan,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/redd-project-kutai-barat-west-kalimantan>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁴¹ WWF, “Maintaining the Heart of Borneo’s Forests for People and the Planet” (October 2011), available at: Forest Carbon Asia <<http://www.forestcarbonasia.org/tag/kutai-barat/>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ WWF, “Fact Sheet: WWF Forest and Climate Programme, REDD+ Inspiring Practices: Building REDD= Readiness through participatory land use mapping and planning in Indonesia” (2014) available at: <http://d2ouvy59p0dg6k.cloudfront.net/downloads/final_ip_indo_land_map_english__web.pdf> (accessed on June 17, 2016) at 2.

⁴⁴ *Ibid* at 5.

⁴⁵ *Ibid*.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*.

⁴⁷ Forest Climate Center, “Mitigation of Climate Change through Promotion of Community-Based Economic Growth,” available at: <<http://forestclimatecenter.org/map.php?cnt=International&lang=English&ID=40>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁴⁸ Forest Climate Center, “Mitigation of Climate Change through Promotion of Community-Based Economic Growth,” available at: <<http://forestclimatecenter.org/map.php?cnt=International&lang=English&ID=40>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁴⁹ NYEEMA Foundation, “Project Support document: Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) Activity in Nusa Tenggara Timur, Indonesia: The TEBE Project for the Mutis-Timau Forest Complex,” available at: <http://theredddesk.org/sites/default/files/tebe_indonesia_update_1712092_2.pdf> (accessed on June 17, 2016) at 2.

⁵⁰ The REDD Desk, “Leuser Ecosystem REDD Project,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/leuser-ecosystem-redd-project>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁵¹ Global Eco Rescue, “Project info: Leuser Ecosystem REDD Project: Avoided Deforestation, Biodiversity Conservation and Development. REDD Desk” (21 December 2010), available at: <http://theredddesk.org/sites/default/files/2010-12-21_moforestry_workshop_-_global_eco-rescue_project_info_data_sheet.pdf> (accessed on June 11 2016) at 5.

⁵² The REDD Desk, *supra* note 50.

⁵³ Governors’ Climate & Forest (GCF), “Aceh Province REDD Progress Update”, GCF meeting, Banda Aceh May 2010. Available at: <<http://forestclimatecenter.org/redd/2010-05%20Presentation%20-%20Aceh%20Province%20REDD%20Progress%20Update.pdf>> (accessed on June 17, 2016) at slide 8.

⁵⁴ Forest Climate Center, “Kampar Carbon Reserve Project,” available at: <<http://forestclimatecenter.org/map.php?cnt=International&lang=English&ID=35>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁵⁵ Forest Peoples Programme, “Sumatra: Update on RAPP’s Activities in the Kampar Peninsula, Riau,” Rights, Forests and Climate Briefing Series (October 2011), available at: <<http://www.forestpeoples.org/sites/fpp/files/publication/2011/10/kampar-peninsula-briefing-5.pdf>> (accessed on 4 December 2014) at 2.

⁵⁶ The REDD Desk, “Sulbar Habitat, West Sulawesi,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/sulbar-habitat-west-sulawesi>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁵⁷ *Ibid*.

⁵⁸ Keep the Habitat, “Mamuju Habitat” (May 2009), available at: <<http://www.youblisher.com/p/232966-Keep-the-Habitat-document/>> (accessed on June 11, 2016) at 11.

⁵⁹ The REDD Desk, “Tesso Nilo Bukit Tigapuluh REDD Project,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/tesso-nilo-bukit-tigapuluh-redd-project>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁶⁰ World Growth, Chapter 5: “Case Study: Failure of Protected Areas” in ‘REDD Conservation: Avoiding The New Road To Serfdom: A World Growth Report’ (December 2010), available at: <http://worldgrowth.org/site/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/WG_REDD_Conservation_Report_12_10.pdf> (accessed on June 11 2016) at 27.

⁶¹ The REDD Desk, “Avoided Deforestation Project in Malinau, East Kalimantan,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/avoided-deforestation-project-malinau-east-kalimantan>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁶² Forest Climate Center, “Malinau Avoided Deforestation Project,” available at: <<http://forestclimatecenter.org/map.php?cnt=International&lang=English&ID=13>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁶³ Global Eco Rescue, “Project Info: Avoided Deforestation and Resource-Based Community Development” (21 December 2010), available at: <http://theredddesk.org/sites/default/files/2010-12-21_moforestry_workshop_-_global_eco-rescue_project_info_data_sheet.pdf> (accessed on June 11 2016) at 3.

⁶⁴ The REDD Desk, “Community Carbon Measurement in Kutai Barat,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/community-carbon-measurement-kutai-barat>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁶⁵ WWF, “Community Carbon Measurement in Kutai Barat” (December 2011), available at: <<http://wwf.panda.org/?202843/Community-Carbon-Measurement-in-Kutai-Barat>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ WWF Forest and Climate Programme, “Empowering Communities Through Participatory Carbon Measurement in Indonesia” (2014), available at: <http://d2ouvy59p0dg6k.cloudfront.net/downloads/final_ip_indo_carbon_measurement_web.pdf> (accessed on June 11 2016) at 4.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ The REDD Desk, “Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/rimba-raya-biodiversity-reserve-project>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁷¹ Environmental Services, Inc. “Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (Second Edition – December 2008) Project Verification Report: Rimba Raya Biodiversity Reserve Project – M2,” (09 January 2014), available at: <https://s3.amazonaws.com/CCBA/Projects/Rimba_Raya_Project/Verification/048_01+Rimba+Raya-CCBA+Verification_Report-Final_09Jan2014.pdf> (accessed on 4 December 2014) at 43.

⁷² *Ibid.* at 42.

⁷³ *Ibid.* at 35-36. But see Yayan Indriatmoko *et al.*, “Katingan Peatland Restoration and Conservation Project, Central Kalimantan, Indonesia,” in Sills *et al.*, *supra* note 5, 309 at 360 (arguing that potential restrictions that the project may oppose on forest use “may conceivably have negative livelihood implications for local people because it limits their forest access and rights to change land uses, including to oil palm.”)

⁷⁴ The REDD Desk, “Katingan Peat Forest Restoration Project, Central Kalimantan,” available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/katingan-peat-forest-restoration-project-central-kalimantan>> (accessed on 4 December 2014).

⁷⁵ Indriatmoko *et al.*, *supra* note 73 at 315.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ PT. Rimba Makmur Utama, “VCS/CCB Summary Project Description: Katingan Peatland Restoration and Conservation Project” (6 august 2015), available at: <http://database.v-c-s.org/sites/v-c-s.org/files/2015-09-01%20Summary%20PDD_RMU.pdf> (accessed on June 13, 2016) at 15.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* at 8.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* at 9.

⁸¹ *Ibid.* at 14.

⁸² The REDD Desk, *supra* note 74.

⁸³ PT. Rimba Makmur Utama, *supra* note 77, at Cover Page note 10.

⁸⁴ Dian Yusvita Intarin *et al.*, “Ketapang Community Carbon Pools, West Kalimantan, Indonesia” in Sills *et al.*, *supra* note 5, 329 at 337-338.

⁸⁵ *Ibid* at 334-335.

⁸⁶ *Ibid* at 337.

⁸⁷ *Ibid* at 339.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*.

⁸⁹ Forest Climate Center, "Korea-Indonesia Joint Project for Adaptation and Mitigation of Climate Change in Forestry - REDD+ Project", available at: <<http://forestclimatecenter.org/map.php?cnt=International&lang=English&ID=41>> (accessed on June 13 2016).

⁹⁰ KOICA, “KOICA (KIPCCF) Project in Lombok: Korea-Indonesia Joint Project for Adaptation and Mitigation of Climate Change in Forestry Through A/R CDM and REDD in Indonesia” Presentation (21 June 2011), available at: <[http://forestclimatecenter.org/redd/2011-06-21%20Presentation%20-%20KOICA%20\(KIPCCF\)%20Project%20In%20Lombok.pdf](http://forestclimatecenter.org/redd/2011-06-21%20Presentation%20-%20KOICA%20(KIPCCF)%20Project%20In%20Lombok.pdf)> (accessed on 13 June 2016).

⁹¹ The REDD Desk, "Forest Resources Management for Carbon Sequestration," available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/forest-resources-management-carbon-sequestration>> (accessed in 13 June 2016).

⁹² *Ibid*.

⁹³ *Ibid*.

⁹⁴ Garry A. Shea, Ika Francisca & Anny Andaryati, “Gender and Climate Change in Indonesia” in Daniel Murdiyarso & Hety Herawati, “Carbon Forestry: who will benefit? – Proceedings of Workshop on Carbon Sequestration and Sustainable Livelihoods” (CIFOR: 2005), available at: <http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/Books/BMurdiyarso0501.pdf> (accessed on 13 June 2016) at 187.

⁹⁵ The Kapuas Hulu is a part of a group of three REDD pilot projects under FORCLIME, which fall under the Heart of Borneo Initiative (the other pilot projects are at Malinau and Berau).

⁹⁶ The REDD Desk, “Kapuas Hulu FORCLIME”, available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/kapuas-hulu-forclime>> (accessed on 13 June 2016).

⁹⁷ The REDD Desk, "Kapuas Hulu District", available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/kapuas-hulu-district>> (accessed on 13 June 2016).

⁹⁸ FORCLIME TC, “FORCLIME TC Module Briefing Note No.6: Community Based Forest Management" (March 2015), available at: <http://www.forclime.org/documents/Briefing%20Note/English/BR%206%20-%20CBFM_Eng.pdf> (accessed on 13 June 2016) at 4

⁹⁹ *Ibid*.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid* at 5.

¹⁰² The REDD Desk, “Malinau Project (FORCLIME)”, available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/malinau-project-forclime>> (accessed on 13 June 2016).

¹⁰³ FORCLIME TC, *supra* note 98.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid* at 5.

¹⁰⁶ The REDD Desk, “Berau Project (FORCLIME), available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/berau-project-forclime>> (accessed on 13 June 2016).

¹⁰⁷ FORCLIME TC, *supra* note 98.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid*.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid* at 5.

-
- ¹¹⁰ WWF, “REDD+ Project Development by WWF Indonesia,” Presented at the workshop on Surveys on Current Status of REDD+ in Indonesia, Kemenhut PKLN (11 October 2011), available at: <<http://forestclimatecenter.org/redd/2011-10-11%20Presentation%20-%20REDD+%20Project%20Development%20by%20WWF%20Indonesia.pdf>> (accessed on 13 June 2016).
- ¹¹¹ The REDD Desk, “Jayapura REDD Pilot Project”, available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/jayapura-redd-pilot-project>> (accessed on 13 June 2016).
- ¹¹² WWF, *supra* note 110.
- ¹¹³ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁴ The REDD Desk, “REDD Project in Papua”, available at: <<http://theredddesk.org/countries/initiatives/redd-project-papua>> (accessed on 13 June 2016).
- ¹¹⁵ New Forests, “The Papua REDD Project- Briefing Paper” (16 December 2010), available at: <http://theredddesk.org/sites/default/files/2010-12-16_the_papua_redd_project_-_briefing_paper_by_newforests.pdf> (accessed on 13 June 2016).
- ¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁷ These projects were funded through Norway’s bilateral agreement with Tanzania on REDD+. There is one non-governmental avoided deforestation project that has been developed without the funding and support of the Norwegian Government (Carbon Tanzania, “Yaeda Valley Forest Carbon Project” available at: <<http://www.carbontanzania.com/our-projects/yaeda-valley-redd-project/>> (accessed on 11 November 2014).
- ¹¹⁸ Deloitte, “Mid-term Review Report of Nine NGO REDD+ Pilot Projects in Tanzania – African Wildlife Foundation – Advancing REDD in the Kolo Hills Forests,” (13 August 2012) (on file with the author) at 4.
- ¹¹⁹ NIRAS Finland Oy, “Final Review of the Project- African Wildlife Foundation -Advancing REDD in the Kolo Hills forest” (June 2015) (on file with the author) at 11.
- ¹²⁰ *Ibid.* at 21.
- ¹²¹ *Ibid.* at 20.
- ¹²² *Ibid.* at 22.
- ¹²³ Deloitte, “Mid-term Review Report of Nine NGO REDD+ Pilot Projects in Tanzania – Jane Goodall Institute (JGI) – Building REDD Readiness in the Masito Ugalla Ecosystem Pilot Area in Support of Tanzania’s National REDD Strategy,” (15 August 2012) (on file with the author)
- ¹²⁴ NIRAS Finland Oy, “Final Review of the Project- Care International- Piloting REDD+ in Zanzibar through Community Forest Management” (June 2015) (on file with the author) at 33.
- ¹²⁵ *Ibid.* at 15.
- ¹²⁶ *Ibid.* at 18.
- ¹²⁷ *Ibid.* at 34.
- ¹²⁸ Deloitte, “Mid-term Review Report of Nine NGO REDD+ Pilot Projects in Tanzania. Care International in Tanzania – ‘HIMA-Piloting REDD in Zanzibar through Community Forest Management’” (16 August 2012) (on file with the author) at 4.
- ¹²⁹ INDUFOR, “End Review of JGI REDD+ Pilot Project – Final Report” (21 May 2014) (on file with the author) at 28.
- ¹³⁰ Demetrius L. Kweka, “Building REDD Readiness in the Masito Ugalla Ecosystem Pilot Area in Support of Tanzania’s National REDD Strategy” in Sills *et al.*, *supra* note 5, 222 at 224-225.
- ¹³¹ INDUFOR, “End Review of JGI REDD+ Pilot Project – Final Report” (21 May 2014) (on file with the author) at 21.
- ¹³² *Ibid.* at 2
- ¹³³ *Ibid.* at 20.
- ¹³⁴ *Ibid.* at 24.

¹³⁵ *Ibid* at 17.

¹³⁶ Deloitte, “Mid-term Review Report of Nine NGO REDD+ Pilot Projects in Tanzania. Mpingo Conservation and Development Initiative – ‘Combining Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD), Participatory Forest Management (PFM) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Certification in South Eastern Tanzania’” (17 August 2012) (on file with the author) at 4.

¹³⁷ Demetrius L. Kweka, “Mpingo Conservation and Development Initiative: Combining REDD, PFM and FSC certification in southeastern Tanzania” in Sills *et al.*, *supra* note 5, 261 at 266.

¹³⁸ Deloitte, *supra* note 136 at 11.

¹³⁹ NIRAS Finland Oy, “Final Review of the Project-MCDI –Combining REDD, PFM, and FSC Certification in South-Eastern Tanzania” (June 2015) (on file with the author) at 20.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid* at 15.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid* at 10.

¹⁴² *Ibid* at 26.

¹⁴³ *Ibid* at 22.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid* at 20.

¹⁴⁵ Deloitte, “Mid-term Review Report of Nine NGO REDD+ Pilot Projects in Tanzania. Tanzania Traditional Energy Development Organisation – ‘Community-Based REDD Mechanisms for Sustainable Forest Management in Semi-Arid Areas’” (13 August 2012) (on file with the author) at 5.

¹⁴⁶ Andina Auria Dwi Putri & Demetrius L. Kweka, “Pilot project on Community-Based REDD Mechanisms for Sustainable Forest Management in Semiarid Areas: The Case of Ngtilis in the Shinyanga Region, Tanzania” in Sills *et al.*, *supra* note 5, 272 at 276.

¹⁴⁷ Deloitte, *supra* note 145 at 6.

¹⁴⁸ Putri & Kweka, *supra* note 146 at 276-277.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid* at 277.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid* at 284.

¹⁵¹ Deloitte, “Mid-term Review Report of Nine NGO REDD+ Pilot Projects in Tanzania. Tanzania Forest Conservation Group – ‘Making REDD work for Communities and Forest Conservation in Tanzania’” (14 August 2012) (on file with the author) at 4.

¹⁵² *Ibid.* at 5-6. See also CCBA, “Mjumita Community Forest Project,” available at: <https://s3.amazonaws.com/CCBA/Projects/Mjumita_Community_Forest_Project/MJUMITA+Community+Forest+Project+Lindi+CCB+1st+PIR+060514.pdf> (accessed on 13 June 2016).

¹⁵³ MJUMITA, “MJUMITA Community Forest Project (Lindi), First Project Implementation Report For Verification Using the Climate, Community and Biodiversity (CCB), Project Design Standards Second Edition” (December 2013) (on file with the author).

¹⁵⁴ SCS Global Services, “Final CCBA Project Verification Report –‘MJUMITA Community Forest Project (Lindi)’” (22 May 2015), available at: <http://database.v-c-s.org/sites/v-c-s.org/files/CCB_MJUMITA_VerificationRpt_22052015.pdf> (accessed on 13 June 2016).

¹⁵⁵ NIRAS Finland Oy, “Final Review of the Project – TFCG- Making REDD+ and the Carbon Market work for Communities and Forest Conservation in Tanzania” (June 2015) (on file with the author) at 24

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid* at v.

¹⁶⁰ Deloitte, “Mid-term Review Report of Nine NGO REDD+ Pilot Projects in Tanzania. Wildlife Conservation Society of Tanzania – ‘Piloting REDD in Pugu Kazimzumbwi Forests Reserves,” (14 August 2012) (on file with the author) at 4.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid* at 3-4.

¹⁶² *Ibid* at 13.

¹⁶³ NORAD, “Real-Time Evaluation of Norway’s International Climate and Forest Initiative. Synthesising Report 2007-2013. Annexes 3-19. Report 3/2014” (August 2014), available at: <http://www.norad.no/no/evaluering/publikasjoner/publikasjon/_attachment/415168?_download=true&_ts=147e976c97e> (accessed on 6 October 2014) at 338.

¹⁶⁴ Deloitte, “Mid-term Review Report of Nine NGO REDD+ Pilot Projects in Tanzania. World Wide Fund for Nature Tanzania Country Office – ‘Enhancing Tanzanian Capacity to Deliver Short and Long Term Data on Forest Carbon Stocks across the Country” (16 August 2012) (on file with the author) at 4.

¹⁶⁵ NIRAS Finland Oy, “Final Review of the Project- WWF Tanzania- Enhancing Tanzanian Capacity to Deliver Short and Long Term Data on Forest Carbon Stocks across the Country” (June 2015) (on file with the author) at 3.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid* at 11.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid* at 26.

¹⁶⁸ Deloitte, *supra* note 164.

¹⁶⁹ Deloitte, “Mid-term Review Report of Nine NGO REDD+ Pilot Projects in Tanzania. Wildlife Conservation Society – ‘Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) Readiness in Southwest Tanzania,” (10 August 2012) (on file with the author) at 5.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid* at 13.

¹⁷¹ NIRAS Finland Oy, “Final Review of the Project-WCS- REDD+ Readiness in Southwest Tanzania” (June 2015) (on file with the author) at 15.

¹⁷² *Ibid*.

¹⁷³ *Ibid* at 14.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid* at 23.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid*. at 22.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid* at 24.

¹⁷⁷ Carbon Tanzania, “Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in the Yaeda Valley, Northern Tanzania. Project Design Document,” (January 2015) available at: <http://www.planvivo.org/docs/Yaeda_REDD_PDD_Jan15.pdf> (accessed on 21 April 2016).

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid* at 3.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid* at 15 & 23.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid*.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid* at 5.

¹⁸² *Ibid* at 19.

¹⁸³ *Ibid* at 20.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid*.