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Objective and structure of this document

The objective of this document is to provide a clear understanding of the scope and coverage of this safeguard and what IP and LCs should expect from national and subnational government led processes when demonstrating conformance with TREES indicators under this safeguard.

The analysis contained therein is based on the authors’ practical experience and international best practice. Direct quotations from TREES will be appropriately cited and quoted in italic.

This booklet is divided into two sections and associated questions:

- What is TREES Safeguard ‘F’ and how does it protect IP and LCs? This section will explain the scope and coverage of this safeguard, and how it recognizes and protects the rights of IP and LCs.
- What to expect when demonstrating conformance with TREES safeguard ‘F’? This section will explain what IP and LCs should expect from national and sub-national governments when demonstrating conformance with TREES indicators under this safeguard.
1. What is TREES Safeguards ‘F’ and how does it protect IPLCs?

As a reminder, TREES Safeguard F, and in alignment with Cancun safeguard F, calls for “Actions to address the risks of reversals”. This safeguard has one theme, the scope of which will be examine below:

- THEME 6.1 The risk of reversals is integrated in the design, prioritization, implementation, and periodic assessments of REDD+ policies and measures

THEME 6.1 The risk of reversals is integrated in the design, prioritization, implementation, and periodic assessments of REDD+ policies and measures

To address and respect this theme, national and sub national governments are expected to address the risk of reversals of emissions reductions into the design, prioritization, implementation and periodic assessments of REDD+ actions.

The scope of this theme is therefore to ensure that emission reductions or removals are durable and real, i.e. the net benefit of an action will remain fixed for a long period (i.e. not be reversed, sometimes referred to as “permanence”). It is important to consider that the risks of reversals will vary among countries, but may include issues of forest governance and insecure land tenure rights. In this sense, IP and LCs relevant rights and interests are therefore expected to be recognized under this safeguards theme when identifying and addressing these risks.
2. What to expect when demonstrating conformance with TREES safeguard ‘F’?

This section will explain what IP and LCs should expect from national and sub-national governments when demonstrating conformance with TREES indicators under this safeguard. Please note the TREES Safeguards Guidance document provides a prescriptive list of the validation and verification body’s (VVB) requirements for the provision of information on each safeguard\(^1\). This section is instead intended to provide a clear understanding for IP and LCs of the types of information they should expect to see from national and subnational government led processes when demonstrating conformance with TREES indicators under this safeguard, and which is most relevant to them.

As a reminder, under each theme TREES has three types of indicators that national and subnational governments would need to demonstrate conformance with. The guidance document from TREES states the following in relation to each type of indicator:

- **Structural Indicators:** demonstrate that relevant governance arrangements (e.g., policies, laws, and institutional arrangements) are in place in the country or applicable jurisdiction(s) to ensure that design and implementation of REDD+ actions is done in line with relevant safeguards theme. These arrangements may be part of the national or subnational legal framework or may be REDD+ specific arrangements.\(^2\)

- **Process Indicators:** demonstrate that appropriate processes, procedures or mechanisms are in place to enact and enforce the arrangements outlined in the Structural indicator.\(^3\)

- **Outcome Indicators:** demonstrate implementation outcomes for each theme are being monitored. For the outcome indicator for all themes, Participants will need to identify and describe the selected monitoring parameters including how a successful outcome is defined, monitoring methods to be used and a summary of collected data. If the data analysis does not indicate a successful outcome, a description of how the governance arrangements or supporting processes, procedures or mechanisms (structure or process indicators) will be modified should be included.\(^4\)

---


\(^3\)ibid
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Unlike the other safeguards, safeguard F only has one indicator, at the process level.

In this regard, based on best practices, IP and LCs should expect to see:

- A full breakdown of the relevant public institutions in place for the REDD+ actions and associated mandates relevant to this theme.
- Description of any processes and procedures executed with regards to this theme, in particular any activities/processes undertaken to identify risks of reversals, and how the rights and interests of IP and LCs have been integrated into these processes.