

Grading for ER-PIN Assessments:

Color	Qualification	Analysis
Green	The indicator is clearly addressed and supported by country stakeholders and other sources of evidence;	Reasons for attributed grade should be clearly stated and supported by evidence.
Yellow	The indicator is partially addressed, ER-PIN claims are contested, and/or supporting evidence is weak;	
Red	The indicator is not addressed or is mentioned but not defined/explained, nor supported by evidence and local stakeholder input.	

Section 1: ADVANCING INDIGENOUS AND COMMUNITY RIGHTS TO LAND AND FORESTS: To what extent does the proposed emission reduction program protect and advance the rights of Indigenous Peoples (IP) and local communities (LC) to land and forests within REDD+ systems and processes?

1) Stakeholder participation in ER-PIN planning and ERP design

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
Yellow	1a) The ER-PIN design process shows evidence of full and effective engagement of locally affected populations and vulnerable groups, including women, indigenous peoples and local communities	Community leaders and women’s organizations are listed as participants without specific reference. Commenting on the R-PP process, CIFOR mentioned that there have been irregularities, such as corruption and low level of representation in consultation process, particularly of women. ⁱ The ER-PIN design process did not sufficiently address the issues low representation identified by CIFOR.
Red	1b) The ER-PIN presents a clear and realistic approach for ensuring IP/LC involvement in the design and implementation of the full ER Program	The ER-PIN lists 8 community consultations that should have been conducted by the end of 2015. With the exception of the meeting in Quelimane, these meetings are not listed as having been concluded on Mozambique’s official REED+ website ⁱⁱ . The ER-PIN is very vague in what regards participation of local communities in the design and implementation phases (see for example ER-PIN, pp.23-24, p.34; 40). Furthermore, Mozambique does not officially recognize the existence of IP within the country (ER-PIN , p.34).

2) Land and forest tenure

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	2a) Robust tenure assessments (i.e., assessment takes into account customary and legal land hold, disputed areas, challenges, etc) in the geographical area of the proposed ER Program were conducted as part of the SESA	No, SESA was not concluded. Also, although Mozambique has relatively progressive legislation recognizing community land rights, the ER-PIN identifies some issues that will need to be addressed, in particular the harmonization of DUATs (Direito de Uso e Aproveitamento da Terra), or the legal right to use and benefit from the land, and the legal right to use and benefit from the forests, which could be abbreviated as DUAF (Direito de Uso e Aproveitamento Florestal) (ER-PIN, p.40; See also CIFOR p.50). No solution to address the issue was presented. Also, as highlighted by CIFOR, insufficient implementation of the legal recognition of community land rights may affect the equity of REDD+ policies (CIFOR, p.50). The creation of a Land Registry and registration of community areas and others is listed as a proposed intervention in the first 5 years of the Program to tackle these issues (ER-PIN, p.19).
	2b) Land and resource tenure assessments were publically vetted and endorsed by all concerned stakeholders;	No, pending the conclusion of the SESA.
	2c) The land use / land tenure context of the proposed ER Program, including implementation risks (conflicting claims) and available arbitration processes is well defined.	Land tenure is not assessed as an implementation risk in the ER-PIN (ER PIN, p.21) and arbitration processes will likely rely on the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), still in the design phase (ER-PIN, p.39). As stated in the R-PP, local tribunals and human rights organizations have been used and could serve as laboratory to address conflicts between land users in future conflicts (R-PP, p. 112).
	2d) The process for addressing emerging land and forest tenure issues (e.g., conflicting claims, tenure insecurity for IP/LC and women) is clearly defined in the ER-PIN	There is no clearly defined mechanism for addressing tenure conflicts in the ER-PIN.

3) Assignment of rights to forest carbon

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	3a) The legal framework for carbon rights is defined in the ER-PIN	Carbon rights were only mentioned in the R-PP. In consultations held in Maputo, participants suggested that they should be linked to customary rights over the land (R-PP, pp.42, 82-90) and as such communities should hold carbon rights. Nevertheless, the matter was not discussed within the ER-PIN nor defined in national legislation.
	3b) The process for dealing with contested and/or overlapping land, forest and carbon claims is defined.	A process is not clearly defined.
	3c) The legal basis for the transfer of ER titles is defined.	There is no legal basis for the transfer of ER titles (although this is not a requirement at the ER-PIN stage).

4) Equitable benefit sharing and non-carbon benefits

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	4a) The ER-PIN presents a transparent and verifiable process to equitably share carbon-related benefits (e.g., REDD+ revenue streams).	There is no benefit sharing mechanisms clearly defined, however Mozambique has a legal framework in place that allows that 20% of the revenues from wildlife and forestry exploration to be channeled down to local communities. The ER-PIN also describes general principles for an additional benefit sharing arrangement aimed at decentralizing environmental management that would allow disburse at least 70% of the ER program revenues at local level (ER-PIN, pp. 40-41).
	4b) The ER-PIN presents a transparent and verifiable process to prioritize and equitably share non-carbon benefits (e.g., alternative business models and revenue streams).	There is no transparent and verifiable process. The ER-PIN lists six overarching co-benefits to be achieved including livelihoods, biodiversity, climate resilience, rehabilitation of degraded lands and improved forest governance. (ER-PIN, pp.42-43).
	4c) The benefit sharing mechanisms outlined in the ER-PIN are broadly supported by indigenous and forest dependent communities, including women.	There is no evidence of broad support and there were no discussions identified on women's rights.

5) Alignment of ERP strategies with main drivers of deforestation

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	5a) The drivers of deforestation and forest degradation identified in the ER-PIN are consistent with expert analyses and local stakeholder input.	The ER-PIN deforestation rates in the geographical area of the program are consistent with expert analysis (p. 30, ER-PIN). However, it lacks experts' feedback and stakeholders' inputs concerning deforestation drivers. Additional studies, concerning the drivers were supposed to be concluded by November 2015. The ER-PIN also states drivers of deforestation and degradation were discussed with stakeholders within consultation, but the content of consultations, nor their inputs, were presented in the document or linked with main drivers (p.23, ER-PIN).
	5b) Challenges to overcoming identified drivers (i.e., technical, institutional, political or economic) are clearly defined.	Challenges to overcoming identified drivers are only generally defined (p.17. ER-PIN)
	5c) Proposed ER Program interventions specifically target the main drivers and their related challenges.	ER-Program intervention address partially identified drivers of deforestation and challenges (p.15-21, ER-PIN).

6) Safeguards framework

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	6a) The country has completed its SESA and elaborated an ESMF (yes/no; if yes then consider b through e; if no, got to 6f)	No (originally planned to be concluded by DEC/2015)
	6b) The assessment of social and environmental considerations was conducted in a transparent and participatory manner	
	6c) FPIC is presented as a requirement of the ESMF	
	6d) The EMSF identifies key steps, including budget and timeline, to strengthen forest governance issues within the national legal framework	
	6e) The ER-PIN presence a credible grievance/dispute resolution mechanism, based on the FGRM assessment	
	6f) The ER-PIN describes the design of the Safeguard Information System and its application in the context of the ER-P.	No. A safeguard specialist was hired and an information platform is expected to be launched in 2016.
	6g) Proposed safeguards adequately address the land and resource rights of indigenous peoples, forest communities and women	

Section 2: BROADER GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES FOR ADDRESSING DEFORESTATION DRIVERS: To what extent does the proposed emission reduction program consider other key forest governance challenges for achieving REDD+?

7) Government capacity and coordination in ERP planning and implementation

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	7a) The ER-PIN shows evidence of coordination across sectors, line ministries, and levels of government (local, sub-national, national).	The ER-PIN identifies lack of coordination between different sector and government levels as one of the major barriers to the ER program's implementation (ER-PIN, p. 17,). It also describes the institutional arrangements for Zambezia Integrated Landscapes Management Program (ZILMP), which aim at decentralizing governance and empower local communities (p. 24-25, ER-PIN).
	7b) The ER-PIN identifies opportunities for community-based interventions, including natural resource management, tenure recognition, and other dedicated REDD+ investments.	Although the ER-PIN describes the ER-Program as inclusive, with participation of different government and civil society actors, it is very vague in what regards specifically the participation of local communities (see for example ER-PIN, p.34; 40). Furthermore, subsistence farming (practiced broadly by local communities) is listed as a deforestation driver with no realistic approach designed for the transition to low carbon agriculture.
	7c) The ER-PIN discusses efforts to combat corruption and the measures that will be used in the ER Program.	The ER-PIN does not discuss corruption even though corruption is as an endemic problem in Mozambique (p.48, CIFOR) and the R-PP considers the adoption of anti-corruption policy and strategy within the ER program.

8) Transparent monitoring and oversight of REDD+

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	8a) The ER-PIN shows evidence of an open-access information management systems for REDD+	As self-assessed in the ER-PIN, the establishment of a MRV system in Mozambique still lacks considerable development (pp.10, 32; ER-PIN). According to the ER-PIN the design and implementation of an information system has funded secured (JICA) and will be finalized by mid-2016 (ER-PIN, pp.7, 44). A website was created to raise awareness over for the ER-Program however it is not regularly updated.
	The ER-PIN proposes mechanisms to independently and transparently:	
-	8b) Monitor the social and environmental impacts of REDD+ investments;	Not sufficiently defined in the ER-PIN (p. 22; 38; ER-PIN).
-	8c) Monitor the application of safeguards via the Safeguard information system	Not defined in the ER-PIN. A safeguard specialist was hired at UT-REDD+ and is supervising the implementation of the SESA (ER-PIN, p. 9).
-	8d) Monitor the effectiveness of governance-related interventions;	The National Technical Committee for REDD+ (CTR) is defined as the body responsible for monitoring governance-related interventions and promoting inter-institutional coordination. Details of how this monitoring will take place is not defined in the ER-PIN (p. 6; 24).
-	8e) Track and coordinate international finance flows;	The National Environment Fund (FUNAB) is responsible for fiduciary management. Monitoring if FUNAB's activities is not defined in the ER-PIN.
-	8f) Monitor the distribution of carbon and non-carbon benefits	The monitoring of non-carbon benefits still relies heavily on the conclusion of keys documents such as the SESA and the ESMF, and the MRV system.

Section 3: OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	9a) The proposed emission reduction program protects and advances the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities to land and forests within REDD+ systems and processes.	Current legislation of Mozambique is relatively favorable to the participation of local communities in forest management in general. In what concerns specifically REDD+ systems and processes, although the ER-PIN acknowledges the role of local communities in forest management and REDD+ policies in Mozambique it does not clearly define how it will take place.
	9b) The proposed emission reduction program presents a credible plan for addressing governance issues at national and sub-national levels, and establishes clear processes for monitoring progress on critical risk factors.	The ER-PIN presents the basis of emission reduction program, however, most of the main topics still need to be further developed and clarified so that a credible plan and process for monitoring can be established. While the ER-PIN identifies the “creation of Land Registry and registration of community areas and individual farms Law enforcement, monitoring & control of illegal activities (timber, deforestation, etc.)” it does not describe these programs, nor how community forest management would be developed and implemented. (ER-PIN. P.19) The ER-PIN does not identify existing budget resources for these measures, proposing they be funded out of proceeds of the ERPA. Mozambique has been selected into the FIP, and is in the early stages of defining an investment plan, so synergy with the IP and the DGM can be expected.

ⁱ Siteo, A., Salomão, A. and Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S. 2012. O contexto de REDD+ em Moçambique. Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor, Indonesia. P. 44.

ⁱⁱ See Consultas públicas, Projeto REDD+ Moçambique. Available at: <http://redd.org.mz/page.php?id=59>. (accessed March 28, 2016)