

Table 6: Summary of voluntary certification standards and institutional requirements

	Is there effective legal recognition of communities' customary land and resource rights?	Is there explicit legal recognition of communities' rights to carbon?	Is the full and effective participation of IP / LC / ADPs mandated? Are there robust requirements for FPIC?	Is a formal benefit-sharing mechanism required?	Is a formal feedback and grievance redress mechanism required?	Are there robust provisions for measurement, monitoring, reporting, and verification with respect to rights and safeguards?
ART/TREES (information from TREES Draft 2.0)	Limited. Under Theme 2.3, Participants are required to "have in place a legal framework, policies or programs for the recognition, inventorying, mapping, and security of customary and statutory land and resource tenure rights where REDD+ actions are implemented" and public institutions must have "made use of mandates, procedures, and resources to recognize, inventory, map, and secure statutory and customary rights to lands and resources relevant to the implementation of REDD+ actions in line with relevant ratified international conventions, agreements, and/or domestic and if applicable, subnational, legal framework." The outcome indicator for this theme stipulates that stakeholders have "access to, use of, and control over land and resources in line with relevant ratified international conventions, agreements, and/or domestic and if applicable, subnational, legal framework". However, this framing fails to establish an adequate threshold or uniform standard for the protection of communities' rights. Adherence to UNDRIP is not mandatory under this standard, as it is not an international convention or agreement (and the Cancun Safeguards simply note that the UN General Assembly has adopted UNDRIP). Moreover, many countries have not ratified ILO 169, and the protections provided by countries' domestic frameworks vary considerably.	No.	Limited. Participants are required to comply with the Cancun Safeguards. However, FPIC is only mentioned once in the standard, in the context of the outcome indicator for Theme 4.2. Participants must ensure that the "[d]esign, implementation, and periodic assessments of REDD+ actions were, where relevant, undertaken with the participation of indigenous peoples and/or local communities, or equivalent, including if applicable through FPIC, in accordance with relevant international and/or domestic and if applicable, subnational, legal framework, and in accordance with their respective rights and decision making structures and processes." However, no guidance is provided regarding the procedural requirements for effective FPIC-related processes. Moreover, as an outcome indicator, adherence to FPIC requirements need not be assessed until the second reporting period, and is thus not as prerequisite for any project-related activities or planning processes prior to that point.	No.	No. However, under Theme 2.4, Participants are required to have in place procedures for guaranteeing nondiscriminatory and non-cost prohibitive access to dispute resolution mechanisms at all relevant levels, and these are anchored in relevant ratified international conventions/agreements and/or domestic and if applicable, subnational, legal framework.	Limited. A number of the proposed indicators, including those for the realization of social and environmental benefits (12.5.5, Theme 5.3) and respecting, protecting, and fulfilling rights of indigenous peoples and/or local communities (12.5.3, Theme 3.3), are largely limited to the demonstration of procedural requirements and offer no articulated means of measuring change in baseline conditions over time, nor any qualifying metrics for assessing improvements in the social and environmental wellbeing and status of affected communities.
Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards (version 3.1)	Yes. Projects must recognize, respect and support rights to lands, territories and resources, including the statutory and customary rights of Indigenous Peoples and others within communities. The standard provides concrete indicators and FPIC requirements. Projects must not encroach uninvited on community property, including collective rights, both customary and statutory, to lands, territories and resources that communities have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired whether or not such ownership has been formally recorded.	No.	Yes. Communities and other stakeholders are involved in the project through full and effective participation, including access to information, consultation, participation in decision-making and implementation, and free, prior and informed consent. The standard provides concrete indicators in this regard.	No. Creation of a benefit sharing mechanisms is not a certification requirement, although it is included as an optional criterion (GL2. Exceptional Community Benefits)	Yes. Projects must demonstrate that a clear grievance redress procedure has been formalized to address disputes with communities and other stakeholders that may arise during project planning, implementation and evaluation.	Yes. Use of the CCB Program requires that independent validation/verification bodies (VVBs) determine conformance with the CCB rules. Verification must be performed at least every five years, and projects must establish a community baseline in order to monitor community impacts through the use of indicators.
The Plan Vivo Standard (2013)	Limited. Project interventions must take place on land where smallholders and/or community groups have clear, stable land tenure (defined as the relationship, whether legally or customarily defined, through which people, as individuals or groups, own or hold rights to use land). However, there is no explicit provision for the recognition or protection of customary rights as such, particularly in situations in which these rights may not have been formally recognized.	No.	Yes. Projects must demonstrate community ownership, and communities must participate meaningfully through the design and implementation of land management plans. The standard provides a number of requirements to this effect. The standard also stipulates that "Participants must enter into PES agreements voluntarily according to the principle of free, prior and informed consent, where sufficient information, in an appropriate format and language, is available to potential participants to enable them to make informed decisions about whether or not to enter into a PES Agreement	Yes. The standard requires that a fair and equitable benefit-sharing mechanism be applied that has been agreed with the participation of communities involved, identifying how PES funding will be distributed among participants and other stakeholders, including the project coordinator. The mechanism should include consideration of how benefit-sharing might change over time as the project progresses.	Yes. The standard state that "[a] robust grievance redressal system should be part of project design, and should ensure that participants are able to raise grievances with the project coordinator at any given point within the project cycle, and that these grievances are dealt with in a transparent, fair, and timely manner." A summary of grievances received, their resolution, and details of outstanding grievances must also be reported through the periodic reporting process.	Limited. A socioeconomic baseline scenario must be defined for certified projects, along with a socioeconomic impact assessment/monitoring plan (to be developed within one year of project validation). The plan must be based on "locally relevant and cost effective indicators". PES agreements between project coordinators and smallholders / community groups are also required to include performance targets that must be met to trigger the disbursement of payments or other benefits, with reference to monitoring methods, frequency and duration. However, minimum requirements for the strength and content of indicators and performance targets are not prescribed by the standard.

	Is there effective legal recognition of communities' customary land and resource rights?	Is there explicit legal recognition of communities' rights to carbon?	Is the full and effective participation of IP / LC / ADPs mandated? Are there robust requirements for FPIC?	Is a formal benefit-sharing mechanism required?	Is a formal feedback and grievance redress mechanism required?	Are there robust provisions for measurement, monitoring, reporting, and verification with respect to rights and safeguards?
Gold Standard for the Global Goals (version 1.2)	Yes. Project Developers must demonstrate full and uncontested legal ownership of any products generated under Gold Standard Certification (for example carbon credits). Where such ownership is transferred from project beneficiaries this must be demonstrated transparently and with full, prior and informed consent (FPIC). Projects must also respect and safeguard legal rights and customary rights, and Project Developers must recognise and respect Indigenous Peoples' collective rights to own, use, and develop and control the lands, resources and territories that they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired, including lands and territories for which they do not yet possess title.	No.	Yes. The Gold Standard includes a separate, detailed document on Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement Requirements. FPIC is also required with respect to changes to legal arrangements, and cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property. However, with respect to Projects in which communities' rights, lands, resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods may be affected, the standard only requires that participation take place "with the objective of securing their free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC)" [emphasis added].	No. Project developers must ensure that the Indigenous people are provided with the equitable sharing of benefits to be derived from utilisation and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories or use of their traditional knowledge and practices by the project, but there is no requirement for the establishment of a formal benefit sharing mechanism as such.	Yes. Projects must have a formal input, feedback and grievance mechanism in place.	Yes. Projects must undertake an upfront assessment against the Gold Standard Safeguarding Principles and must be implemented in accordance with the stated requirements. The assessment applies to the Project Scenario, although assessment questions and requirements involve a comparison to the Baseline Scenario(s) and/or the implementation or decommissioning phases of a Project. As per the Safeguarding Principles & Requirements document, any failure, at any time in respect to the completion of the Safeguarding Principles Assessment, including conformity with Requirements and Monitoring & Reporting Requirements shall lead to the invocation of the Non-Conformity section of the Gold Standard Principles and Requirements.
Verified Carbon Standard (version 4.1)	Limited. Project proponents must identify any legal or customary tenure/access rights to territories and resources, including collective and/or conflicting rights, held by local stakeholders, as well as the location of territories and resources which local stakeholders own or to which they have customary access. Moreover, "The project proponent shall recognize, respect and support local stakeholders' property rights and where feasible, take measures to help secure rights. The project shall not encroach on private, stakeholder or government property or relocate people off their lands without consent. The project may affect property rights if free, prior and informed consent is obtained from those concerned and a transparent agreement is reached that includes provisions for just and fair compensation." However, there is no obligation on the part of the project proponent to recognize or respect communities' customary rights if they have not otherwise been legally recognized.	No.	Limited. The standard includes requirements for local stakeholder consultation, and project proponents must demonstrate to the validation/verification body what action they have taken in respect of the local stakeholder consultation as part of validation, and in respect of ongoing communications as part of each subsequent verification. FPIC is only mentioned once in the document, in the context of property rights ("The project may affect property rights if free, prior and informed consent is obtained from those concerned and a transparent agreement is reached that includes provisions for just and fair compensation"). No concrete guidance is provided regarding the procedural requirements for effective consultation or FPIC-related processes.	No.	Yes. The project proponent must develop a grievance redress procedure to address disputes with local stakeholders that may arise during project planning and implementation.	No. While project descriptions should include expected changes in well-being and other stakeholder characteristics under the baseline scenario, there is no requirement that indicators be developed, nor any explicit requirement that these changes be monitored, reported or verified.
VCS Jurisdictional and Nested REDD+ (Scenario 3 Requirements) (version 4.0)	Limited. Jurisdictional proponents must demonstrate the rights to GHG emission reductions generated by the jurisdictional program, including an explanation of how jurisdictional rights relate to the rights of non-state stakeholders including indigenous peoples, local communities, private entities and individuals. The standard specifies that rights to GHG emission reductions are the right to participate in jurisdictional benefit-sharing or transact GHG emission reductions resulting from, inter alia, formal or informal, statutory, customary or ancestral land rights or land management rights (3.6). However, there is no obligation on the part of the project proponent to recognize or respect communities' customary rights if they have not otherwise been legally recognized.	No. While stakeholders' carbon rights must be considered in relation to the creation of a benefit-sharing system, the standard stops short of explicitly recognizing communities' rights to carbon.	Limited. Jurisdictional programs are to be developed and documented in a transparent manner and in consultation with stakeholders, including rural and/or indigenous communities, but there is no explicit mention of FPIC. However, the rules and requirements of the VCS Standard apply mutatis mutandis (see above), so there is recognition of FPIC to the extent that it is included in the VCS Standard.	Yes. Jurisdictional proponents must put in place an equitable, transparent, and legally binding benefit-sharing system. This system must consider stakeholders' carbon rights, including rights to land, forests, forest resources, as well as their contribution to ecosystem services that resulted or will result in GHG emission reductions. Benefit-sharing systems are to be developed through a transparent and participatory process in which stakeholder participation is justifiably representative, with a special emphasis on indigenous peoples, local communities, women and the most marginalized and/or vulnerable.	Yes. Jurisdictional proponents shall develop a mechanism for receiving, screening, addressing, monitoring and reporting feedback on grievances and concerns submitted by stakeholders relating to the design, implementation and evaluation of the jurisdictional program at the local, subnational and national levels. This mechanism shall include appropriate means of communication to enable all interested and/or stakeholders to participate.	No. Jurisdictional proponents shall provide information in the monitoring report with respect to how, during the design and implementation of the program, UNFCCC decisions on safeguards and any relevant jurisdictional (national and subnational) safeguards requirements have been addressed and respected. (3.8.2). But as with the VCS Standard (above), there is no requirement that indicators be developed, nor any explicit requirement that these changes be monitored, reported or verified.

	Is there effective legal recognition of communities' customary land and resource rights?	Is there explicit legal recognition of communities' rights to carbon?	Is the full and effective participation of IP / LC / ADPs mandated? Are there robust requirements for FPIC?	Is a formal benefit-sharing mechanism required?	Is a formal feedback and grievance redress mechanism required?	Are there robust provisions for measurement, monitoring, reporting, and verification with respect to rights and safeguards?
Carbon Fund (Methodological Framework + World Bank Environmental and Social Standards)	Yes. ER Programs must undertake and make publicly available an assessment of the land and resource tenure regimes present in the Accounting Area, including legal and customary rights of use, access, management, ownership, exclusion, etc. If the ER Program involves activities that are contingent on establishing legally recognized rights to lands and territories that Indigenous Peoples have traditionally owned or customarily used or occupied, the relevant Safeguards Plan must set forth an action plan for the legal recognition of such ownership, occupation, or usage.	Limited. The Methodological Framework recognizes that the status of rights to carbon and relevant lands should be assessed to establish a basis for successful implementation of the ER Program. To this end, the ER Program Entity must "demonstrate its ability to transfer to the Carbon Fund Title to ERs, while respecting the land and resource tenure rights of the potential rights-holders, including Indigenous Peoples (i.e., those holding legal and customary rights, as identified by the assessment conducted under Criterion 28), in the Accounting Area." However, the Methodological Framework stops short of explicitly stating that communities have a right to the carbon in their customary lands. Moreover, as set out in Indicators 36.1 and 36.2, the legal transfer of emission reductions titles can be accomplished by enacting a law, regulation, or decree granting governments the authority to make such transfers, "while respecting the land and resource tenure rights of the potential rights-holders, including Indigenous Peoples." Otherwise, Indicator 36.2 goes on to state that the authority to transfer such titles can also be conferred through sub-arrangements or benefit sharing agreements with rights-holders in the accounting areas.	Limited. The methodological framework only addresses community participation with respect to monitoring and reporting (e.g., of ER Program Measures, activity data, emission factors, safeguards and Non-Carbon Benefits), and encourages such community participation where appropriate, although the World Bank's ESS10 on Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure provides more comprehensive guidance. Moreover, FPIC is not explicitly endorsed by the Methodological Framework, while ESS7 on Indigenous Peoples/Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities only requires that FPIC be obtained in a limited set of circumstances (namely, when a project will: (a) have adverse impacts on land and natural resources subject to traditional ownership or under customary use or occupation; (b) cause relocation of Indigenous Peoples/ Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities from land and natural resources subject to traditional ownership or under customary use or occupation; or (c) have significant impacts on Indigenous Peoples/Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities' cultural heritage that is material to the identity and/or cultural, ceremonial, or spiritual aspects of the affected Indigenous Peoples/ Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities' lives.)	Yes. A benefit-sharing plan is required and must elaborate on the benefit-sharing arrangements for Monetary and Non-Monetary Benefits.	Yes. An appropriate Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) must be developed during the Readiness phase or must otherwise exist, building on existing institutions, regulatory frameworks, mechanisms and capacity.	Yes. The Methodological Framework includes indicators for each of its criteria. In general, ER Programs are expected to meet the requirements stated by the criteria and indicators at the time the final ER Program Document is submitted to the Carbon Fund, and continuing through implementation, although some requirements should be met at the time of ERPA signing or at other points during the implementation of the ER Program. In addition, the General Conditions that form part of each Emission Reductions Payment Agreement (ERPA) are non-negotiable and include application of World Bank Operational Policies (including environmental and social safeguards policies), benefits and benefit sharing principles. The General Conditions list a number of "default" events, including "failure to observe, implement and meet all requirements contained in the ER Monitoring Plan, the Benefit Sharing Plan or a Safeguards Plan provided for under the ERPA (including any feedback and grievance redress mechanism provided for under the ER Program, the Benefit Sharing Plan and/or a Safeguards Plan)".
GCF (Terms of reference and scorecard for the pilot programme for REDD+ results-based payments)	Limited. REDD+ results-based payments funding proposals must include information on how the Cancun safeguards have been addressed and respected in a way that ensures transparency, consistency, comprehensiveness and effectiveness, including safeguard "c" (Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities). However, there are no specific provisions addressing communities' customary land and resource rights.	No.	Yes. REDD+ results-based payments funding proposals must include information on how the Cancun safeguards have been addressed and respected in a way that ensures transparency, consistency, comprehensiveness and effectiveness, including safeguard "d" (the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities). The interim Environmental and Social Safeguards (ie. IFC Performance Standards) also require FPIC for projects impacting lands and natural resources subject to traditional ownership or under customary use. In addition, Accredited Entities must provide a description of stakeholder engagement in their Environmental and Social Assessment, including a description of how the stakeholders were identified, informed, and consulted and how they have participated in the activities.	No. A formalized benefit-sharing plan is optional, although funding proposal must include a description of how the proceeds will be used consistent with the country's NDC and national REDD+ strategy, and/or low-GHG development strategy.	Yes. Under the Terms of reference for the pilot programme for REDD+ results-based payments, the Environmental and Social Assessment prepared by the Accredited Entity must include a description of the grievance redress mechanisms, or analogous system whether established as part of the REDD-plus activities or as integral to the system of the country.	Limited. The Accredited Entity describes the safeguards framework in the funding proposal and prepares an environmental and social assessment report that is checked by an independent technical advisory panel and GCF Secretariat; however, once programmes have been accepted, disbursements are not contingent on performance against safeguards criteria.