

ANNEX B: Project Alignment Review for Proyecto Socio Bosque de Conservación de Ecuador

The *Proyecto Socio Bosque de Conservación* (the **Socio Bosque Program** or **PSB** or **Socio Bosque**) is consistent with Ecuador's *Plan Nacional de Desarrollo: Toda una Vida (2017-2021)* (National Development Plan) - including the goal of diminishing deforestation by 50% and reduction of poverty. PSB is a priority government program (2008 to present) with the objective of avoiding deforestation and improving the well-being of communities by signing *convenios* (agreements) with title owners of land (especially indigenous and campesino communities) to conserve forests, páramos and critical vegetation formations throughout Ecuador. The Ministry of Environment (**MAE**), the Executing Agency, worked in close consultation with relevant government agencies, indigenous peoples and other local communities, local governments and NGOs to refine the PSB's guidelines and implementation (known as the *Manual Operativo* (Operations Manual)) throughout the years of operation. In 2014 Ecuador registered reduced emissions of 4 831 679 tCO₂e. PSB's success was a significant contributing factor to these reductions. In 2014, PSB: i) signed 2,748 *convenios* (agreements), ii) placed 1,434,061.95 hectares under areas of conservation, and iii) released \$10,001,899.26 in incentive payments, benefitting and reducing the poverty of at least 173,233 individuals.

Review Indicators	Alignment Review	Evaluation / Recommendations
Human Rights		
<i>Key objective: Support universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Measures in place to uphold human rights principles of accountability and rule of law, participation and inclusion, and equality and non-discrimination ▪ No activities undertaken that may contribute to violations of a State's human rights obligations and the core international human rights treaties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Socio Bosque focused on support to Indigenous communities, peoples and nations, the Afro-Ecuadorian people, the back-country people (montubios) of the inland coastal region, and communes. (hereinafter, "<i>indigenous peoples and local communities</i>") to voluntarily decide, according to their own customs and forms of decision-making via the organizations of government they choose, to submit their lands into conservation areas in exchange for incentives to be used to finance an Investment Plan that is designed by them in accordance with their vision and priorities for development. Restrictions on their use of resources are to be entered into knowingly and voluntarily. PSB shows respect for indigenous rights to their lands, institutions, self-determination to define their own development, among others. Private owners, not collectives, also must establish legal property rights and there is no discrimination between men or women entering into the <i>convenios</i> for conservation in exchange for investments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Where land conflicts existed between alleged property holders, and resolution was not possible, PSB chose to avoid prejudicing rights of either party and refrained from accepting <i>convenios</i> with those parties. ▪ Grievances submitted to date show no concerns expressed about human rights violations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good level of alignment, consistent with key objectives of UNDP SES, without significant shortcomings.

Review Indicators	Alignment Review	Evaluation / Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rather than undermine State obligations with respect to human rights, PSB appears to have supported State's duties to respect the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking a conservative approach and avoiding conflict areas. Eventually, State land regularization will be needed in these areas too. ▪ Equal opportunities were offered to men and women who may hold titles and be landowners eligible to participate in the <i>convenios</i>. 	
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment		
<i>Key objective: Promote gender equality and women's empowerment</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Activity does not discriminate against women or girls or reinforce gender-based discrimination ▪ Activity designed in gender responsive manner (e.g. address both women's and men's needs, interests and concerns) ▪ Equitable access to opportunities, benefits, and resources ▪ Meaningful and equitable participation of women and men 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Socio Bosque did not <i>directly</i> address gender equality or women's empowerment as part of its mission, but in its efforts to reduce poverty in these prioritized areas, it in no way hindered the participation of or equitable benefit sharing and participation of women. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any person (male or woman) was eligible to participate as a <i>socio</i> that could enter into <i>convenios</i>. ▪ The problem, however, was more endemic: less women in Ecuador being landowners was not directly addressed (i.e. no affirmative measures in place to target women title holders), and consequently, though not intended, statistics would inevitably show more incentive beneficiaries and <i>socios</i> being men. ▪ Also, given that the majority of <i>convenios</i> were entered into by collectives, the matter of men and women was somewhat moot as the title was held by a collective entity (a traditional governance structure, an indigenous or community association etc., not a single man or woman). ▪ The State, respecting self-determined development and the decisions of the communities with respect to their investment plans, did not impose a particular percentage of incentives requiring dedication to women's initiatives. However, statistics gathered showed that 19% of the incentives given to communities were dedicated to women's issues. ▪ All briefings and capacity sessions were provided without discrimination as to participants being men or women. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Positive alignment with UNDP SES dominates, but areas identified for improvement. Most areas to be strengthened are covered by other elements of REDD+ programming. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The PSB has committed to continue working on promoting gender equality. PSB's lines of action include definition of the intercultural gender approach, incorporation of gender and equality indicators, gender mainstreaming in internal PSB policies, and others. ▪ Also, in further preparations of REDD+ programming, at least four (4) studies on gender have now been completed, with key recommendations to include more women in decision-making and working groups of projects; collect more disaggregated data on gender in project benefits; include indicators to show social benefits by gender for all monitoring of social impacts and effectiveness of mitigation measures; take effective measures that are culturally appropriate to increase the likelihood that all community briefings and capacity sessions and other forms of communication strategies reach women (in design, time, location of meetings); look at why women are less likely to be landowners and how this dynamic could be influenced; and exercise the Ministry that the Investment Plan take greater consideration of women's issues and opinions. ▪ On the latter, technically the Operations Manual does provide the MAE with the authority to request changes

Review Indicators	Alignment Review	Evaluation / Recommendations
		to the assignment of funds in the areas of investment, so this is possible, but the change cannot be mandatory.
Social and Environmental Assessment and Management		
<i>Key objective: Potential social and environmental risks and impacts are identified, assessed and managed, and monitored</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Systematic process in place to identify, assess, mitigate and manage potential social and environmental risks and impacts ▪ Assessment and management conducted in manner proportionate to significance of risks ▪ Impact mitigation measures follow mitigation hierarchy ▪ Mitigation measures monitored in manner proportionate to risks and corrective actions are taken as required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Socios</i> in the agreements with the government were required to report every two years on compliance with the <i>convenios</i> (both how conservation had progressed and how the incentives were properly used). ▪ To mitigate the potential for adverse impacts from third parties, the <i>convenios</i> required and the government promoted a system of regular communications between the government and <i>socios</i> to resolve urgent situations that raised the potential risks – like an unauthorized intrusion by a logger, or a fire set by a trespasser. ▪ There was also a grievance mechanism that could forecast trends in potential social or environmental risks. It received, tracked and addressed approximately 1800 grievances received through the MAE on matters ranging from convenio compliance, issues with proper title registrations, and third party interferences with the conservation objectives. ▪ Several consultations with stakeholders were also held in which social and environmental risks and concerns were expressed (for instance in 2014, there were 10 meetings of the <i>Mesa de Trabajo REDD+</i> (a working group/multi-stakeholder roundtable for discussions) (MdT REDD+), many of these which led to changes in the five (5) iterations of the Operations Manual. These included: concerns about potential discrimination between titled and untitled indigenous lands (leading to a new provision for participation of indigenous communities without titles yet to their ancestral lands), and a concern about too great a focus on certain areas at risk of deforestation, ignoring other “hotspot” areas and places of potential leakages (leading to the selection and focus on additional priority geographic areas to include areas of <i>páramos</i> and high native vegetation). ▪ Socio Bosque applies a monitoring and evaluation process which was implemented in the period of the achieved results. This process included legal monitoring, local monitoring by spot checks on site and GIS monitoring (satellite images) to monitoring the compliance of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Positive alignment with UNDP SES dominates, but areas identified for improvement. Most areas to be strengthened are covered by other elements of REDD+ programming. ▪ Increased need to finalize socio-cultural indicators for monitoring and increased collection of such impact information to be integrated into the REDD+ SIS system so that opportunities for mitigation and social benefits can be identified and acted upon more systematically. ▪ The internal monitoring system (<i>Sistema de Evaluación Monitoreo y Postulación</i>- SEMOP on line in 2015 should continue to be strengthened and utilized and synced with the National Forest Monitoring System. ▪ The Operations Manual or additional PSB guidance could benefit from modifications to expressly require the identification of key risks, aligned with the corresponding mitigation measures and the processes that will be used to regularly monitor the social and environmental impacts. Some of this has been done, but not per express requirements. ▪ There were some execution risks associated with implementation of PSB, including criticism for focusing in isolated areas and not including some of the hotspots for deforestation. These risks were successfully managed by developing a broader plan (Ecuador’s National REDD+ Action Plan) that complements Socio Bosque, calls for restoration actions not just conservation actions, increases the scope of the geographic areas covered by the programme, and enhancing coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture programs in particular the Transformation of the Amazon Productive Agenda.

Review Indicators	Alignment Review	Evaluation / Recommendations
	<p>agreement and social, environmental, and accountability parameters. Guidelines for monitoring can be found in following http://sociobosque.ambiente.gob.ec/files/monitoreometodo2011.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis has shown that the incentive payments have contributed not only to the conservation and sustainable resource management of these communities, but also projects related to education, housing, health, ecotourism, other sustainable agricultural activities to improve the livelihoods of the people, as well as initiatives to preserve and revitalize cultural practices and activities such handicrafts, dance, and use of ancestral medicines. ▪ The above said, it has been recognized that the monitoring and verification tended to focus on the environmental objectives more than the social impacts. A call was made to increase the number of social indicators to be monitored. That said, the social impacts were collected in terms of the accountability provided by the socios for the use of the incentives. Through this mechanism, the State was able to see where incentives were used for improvement of social matters (like education, health, and cultural identity etc.) and not just conservation. ▪ A 2017 study of past socio-cultural impacts of PSB demonstrated largely positive results along all but 2 of its 14 impacts reviewed. Where positive results arose, it was clear improvements could still be made. 	
Stakeholder Engagement		
<i>Key objective: Promote effective stakeholder engagement throughout the project-cycle</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stakeholders and engagement process identified ▪ Stakeholders, in particular project-affected groups, involved in planning, implementation, monitoring ▪ Vulnerable or disadvantaged groups identified and consulted ▪ Stakeholders views taken into account and considered in project design and implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The initial Socio Bosque establishment occurred quickly and was enacted by the Government without significant participation with stakeholders. ▪ Recognizing this occurrence, however, the Socio Bosque framework and implementation guide (known as the <i>Operations Manual</i>) went through five iterations to be responsive to continued concerns, comments and inputs by stakeholders throughout PSB – largely compensating for the lack of earlier engagements. Through regular identified stakeholder engagements, (especially the earliest consultations in October of 2008 (Quito) and Lago Agrio (2009), and then stakeholder collaborations within the pilot phases of the programme (in Morona Santiago and Esmeraldas), the manual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good level of alignment, consistent with key objectives of UNDP SES, without significant shortcomings.

Review Indicators	Alignment Review	Evaluation / Recommendations
	<p>underwent a number of changes to address stakeholder concerns including those around land conflicts, transparency in community decision-making, discrimination between communities with titles and those with government recognitions still pending, and fears that the payment structures only incentivized participation of large land owners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Early on, the Government recognized the overlap between land tenure security for indigenous peoples and local communities and forest conservation. Consequently, vulnerable, disadvantaged groups (indigenous peoples and local communities) were identified as the stakeholder group to be targeted by this program. ▪ The selection of priority geographic areas targeted by the PSB was done by a weighted formula which includes the factor, “level of poverty of the population”. In light of socio-economic data on various mestizo, Afro Ecuadorian and indigenous communities, PSB therefore favors providing benefits to underserved populations. ▪ Affirmative actions were taken to send out Socio Bosque teams to these indigenous peoples and local communities to explain Socio Bosque, the rights of the beneficiaries under applicable law, and the potential opportunities and responsibilities should they join in the initiative with the Government. This direct targeting allowed for exchanges with key stakeholders and increased their participation in PSB’s benefits (and as mentioned above, its ongoing design and implementation). Ninety percent of the agreements are with communities and over 87% of the lands under conservation belong to said communities. ▪ The entire Socio Bosque Program depends on partnerships and engagements with the key stakeholders –in this case, the socios to the <i>convenios</i> and those that benefited from the Investment Plans. For instance, the stakeholders who participate are required to participate in the monitoring of the lands placed within the conservation areas. They are the front line of the <i>control y vigilancia</i> (control and surveillance). ▪ In 2014 alone, the period for which the results-based payments (RBP) are sought, there were 10 meetings of the MdT REDD+. The MdT REDD+ is composed of one representative from academia; two from the private sector; two from national NGOs; one organization 	

Review Indicators	Alignment Review	Evaluation / Recommendations
	representing women; one representing young people; and, finally, three organizations representing indigenous groups.	
<i>Key objective: Ensure stakeholders have access to relevant and timely information</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information on project opportunities and risks disclosed in timely, accessible, appropriate manner, language, form ▪ Environmental/social reviews and assessments disclosed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PSB has a dedicated team of approximately 110 staffers. The PSB financed numerous outreach programs where Socio Bosque teams and program “promotores” (promoters) went into the communities with power point presentations and user-friendly pamphlets (many in simple Q&A formats) and carried out education and capacity building sessions to share relevant information about PSB’s scope, potential benefits, the manner in which Socio Bosque protected their internationally and nationally protected human rights to their lands, a healthy environment, ownership, use and conservation of their resources and territories, and self-governance. These sessions contributed to informed decision-making of the communities and landowners. (Examples of some of these outreach documents can be found at http://sociobosque.ambiente.gob.ec/node/595.) The website includes various other manuals, formulas, templates and instructional documents to ensure stakeholder effective and informed participation in PSB and fulfillment of their responsibilities as conservation partners). The material was disseminated at multiple community and field-based meetings where there was a use of interpreters as well. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Numerous capacity sessions, workshops and briefings were conducted as well with key stakeholders and information and technical assistance was provided to assist communities in participating in the program. ▪ The Operations Manual itself requires dissemination of information through the media, field visits, participation in local and national events, and other mechanisms defined by PSB’s communication strategy. ▪ The Socio Bosque website posts a number of the monitoring reports on environmental monitoring and assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Positive alignment with UNDP SES dominates, but areas identified for improvement. Most areas to be strengthened are covered by other elements of REDD+ programming. ▪ The requirements for assessing social impacts need improvement (including the identification of key indicators for such impacts –which are in development within the National REDD+ AP and provisions for the public dissemination of these reviews and assessments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The MAE and Socio Bosque websites should include: (i) the 2017 socio-cultural assessment conducted by the Government and financed by the IDB (<i>Evaluación Socio Cultural del Programa Socio Bosque</i>, (Socio Cultural Assessment of the Socio Bosque Programme) and (ii) the 2018 <i>Análisis de Políticas y Procedimientos del Programa Socio Bosque para el Abordaje y Respeto de Salvaguardas de REDD+ y Herramientas para el Reporte e Información Existentes</i> (Analysis of Policies and Procedures of the Socio Bosque Program for the Approach to and Respect of REDD + Safeguards and Existing Information Reporting Tools). ▪ Demonstrating the systematic following up on the recommendations in these publications, would be a next good step.
<i>Key objective: Ensure stakeholders may communicate project concerns</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders have access to effective grievance redress mechanism or process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The <i>convenios</i> included a specific provision that stated “<i>In the event of disputes arising from the application of this Agreement, the parties undertake to solve them directly. If controversies are not resolved through this procedure, the parties will submit,</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Positive alignment with UNDP SES dominates, but areas identified for improvement. Most areas to be strengthened are covered by other elements of REDD+ programming.

Review Indicators	Alignment Review	Evaluation / Recommendations
	<p><i>alternatively, to mediation under the terms established in Ecuador's Law on Arbitration and Mediation before the Mediation Center of the State's Attorney General's Office, in case that the controversy is not resolved by these means, the respective action will continue before the ordinary justice in the city of Quito, for which the executor renounces his legal domicile".</i> Consequently, PSB provides an escalating mechanism for <i>socios</i>: from friendly settlement, mediation, to legal action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A separate formal mechanism for stakeholders <i>not</i> party to a <i>convenio</i> was never elaborated in a specific document or published in materials distributed. Stakeholders, however, were informed that if any concerns or grievances arose they should contact the MAE centrally or via its local directorates. The MAE then handled the grievances within its authority or forwarded it to agencies and departments with the appropriate competency to resolve the manner. ▪ The grievance mechanism seemed widely understood, nevertheless, as the Socio Bosque has diligently logged and tracked receiving approximately 1800 complaints/grievances and document that each was resolved (relating to, among others, <i>socio</i> desires to withdraw from <i>convenios</i> before the 20-year duration (approx. 9 cases), commission of prohibited activities, land registration difficulties/inconsistencies needing resolution]) ▪ Also, an online form for presenting <i>denuncias</i> (complaints) was made available, see http://suia.ambiente.gob.ec/mae-transparente which brings stakeholders to <i>MAE Transparente</i>. ▪ There is also evidence that local dispute resolution mechanisms of indigenous peoples and local communities resolved a number of grievances and concerns. ▪ The issue of a formalized grievance mechanism was discussed in the MdT REDD+ and the result was the elaboration of a draft grievance mechanism "<i>REDD+ se propone el Mecanismo de Quejas y Resolución de Controversias para REDD+</i>". This draft was the subject of debate and deliberation by stakeholders in the MdT REDD+ of October of 2016. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A specific grievance mechanism was not provided in detail, and a communication campaign around the same is not evident. However, the mechanism that was used, did seem to work to a good extent (processing of 1800 grievances). Also, consistent with effective grievance mechanisms, especially toward the latter years of PSB, those in charged received, tracked and addressed a significant number of grievances demonstrating that there was certainly a substantial degree of stakeholder awareness in the same and confidence in its capacity. ▪ It is recommended that the comments expressed in the October 2016 meeting deliberating the new draft grievance mechanisms, be reviewed in the context of the UNDP standards and the widely accepted eight "effectiveness criteria" for non-judicial GRMs (see Principle 31 of the guiding principles found at, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_Guiding_Principles_on_Business_and_Human_Rights) and that the MAE (in conjunction with the stakeholders) promptly elaborates several changes to the draft mechanism before final adoption. ▪ Increased support should be given by the Government to enhance and further empower the local dispute resolution mechanisms; whereby the decisions of the same are respected by Socio Bosque going forward and matters before those mechanisms can be tracked and reported on as well (in conjunction with the formal program grievance mechanisms)

Biodiversity and Sustainable Natural Resource Management

Key objectives: Conserve biodiversity. Maintain and enhance benefits of ecosystem services

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adverse impacts (direct and indirect) to natural resources, biodiversity, ecosystem services identified, assessed, mitigated and managed ▪ No conversion of natural forests ▪ No measurable adverse impacts to critical habitats ▪ Adverse impacts to other habitat types avoided, minimized and managed ▪ No reduction in endangered species ▪ No introduction of known invasive species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no evidence as monitored, collected and verified that shows that the PSB program resulted in any adverse impacts to natural forests, critical habitats, endangered species, introduction of invasive species, including conversion etc. (save the possibility that adverse actions permeated other areas not yet covered by the conservation/incentive agreements (<i>convenios</i>)). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The <i>convenios</i> prohibited conduct that would have caused such impacts (i.e. no felling of trees, no fires, no changes in surface uses), and because of the required monitoring by Government and <i>socios</i>, and the urgent actions taken when reports came from the field of unauthorized activities (a fire started, a logging, intensive grazing, no commercial or sports hunting, etc.), adverse impacts were avoided, if not mitigated whenever possible. ▪ In fact, in addition to the 1,434,061.95 hectares conserved in 2014 per the PSB, recent analysis has showed that 90% of the total area conserved showed maintenance of the vegetation coverage, improved water flow in the páramos, and a reduction of fires. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good level of alignment, consistent with key objectives of UNDP SES, without significant shortcomings.
--	---	---

Key objective: Promote sustainable management of living natural resources (e.g., forestry, agriculture, livestock, fisheries)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure sustainable resource management that protects biodiversity and ecosystem services ▪ Appropriate industry-specific sustainable resource production/management practices applied, including credible certification systems where appropriate ▪ Sustainable practices supported for small-scale producers ▪ Equitable benefit sharing arrangements reached for utilization of genetic resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PSB involved no utilization of genetic resources. ▪ The formula of weighing factors used to select and prioritize geographic areas for PSB coverage (detailed in the Operations Manual) included consideration of the area's capacity to provide ecosystem services including regulation of water uses, carbon storage, and biodiversity refuges. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Socios</i> outside of the páramos, were not prohibited from engaging in agricultural activities that did not result in deforestation or changes in the use of the surface resources or diminish the ecosystem service provided by the area. ▪ <i>Convenios</i> overlapping protected areas where subject to appropriate management plans for which the <i>socios</i> committed to comply with during the lifetime of the <i>convenio</i>. ▪ No certifications systems were part of the PSB program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good level of alignment, consistent with key objectives of UNDP SES, without significant shortcomings.
--	--	---

Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		
<i>Key objective: Ensure projects sensitive to climate change risks</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project components reviewed for sensitivity and vulnerability to potential climate change ▪ Social and gender risks and differentiated impacts related to climate change addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Socio Bosque’s aim is to conserve forest as a form of climate change mitigation (i.e. carbon sequestration, reduction in emissions). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As designed, the PSB will not produce significant GHG emissions; have development outcomes that may be threatened by climate change; or contribute to increased exposure and/or vulnerability to climate change. ▪ Data collected to date does not reveal that communities already subjected to impacts from climate change may experience an acceleration and/or intensification of such impacts due to the conclusion of these <i>convenios</i> and realization of their conservation objectives. ▪ Where climate change mitigation requires a reduce in overall GHG emissions, PSB aligned with this goal –z 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good level of alignment, consistent with key objectives of UNDP SES, without significant shortcomings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The larger preparations for the National REDD+ AP as well as the companion projects and activities such as the Agenda for the Productive Transformation of the Amazon and those being proposed for use of the RBPs, are being reviewed for such sensitivities in accordance with the UNDP SES Standard 2.
<i>Key objective: Reduce project-related GHG emissions</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feasible alternatives considered and adopted for reducing project-related greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In 2014 alone, PSB significantly contributed to Ecuador’s reduced emissions from deforestation of 4 831 679 tCO₂e achieved at the national level in Ecuador and reported in the REDD+ Technical Annex of the Biennial Update Report of Ecuador submitted by Ecuador to the UNFCCC in 2016. ▪ The effectiveness of PSB has resulted in decisions to expand the number of <i>convenios</i> in the future and build upon the relationship with socios to now work on reforestation efforts as well in these key areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good level of alignment, consistent with key objectives of UNDP SES, without significant shortcomings.
Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions		
<i>Key objective: Avoid adverse health and safety impacts</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Risks to communities and workers from construction and other interventions prevented or minimized and managed ▪ Measures adopted to prevent or minimize health risks and spread of infectious disease 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Socio Bosque’s activities did not pose any risks to communities or workers due to construction or other interventions. Community, Health, Safety and Working Conditions are not implicated by PSB. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This UNDP SES on Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions does not apply in the case of this project
<i>Key objective: Respect and promote workers’ rights</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Measures in place to promote non-discrimination, equal opportunity and fair treatment of workers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PSB activities did not pose any risks to workers’ rights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as above.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No use of forced labor or child labor, consistent with relevant ILO conventions 		
<p><i>Key objective: Provide safe and healthy working conditions</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures adopted to ensure healthy and safe working conditions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PSB activities did not pose any risks to safe and healthy working conditions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above.
<p>Cultural Heritage</p>		
<p><i>Key objective: Protect, manage, conserve cultural heritage</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural heritage protected from adverse risks and impacts Qualified experts utilized for risk management and conservation Chance find procedures in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PSB activities do not pose any risk to cultural heritage. To the extent that a <i>convenio</i> overlaps with an area containing tangible cultural heritage, or of importance to the protection of non-tangible cultural heritage (like traditional knowledge or practices) – arguably, the fact that it is within an area of conservation only provides greater protection for the same. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With respect to non-tangible cultural heritage like traditional knowledge or practices, the PSB never had activities aimed at affirmatively using traditional knowledge or limiting traditional practices that are not commercial, but rather to provide for their continuance as long as they were consistent with the restrictions to resource uses provided by the <i>convenios</i>. In such circumstances, the restrictions on such practices would only be in place as a result of a voluntary agreement of the communities. The PSB Operations Manual requires the approval of the community for any submission of all or part of their lands within the PSB areas of conservation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the UNDP SES on Cultural Heritage applies, there appears to be a good level of alignment, consistent with key objectives of UNDP SES, without significant shortcomings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where adverse impacts to intangible cultural heritage (like traditional knowledge or practices) is possible, it is recommended that going forward the <i>convenios</i> be very specific about any possible limits or impacts to such heritage to ensure full informed consent. Including assessments of cultural impacts within the context of social impacts could also be beneficial going forward. If indicators for cultural impacts are not yet incorporated into those being developed for the National REDD+ AP, this too should be done.
<p><i>Key objective: Promote equitable benefit sharing from utilization of cultural heritage</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inform affected communities of rights and proceed only if good faith negotiations provide for fair and equitable benefit sharing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PSB does not contemplate any use of cultural heritage, hence no benefit sharing arrangement were required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above.
<p>Displacement and Resettlement</p>		
<p><i>Key objectives: Avoid adverse impacts from land or resource acquisition or restrictions on land/resource use. Minimize adverse impacts where avoidance not possible.</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures in place to avoid, and where avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate physical or economic displacement from land or resource acquisition or restrictions on land or resource use Any displacement activities carried out in fully participatory manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PSB activities do not pose a risk of unlawful physical or economic displacements because 1) no physical relocation of people is required by the PSB or the <i>convenios</i>; and 2) to the extent that limitations on the uses of natural resources arguably could rise to the level of effectuating an economic displacement, the title holders voluntarily agree to such restrictions (they apply for submission of their lands into the programme, it is not a government imposition). Indeed, with respect to indigenous 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arguably, the UNDP SES on Displacement and Resettlement does not apply here, but if it did, there is a Good level of alignment, consistent with key objectives of UNDP SES, without significant shortcomings.

	<p>peoples and local communities, the Socio Bosque requirement that the decision to accept such limitations is expressed in an approval coming from the highest decision-making body of the peoples or communities (if a collective). This ensures that this agreement is the result of a clear expression of consent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The increased capacity sessions and community briefings were in place to ensure that these decisions are taken freely and in an informed manner. ▪ None of the grievances registered with the mechanisms in place include complaints that the community took their decisions under some form of coercion, lack of information, or per procedures not consistent with their own norms, values and customs. 	
<p><i>Key objective: Recognize and respect the prohibition on forced evictions</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No forced evictions, allowing evictions only in exceptional circumstances meeting lawful criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No unlawful physical or economic displacement occurred because of the program. The PSB <i>convenios</i> also provide that the <i>socios</i> can request withdraw of their lands from the programme whenever they wish (if they were to believe that the restrictions were working an economic displacement of sorts). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as above.
<p><i>Key objective: Enhance or at least restore livelihoods of all displaced persons, and improve living standards of displaced poor and other vulnerable groups</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livelihoods of any displaced persons enhanced or at least restored through compensation at full replacement costs and other assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No unlawful physical or economic displacement occurred as a result of the program. The PSB <i>convenios</i> also provide that the <i>socios</i> can request withdraw of their lands from the programme whenever they wish (if they were to believe that the restrictions were working an economic displacement of sorts). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as above.
<p>Indigenous Peoples</p>		
<p><i>Key objective: Recognize and foster full respect for indigenous peoples' human rights</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indigenous peoples' rights recognized and protected ▪ No actions supported that violate indigenous peoples' rights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The rights of indigenous peoples and local communities are expressly recognized in operative documents around PSB, including Resolution No. 281, <i>Norma Técnica para el Control y Seguimiento de Planes de Inversión de Socios Colectivos del Proyecto Socio Bosque</i> (Technical Standard for the Control and Monitoring of Investment Plans of Collective Partners of the Socio Bosque Project). This resolution establishes that in the execution of the PSB, the MAE must observe and guarantee the rights of indigenous communities, peoples and nationalities as reflected in Article 57 of the Constitution, which also means in accordance with international treaties. ▪ The PSB recognizes the rights of indigenous peoples to own their ancestral lands and through decisions by their own representative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good level of alignment, consistent with key objectives of UNDP SES, without significant shortcomings.

	<p>institutions designated by them, decide what to do with them, and be free from an imposition by the Government of a conservation programme on such lands without their consent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are no reports that actions taken by PSB violated indigenous peoples' rights – this makes sense since it is a voluntary programme. There were some misunderstandings by indigenous peoples and local communities, after the fact, as to what was provided by the convenio (limits on their resource uses), these were not violations necessarily, just symptoms of a need to increase information dissemination both before and after the community makes a decision. ▪ To the extent it is argued that certain protected areas (PANES) were previously established on indigenous lands in a manner that was contrary to their rights under applicable law, the PSB <i>convenios</i> with indigenous peoples and local communities for ancestral lands located within these PANES did not change the status quo, reinforce or endorse these prior establishments, but rather provided a mechanism by which indigenous ownership of the lands within such areas would be recognized and an opportunity to receive benefits (per the incentive programme) for their participation in the conservation of these areas. ▪ The eligibility requirements and subsequent vetting of the same provided added measures to ensure that a title owner did not prejudice the rights and/or land claims of indigenous peoples. 	
<p><i>Key objective: Ensure projects designed in partnership with full, effective indigenous peoples' participation, and securing FPIC where IP rights, lands, resources, territories of traditional livelihoods affected</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Culturally appropriate meaningful participation undertaken for all activities that affect indigenous peoples ▪ Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) obtained for activities that affect the rights, interests, lands, resources, territories, traditional livelihoods of affected indigenous peoples ▪ No relocation of indigenous peoples without FPIC and only after just and fair compensation, with option of return where possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Socio Bosque team provided information orally and in written form to communities, including with appropriate translations and interpretation, prior to the decision-making of the peoples and communities in question. ▪ Indigenous peoples and communities participated in various stakeholder engagements to effectuate changes to the five adopted iterations of the Operations Manual. ▪ Decisions were taken freely and in an informed manner by the indigenous peoples and communities in question, by their chosen representative institutions in accordance with their own decision-making norms, values and customs. Assessments have shown ample participation in the initial decisions to submit lands within PSB, though meaningful participation may have decreased over time (i.e. in the implementation of the investment plans, accountability and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good level of alignment, consistent with key objectives of UNDP SES, without significant shortcomings.

	<p>monitoring efforts, capacity sessions for the same). This seems to have occurred for a variety of reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was no physical relocation of indigenous peoples as a result of the PSB program. As noted above, even if the restrictions on use of natural resources could be argued to have risen to the level of an economic displacement for a particular community, these restrictions were voluntarily and assumed in exchange for an incentive programme. 	
<p><i>Key objective: Promote greater indigenous peoples' control and management of developments affecting their lands and resources, aligning with their visions and priorities</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures recognize indigenous peoples' collective rights to own, use, develop, control lands, resources, territories they have traditionally owned, occupied, otherwise used or acquired 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As the inclusion of indigenous peoples' lands and resources in the PSB programme is voluntary and based on their land rights and rights to make decisions to enter their lands in such a programme, there is a respect for their collective rights to property. ▪ In response to concerns about discrimination between indigenous peoples and local communities with titles and those without, the PSB provided a route for those with titles pending to provide certifications from the relevant authorities recognizing their lands as ancestral. ▪ The Socio Bosque staff was charged with vetting all applications and confirming the accuracy of titles. This also helped to prevent an alleged title holder from prejudicing any rights and claims of an indigenous peoples or local community (and vice a verza). ▪ To the extent that Ecuador's law does not fully recognize indigenous peoples' rights to control the administration and use of all of the natural resources within its territories (making distinctions between strategic resources such as non-renewal resources versus renewal resources), this possible inconsistency with internationally recognized rights <i>does not appear to be implicated by the Socio Bosque Program</i>. In particular, logged grievances do not indicate that indigenous peoples have claimed a violation of these rights in practice (per implementation). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good level of alignment, consistent with key objectives of UNDP SES, without significant shortcomings.
<p><i>Key objective: Avoid adverse impacts, mitigate residual impacts, ensure just equitable benefits and opportunities in a culturally appropriate manner</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adverse impacts on indigenous peoples are avoided, and where avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated ▪ Measures in place to ensure equitable benefit sharing from project activities in culturally appropriate manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PSB does not contemplate, nor has it identified adverse impacts on indigenous peoples as long as the conditions and parameters of PSB are implemented in good faith (i.e. all is voluntary, in accordance with their forms of decision-making, through their representative institutions, and based on relevant materials and information previously disclosed to ensure informed decision-making by the community or peoples in question). Evidence received to date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good level of alignment, consistent with key objectives of UNDP SES, without significant shortcomings.

	<p>demonstrates that these parameters have been implemented in good faith.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Socio Bosque is designed to provided equitable benefit sharing by actually prioritizing indigenous peoples and local communities as potential <i>socios</i> and beneficiaries. ▪ The benefits provided to all landowners (individuals and collectives) are distinguishable based on land size, not the identity (or cultural identity) of the owner –whether a single or collective, whether indigenous or non-indigenous. ▪ The benefits are distributed/shared in a culturally appropriate manner if viewed in the context that it is the indigenous peoples and communities themselves that decide, in a self-determined manner, on what they want to spend their incentives. They decide their development priorities – conservation, health, cultural preservation initiatives, education etc. The Government does not mandate the way the communities draw up their Investment Plans and how they spend the incentives, nor does it provide different incentives to non-indigenous beneficiaries. 	
Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		
<i>Key objective: Avoid/minimize adverse impacts on human health and environment from pollution</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Measures in place to avoid, minimize and mitigate risks posed to human health and the environment from pollutants, wastes, and hazardous materials ▪ Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approaches utilized to reduce reliance on synthetic pesticides. ▪ Least toxic effective pesticides utilized and pesticides handled per FAO Code of Conduct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No PSB activities posed risks to human health or the environment due to pollutants, wastes or hazardous materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The UNDP SES on Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency does not apply in the case of this project
<i>Key objective: Promote more sustainable use of resources, including energy, land and water</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Feasible measures implemented to improve efficiency in consumption of inputs (e.g. raw materials, energy, water) ▪ Use of water resources does not adversely impact others or sensitive ecosystems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No Socio Bosque activities posed risks to efficient consumption of inputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as above.