

Sustainable Landscapes Rating Tool DRAFT –28 November30 April25 May 2017

Revision of Nov 2016 ~~version based on~~ feedback on Nov 2016 from working groups at Sustainable Landscapes Workshop in Brussels 7-9 March 2017, participants in workshop in San Martin Peru 25 January 2017 and from several reviewers

This is a working draft prepared by the Climate Community & Biodiversity Alliance, Conservation International, EcoAgriculture Partners, Global Canopy Programme, Rainforest Alliance and Wildlife Conservation Society. More information about the purpose of this tool is available [here](#).

Please send your comments and feedback to Joanna Durbin, CCBA, jdurbin@climate-standards.org

Jurisdiction:		Country:		Date assessed:		Assessed by: <u>organization and individuals leading the assessment</u> How assessed: e.g. literature review and interviews conducted in XXX (see Annexe 1)	
Main export commodities:							
Government pledges/commitments to landscape sustainability: <u>provide description, date and links</u>							
National Ratings: e.g. Transparency International Perceptions of Transparency, World Bank Ease of Doing Business, Economist Intelligence Unit Country Risk Rating (<u>provide rating, date and links</u>)							
Sub-national Ratings: eg Forest 500 (<u>provide rating, date and links</u>)							
Criteria – enabling conditions	Indicators – elements of quality	Guidance on Rating (A, B, C or ID Insufficient Data)			Level 1- Public information 2-From interviews	Rating A, B, C, or ID (Insufficient Data)	Justification and Evidence <u>Justify the rating (A,B,C,ID) given for each indicator</u> Provide links to <u>supporting</u> evidence in the form of policies, strategies, plans, maps, reports etc. <u>and justify the rating given for each indicator</u> <u>Explain clearly where rating is based on national and/or frameworks and where sub-national frameworks affect rating</u> <u>Identify which national or subnational law/institution/practice is the subject of the rating.</u> <u>Users may explain trends or expected changes to rating, providing supporting evidence such as reports and plans.</u>
		A (High)	B (Medium)	C (Low)			
1. Land use planning and management							
1.1 Land use plan/zoning	1.1.1 Formally adopted	Adopted by law and regulations require that it is respected.	Agreed by government and stakeholders but not fully legally adopted.	Does not yet exist. May be in development.	1		Zoning can be scale dependent; i.e., does not reflect zoning within IP territories. In some African geographies, might be “C” for long time. Perhaps too black and white; could better reflect whether govt is on pathway to A or B. <i>Response: added question on extent to which all jurisdiction is covered. Added guidance encouraging users to explain expected progress (backed with evidence) in Justification and Evidence column</i>
	1.1.2 Covers entire jurisdiction	Covers entire jurisdiction land area	Covers 50% or more of jurisdiction land area	Covers less than 50% of jurisdiction land area	1		

Commented [JD1]: Proposed in several comments including 3.05, 3.12 (see accompanying response to comments).

Commented [JD4]: DAR: Evidence or Justification

Commented [JD5R4]: accepted

Commented [CD2]: Is 1 seen as better than 2? Or vice versa? Or might they be equally valid?

Commented [JD3R2]: 1 is more reliable as based on published information

Formatted Table

	1.1.323 Developed through a participatory process	Consultations were held with all groups of stakeholders in the jurisdiction, (including all levels and relevant departments of government, relevant private sector organizations, large and small producers, NGOs, local communities and indigenous peoples where present), comments have been published and with evidence they influenced the plan/zoning, and the land use plan/zoning was validated by stakeholders.	Consultations have been conducted with some but not all groups of stakeholders about the land use plan/zoning and/or not meeting all other conditions for A. -	There is no evidence of consultations with stakeholders about the land use plan-/zoning.	1		<i>Guidance (please delete): Users should provide a reference for the analysis of stakeholder groups used for the rating and evidence of stakeholder groups that were invited to and participated in consultations. Evidence that stakeholder input influenced the plan/zoning may include a written statement or minutes of a meeting explaining of how stakeholder input was taken into account or other relevant documentation.</i>
1.2 Social and environmental impact assessments and plans to mitigate risks	1.2.1 Required by government regulations	All projects/programs affecting land use are required by government regulations to undergo screening to identify those that require social and	Some but not all projects/programs affecting land use are required by government regulations to undergo screening to identify those with significant impacts that	There is no regulatory requirement for project/program screening and for those with significant impacts to implement a social and environmental impact	1	1	most countries if not all have the regulations <i>Response: added requirement for screening to identify those that require SEIA</i> <i>Guidance (please delete): Note that regulations that only require environmental or social impact assessment and mitigation plans get C rating.</i>

Commented [AL6]: It is a bit challenging to determine who ALL stakeholders are. According to whom?

Commented [JD7R6]: Added types of stakeholders to ensure at least these groups were consulted. Also added guidance on need for evidence and justification on analysis of stakeholder groups.

Commented [CD8]: Assessments of what? A jurisdictional program? Any permit? Large scale land use change or infrastructure development?

Commented [JD9R8]: 1.2.1 changed to require screening before SEIA, refers to all projects/programs, private or public

	environmental impact assessments and plans to mitigate significant negative impacts, are required by government regulations for all activities affecting land use.	require social and environmental impact assessments and plans to mitigate significant negative impacts are required by government regulations but there is no requirement for a plan to mitigate significant negative impacts.	assessment and a plan to mitigate significant negative impacts.			
1.2.2 Address impacts on indigenous peoples, and local communities including smallholders and vulnerable people	Government regulations require that impacts on indigenous peoples, and local communities and vulnerable people (identified through stakeholder analysis and/or regulations), including smallholders, must be identified and specific measures developed and implemented to	Government regulations require that impacts on indigenous peoples and local communities people including smallholders are identified with no definition or special attention for vulnerable people but there is and/or no specific requirement for measures to address these impacts.	No regulatory requirement to identify and address impacts on indigenous peoples and/or local communities, including smallholders.	1		Some african countries use "forest dependent communities" as terminolog Response this is covered the term 'local communities'

Commented [CD10]: Required is not the same as actually done – is implementation/ enforcement addressed somewhere?

Commented [JD11R10]: Addressed in 1.2.6

Commented [CD12]: How is local communities defined here? Vulnerable groups? All communities in a jurisdiction?

Commented [JD13R12]: Applies to all those who may be impacted by proposed project/program. Added that these groups are identified through stakeholder analysis and/or regulations. For example there may be a legal definition of vulnerable people/groups.

		address these impacts.					
	1.2.3 Address impacts on biodiversity and other ecosystem service values	Government regulations require that impacts on biodiversity and other ecosystem service values must be identified and specific measures developed and implemented to address these impacts.	Government regulations require that impacts on biodiversity and other ecosystem service values are identified but there is no specific requirement for measures to address these impacts.	No regulatory requirement to identify and address impacts on biodiversity and other ecosystem service values.	1		
	1.2.4 Subject to public consultation	Opportunities are consistently provided for public comments on draft reports. The received are comments received are published and clearly addressed in final versions.	Government regulations require that there are opportunities for public comments on draft reports, but there is no requirement and/or evidence of consistent publication of comments received.	No regulatory public comment requirement on draft reports.	1		
	1.2.5 Publicly accessible (transparency?)	All reports are consistently publicly available on government website.	Some reports are publicly available online.	Reports are not publicly available.	1		
	1.2.6 Conducted in practice for all	Screening for level of impacts and subsequent social social and	Screening for level of impacts and subsequent social social and	Screening for level of impacts and subsequent social social and	2		Farm level activities usually fall well below criteria to trigger regulations, so not done. Consider what scale at which these SEA policies are implemented

	land use activities	environmental impact assessments <u>and mitigation plans</u> are conducted in practice for <u>projects/programs affecting land use activities in most cases</u> <u>nearly all cases</u> , including for agriculture.	environmental impact assessments <u>and/or mitigation plans</u> are conducted in practice in some cases but <u>not all</u> , e.g. not typically <u>conducted</u> for agricultural activities.	environmental impact assessments <u>and/or mitigation plans</u> are rarely conducted in practice.			<i>Response: included a requirement to screen activities to see if they meet a threshold defined in the regulations for ESIA.</i>
1.3 Process for delivering authorizations for land use <u>activities and changes</u>	1.3.1 Consistent with land use plan/zoning	Process for delivering authorizations <u>for land use change following respecting</u> land use plan/zoning is clearly defined by law <u>for all types of land use change</u> .	Process for delivering authorizations for land use change is clearly defined by law <u>for some types of land use change but not all, and/or but</u> does not require the land use plan/zoning to be <u>followed/respected</u> .	Process for delivering authorizations for land use change is not clearly defined by law.	1		
	1.3.2 Depends on impact assessment	Process for delivering authorizations for <u>projects/programs affecting</u> land use <u>change</u> requires taking into account results of impact assessment <u>for all types of land use change</u> .	Process for delivering authorizations for <u>projects/programs affecting</u> land use <u>change</u> does not require taking into account results of impact assessment <u>or not for all types</u>	Process for delivering authorizations for <u>projects/programs affecting</u> land use <u>change</u> does <u>not take into require taking into</u> account results of impact assessment <u>and</u>	1		

Commented [CD14]: Is this practical? "All land use activities" includes each small farm, each community collection of firewood... You may want to be more targeted here.

Commented [JD15R14]: Added clarification on a requirement for screening for land use activities

Commented [JD16]: Anne: Is the issue that what is required is conducted, or what should be required is conducted... If mitigation plans is not included here, it means mitigation may be required but is not done in practice and this would not be measured. JD: Good addition of mitigation plans. I think we should base the assessment on what should be required. If there are no requirements for impact assessments and mitigation plans then could not get A for this indicator.

Anne: Should social and environmental be made into separate questions?
JD Most cases I know of combine social and environmental in one set of regulations. Would get C in 1.2.1 if only one of social or environmental

Commented [JD17]: Changing most to nearly all based on later comment – good suggestion

Commented [JD18]: The third column sounds like implementation, not rules.
JD – good point. Made a change to clarify difference between A, B, C.

			<u>of land use change-</u>	<u>is not for all types of land use change.</u>			
	1.3.3 <u>Follows Respects</u> land use plan/zoning in practice	Land use change authorizations <u>follow-respect</u> the land use plan/zoning in <u>most/nearly all</u> cases.	Land use change authorizations <u>follow-respect</u> the land use plan/zoning in some cases.	Land use change authorizations rarely <u>follow respect</u> the land use plan/zoning.	2		
1.4 Institutions/agencies responsible for land use planning and management	1.4.1 Roles and responsibilities are defined	Clearly defined for all land use types in documents accessible on government website, <u>without overlap or confusion in responsibilities- (eg. from overlaps).</u>	Not fully defined, and/or defined for some but not all land use types, and/or not fully accessible in government documents <u>and/or with overlap or confusion in responsibilities.</u>	Not clearly defined in government documents.	1		
	1.4.2 Have resources and capacity for implementation and enforcement	<u>Implementation and enforcement of compliance with land use regulations is not greatly is little affected by the financial and other resources and capacity of the</u> Institutions/agencies responsible for land use planning and management <u>have sufficient</u>	<u>Implementation and enforcement of compliance with land use regulations is somewhat affected by the financial and other resources and capacity of the</u> Institutions/agencies responsible for land use planning and management <u>have limited</u>	<u>Implementation and enforcement of compliance with land use regulations is greatly affected by the resources and capacity of the</u> institutions/agencies responsible for land use planning and management <u>do not have budget or personnel for on-site</u>	<u>2+2</u>		<u>Guidance (please delete): Evidence for this rating may be provided by published evidence in the form of institutional budget indicating level of resources available for on-site inspection, surveillance and enforcement (for Level 1) and/or through confidential surveys of people directly involved in implementation of land use regulations and people affected by them (for Level 2). The justification should provide information on the number of people surveyed from different stakeholder groups and organizations, and should explain how bias was avoided and confidentiality maintained.</u>

Commented [NC19]: Words like most/ some, or often/sometimes may leave room for ambiguity. (for different sections of the document)

ANNE: Suggest: The vast majority of cases, Joanna – changed to nearly all based on later comment

Commented [NC20]: Here it may also be interesting to see the willingness that the jurisdictions have to work on certain issues. For example, in one of the regions that we visited, they are reluctant to work on “green” issues (regardless of having or not the capacity to do it). I understand that measuring interest/intentions may be harder to evaluate, especially if it’s a single person (like the head of this specific landscape) who makes these decisions or has these inclinations.

Joanna: not sure how to assess political willingness – we now recommend they provide evidence of expected changes in rating through plans/reports in justification column

Commented [AL21]: It is hard to find NO overlaps. And overlaps are not all bad. They require coordination. Perhaps: without overlaps that generate confusion? Though I realize in a law or norm this may not be clear. Joanna – good point – have given overlaps as example of confusion, which is the key issue

Commented [AL23]: Why? Isn’t this a budget issue? Joanna – It is a budget issue., but if they publish the budget, how could one judge if it is sufficient for effective implementation? Added some clarifications of need for budget for site visits. Does this work for level 1? Difference between A and B is still subjective

Commented [AL22]: I don’t understand these statements very well. Do you mean “have sufficient resources”? because it seems to me that implementation will always be affected by the resources available to implement. Joanna – made some edits to address this - thanks

		<u>budget and personnel for on-site inspection, surveillance and enforcement enabling effective implementation.</u>	<u>budget and/or personnel for on-site inspection, surveillance and enforcement which reduces the effectiveness of implementation.</u>	<u>inspection, surveillance and enforcement or no published information exists and/or implementation is greatly affected by lack of resources.</u>			
1.4.323 Have resources and demonstrated capacity for implementation and enforcement of land use regulations	Implementation and enforcement of compliance with land use regulations is not greatly affected by the resources and capacity of the institutions/agencies responsible for land use planning and management. regularly conducted throughout the jurisdiction for all land use regulations and non-compliance leads to penalties.	Implementation and enforcement of compliance with land use regulations is somewhat affected by the resources and capacity of the institutions/agencies responsible for land use planning and management. is sometimes conducted and/or only in some parts of the jurisdiction, and/or non-compliance only sometimes leads to penalties.	Implementation and enforcement of compliance with land use regulations is greatly affected by the resources and capacity of the institutions/agencies responsible for land use planning and management. is rarely conducted and/or non-compliance rarely leads to penalties.	21+2			<i>Response: separated resources and capacity into two indicators in response to comment 3.07 (see accompanying response to comments). Guidance (please delete): Evidence for this rating may be provided by records of infractions and fines or other penalties levied or by reports of surveillance conducted (for Level 1) and/or through confidential surveys of people outside government directly involved in land use activities (for Level 2). The justification should provide information on the number of people surveyed from different stakeholder groups and organizations, and should explain how bias was avoided and confidentiality maintained.</i>
1.4.424 Perceived to be free of corruption	Corruption is perceived to be rare in it is uncommon for individuals or organizations to	Individuals or organizations sometimes make undocumented extra payments or bribes for	Individuals or organizations often make undocumented extra payments or bribes for	2			<i>This is problematic as it is in eyes of beholder. Govt may say LOW, while local communities may say high; if used over time, this would need to be consistent in order to be comparative. there are some national level corruption indices that might be relevant Response- Propose to add country ranking in Transparency International Perceptions of Corruption Index – eg Peru is ranked 101</i>

Commented [AL24]: Is there no way to include a documentable question here such as court or police records? I realize it is not obvious: is no crime an indicator of no crime or of no enforcement...
Joanna – I think we need interviews for exactly this reason.

Commented [CWM25]: Perception is in the eye of the beholder... better way to measure this as it seems quite arbitrary the way it is phrased. Use a world bank or transparency international data set?

		<p><u>make undocumented extra payments or bribes for authorizations for activities affecting land use</u> <u>Institutions/agencies responsible for land use planning and management.</u></p>	<p><u>authorizations for activities affecting land use</u> <u>Corruption is perceived to be localized and/or occasional in Institutions/agencies responsible for land use planning and management.</u></p>	<p><u>authorizations for activities affecting land use</u> <u>Corruption is perceived to be widespread and frequent in Institutions/agencies responsible for land use planning and management.</u></p>		<p><i>among 176 countries assessed. Note that TI PCI is, itself a composite of ratings related to corruption from 13 other sources eg EIU country risk ratings, Freedom House Nations in Transit. Note that not all these sources cover all countries. The following sources were used as a basis to develop this indicator which focuses on corruption related to authorizations:</i></p> <p><i>a) Global Insight Country Risk Ratings 2015- assessments are made by in-house country specialists, who also draw on the expert opinions of in-country freelancers, clients and other contacts. Experts are asked to assess: The risk that individuals/companies will face bribery or other corrupt practices to carry out business, from securing major contracts to being allowed to import/export a small product or obtain everyday paperwork. This threatens a company's ability to operate in a country, or opens it up to legal or regulatory penalties and reputational damage. The ratings range from a minimum of 1.0 (maximum corruption) to 5.0 (minimum corruption) and allow for half-point intermediate scores (e.g. 3.5).</i></p> <p><i>a) World Economic Forum Executive Opinion Survey asks (On a scale of 1-7 where 1 means very common and 7 means never) "In your country, how common is it for firms to make undocumented extra payments or bribes connected with the following": a) Imports and exports; b) Public Utilities; c) Annual Tax Payments; d) Awarding of public contracts and licenses; e) Obtaining favourable judicial decisions.</i></p> <p><u>Guidance (please delete): This rating should be assessed through confidential surveys of people outside government with direct experience of seeking authorizations for land use activities. The justification must should provide information on the number of people surveyed from different stakeholder groups and organizations, and should explain how bias was avoided and confidentiality maintained.</u></p>
<p><u>1.5 Sustainable landscape goals</u></p>	<p><u>1.5.1 Sustainable landscape goals are identified</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainable landscape goals, including environmental, economic and social goals,</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainable landscape goals have been identified but not for the entire</u></p>	<p><u>Sustainable landscape goals have not been identified.</u></p>	<p><u>1</u></p>	<p><i>Response – indicator added in response to comment 3.03 (see separate document providing responses to comments)</i></p>

		have been identified for the entire jurisdiction and endorsed by government, including environmental, economic and social goals	jurisdiction and/or not endorsed by government and/or not including environmental, economic and social goals.				
	1.5.2 Developed through a participatory process	Consultations were held with all groups of stakeholders in the jurisdiction, (including all levels and relevant departments of government, relevant private sector organizations, large and small producers, NGOs, local communities and indigenous peoples where present), comments have been published and with evidence they influenced the goals, and the goals were validated by stakeholders.	Consultations have been conducted with some but not all groups of stakeholders about the goals and/or not meeting all other conditions for A.	There is no evidence of consultations with stakeholders about the goals.	1		<i>Guidance (please delete): Users should provide a reference for the analysis of stakeholder groups used for the rating and evidence of stakeholder groups that were invited to and participated in consultations. Evidence that stakeholder input influenced the goals may include a written statement or minutes of a meeting explaining of how stakeholder input was taken into account or other relevant documentation.</i>
1.656 Data and spatial analysis of	1.656.1 Spatial analysis of past conversion of	Spatial analysis of conversion of major habitat	Partial spatial analysis of conversion of	Data may be available but no spatial analysis	1		20 years seems arbitrary. "data point" is subject to interpretation—do we mean actual analysis or a single data point? 10 years probably more relevant

land use change	major habitat types	types, including all significant activities and habitat types deforestation, if appropriate types, across entire jurisdiction over the last 20 years, with at least 3 data points in the last 10 years is endorsed by government.	major habitat types in the past and/or 2 or fewer data points over last 20-10 years and/or not endorsed by government.	of land use change affecting major habitat types.			<i>Response – B means analysis not just existence of data which would get a C, changed to analysis using 2 or fewer data points in last 10 years. The data could include a 3rd point more than ten years ago but would still get a B.</i>
	1.5.2 Includes degradation	Spatial analysis available of degradation of major habitat types (e.g. forest degradation) covering entire jurisdiction.	Partial or preliminary assessment available of habitat degradation.	No assessment available of habitat degradation.	1		<i>Might be aspirational because so few Landscapes can estimate degradation, because methodologies are not there yet. If ever used in a comparative/standard context Response – removed this indicator as too hard to achieve.</i>
	1.6.25-32 Projection of future land use change	Forest or other reference level projecting expected future land use changes based on historical changes projecting future spatially explicit land use change has been endorsed by government and validated by independent experts covering entire	Forest or other reference level exists projecting future land use change (but not meeting all points in conditions for A).	No future projections of land use change forest or other reference level exists projecting future land use change.	1	1	<i>Response: removed spatially explicit projection as this is not necessary (many are just a level). Maintained the concept of a reference level as a future projection but require that it is based on historical changes for A rating in response to 3.10 (see accompanying response to comments). Validation by independent experts and use of internationally recognised methodology aim to ensure credibility.</i>

Commented [CD26]: Spatial analysis can be done by anyone, using a variety of data sets. Is this meant to imply it has been carried out by the government? Or that it is available on 3rd party sites?

Commented [JD27R26]: Another comment indicated that government capacity to use the data is important. Added that can only get A if endorsed by Govt eg government as a partner.

Commented [JD28]: Comment 3.10 (see separate response to comments) suggested replacing with 'including all significant activities and pools' but pools is very related to emissions analysis so kept habitat types.

Commented [CD29]: RLs may not be projections (might be historic averages, for example), and are not spatially explicit (though some inputs might be). And the existing official RL may not be a credible one, unfortunately.

		jurisdiction, using internationally recognized methodology and consistent with any existing official national reference level.					
1.7.6.7 Data and analysis of drivers of deforestation and degradation other habitat changes	1.7.6.7.1 Available for <u>deforestation</u>	Comprehensive analysis conducted/updated in last five years of direct and indirect drivers of deforestation <u>in the jurisdiction and endorsed by government.</u>	Partial or preliminary analysis of direct and indirect drivers of deforestation.	No analysis of direct and indirect drivers of deforestation.	1		<i>Response: removed degradation as too demanding and made it clear not only considering deforestation but conversión of other habitats</i>
	1.6.2 Includes planned and unplanned deforestation	Comprehensive analysis of planned and unplanned deforestation.	Partial or preliminary analysis of planned and unplanned deforestation.	Data available but no analysis of planned and unplanned deforestation.	1		Less important (SM) Response: removed this indicator to simplify
	1.7.26.3 Includes 2 Available for conversion/ deg radation of non-forest ecosystems shab itatshabitats	Comprehensive analysis of <u>direct and indirect</u> drivers of conversion/ degr adation of non-forest ecosystems <u>in the jurisdiction conducted/updated in last five years and endorsed by government.</u>	Partial or preliminary analysis of <u>direct and indirect</u> drivers of conversion/ degr adation of non-forest ecosystems.	Data available but no <u>No</u> analysis of <u>direct and indirect</u> drivers of conversion/ degr adation of non-forest ecosystems.	1		Maybe not necessary in a section on drivers of deforestation? (SM workshop) Response — changed section to deforestation and other habitat changes

Commented [CD30]: Again, is the implication this analysis has been done by the government?

	1.878.1 Formally adopted	Strategy <u>specific to the jurisdiction</u> addresses all significant drivers and is formally approved <u>and adopted by government</u> and adopted by law .	Strategy addresses only some drivers and/or <u>not specific to the jurisdiction</u> and/or agreed by government <u>and stakeholders</u> but not <u>legally formally</u> adopted.	No progress, or strategy is in development.	1		Should ask if the strategy is specific to the jurisdiction. National strategy less useful <i>Response – added specific to the jurisdiction for A</i>
1.8 Strategy and action plan to address drivers of deforestation/ conversion of other habitats	1.878.2 Developed through a participatory process	Consultations were held with all groups of stakeholders <u>in the jurisdiction, (including all levels and relevant departments of government, relevant private sector organizations, large and small producers, NGOs, local communities and indigenous peoples where present),</u> comments have been published <u>and with evidence they influenced the strategy/plan,</u> and the strategy/plan	Consultations have been conducted with <u>some but not all groups of stakeholders in the jurisdiction</u> about the strategy/plan <u>and/or not meeting all other conditions for A.</u>	There is no evidence of consultations with stakeholders about the strategy/plan.	1		Not so important (SM). Need to check if consultations in jurisdiction, or only at national level <i>Response: added 'in the jurisdiction' Guidance (please delete): Users should provide a reference for the analysis of stakeholder groups used for the rating and evidence of stakeholder groups that were invited to and participated in consultations. Evidence that stakeholder input influenced the analysis may include a written statement or minutes of a meeting explaining of how stakeholder input was taken into account or other relevant documentation.</i>

Commented [CD31]: May want to make “adopted by law” a bit more broad – some systems have other means by which plans are formalized.

Commented [JD32R31]: Changed to ‘formally adopted’

Commented [AL33]: Same as above

		was validated by stakeholders.					
	1.788.3 Includes action plan	Action plan for the jurisdiction includes targets, schedule, roles, responsibilities, budget and secured finance for next five years.	Action plan exists but does not include all points meet all conditions in A.	Action plan does not exist or is in development. <u>May be under</u>	1		
	1.878.4 Implementation	Implementation reports are available on results (e.g. <u>progress towards targets</u>). may include reports to donors .	Implementation reports are available on <u>progress towards targets/activities conducted</u> .	Implementation reports are not <u>yet</u> available <u>yet</u> —early stages of implementation.	1		
1.989 Monitoring and reporting systems	1.989.1 Deforestation Forests	Forest monitoring system <u>is</u> in place to and <u>providing</u> <u>annual</u> <u>providing</u> <u>government endorsed</u> reports of deforestation, <u>reforestation</u> , <u>afforestation</u> and other forest changes in the jurisdiction.	Forest monitoring system in place <u>but has not yet provided a report and/or to provide is</u> <u>providing</u> partial deforestation <u>forest change</u> information for the jurisdiction <u>and/or not endorsed by government or reporting is less frequent than annual</u> .	<u>Not in place.</u> <u>May be</u> <u>under</u> development.	1		
	1.989.2 GHG emissions from land-use	MRV system is in place to and <u>provide</u>	Preliminary or partial MRV in place (e.g. only	<u>Not in place.</u> <u>May be</u>	1		

Commented [CD34]: “Secured finance” may be a bit optimistic. Most of these plans include financing of multiple types, from multiple sources, many of which may include ongoing business operations, etc. Hard to say what is “secured.”

Commented [JD35R34]: If include ‘secured finance’ would need to explain how justify the level of security of the finance. I think this can be justified if there is reasonable expectation that significant funding will be available.

Commented [CD36]: How are A and B different?

Commented [JD37R36]: Changed B to activity report instead of results report

Commented [AL38]: I would add 1.9.5 based on CIFOR’s MRV research, which suggests that these systems should be developed also in participatory ways but also that for their legitimacy, subnational actors also want/need to be able to use the data... 1.9.5 Monitoring data available and used. (1) monitoring systems provide data to local actors, organizations and/or subnational governments and is used for local planning and management activities. (2) monitoring systems provide limited data or data only to some local actors, organizations or subnational governments and/or they do not have the capacity or resources to use it. (3) data is not provided or used.

Commented [JD39R38]: Good suggestion

Commented [CD40]: Ideally not just deforestation, but also degradation, afforestation/reforestation, etc.

Commented [JD41R40]: Changed to forest change

	<u>providing government endorsed annual reports on land use GHG emissions in the jurisdiction that have been periodically verified by an independent third party.</u>	for forests) <u>and/or report has not been verified by an independent third party and/or not endorsed by government or reporting is less frequent than annually.</u>	Under under development.			
1.8.3 Production	<u>Monitoring system is in place to provide annual reports on production for all major production sectors.</u>	<u>Monitoring reports are in place to provide reports on production for some sectors or reporting is less frequent than annual.</u>	<u>Under</u> development.	<u>1</u>		<i>Response — removed as covered for each production system in section 5</i>
1.9.23 Biodiversity and other ecosystem services	<u>Monitoring system is in place and providing government endorsed reports on changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services in the jurisdiction.</u>	<u>Monitoring system is in place but report not produced within last three years and/or covers part of changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services in the jurisdiction and/or not endorsed by government.</u>	<u>Not in place. May be under development.</u>	<u>1</u>		<i>Response — added in response to comment 3.11 (see accompanying response to comments).</i>
1.9.38.4 Economy and human development	<u>Monitoring system is in place and providing government endorsed</u>	<u>Monitoring system is in place but Reports will be available on some economic</u>	<u>Not in place. May be</u> Under under development.	<u>1</u>		

Commented [CD42]: Should results be verified by a 3rd party periodically?

Commented [JD43R42]: Added this

Commented [CD44]: Annual reporting may not be quite as important and is very expensive; every 2-3 years might actually be sufficient.

Commented [JD45R44]: Removed requirement for annual reporting

Commented [CD46]: What does “reports on production” mean? Tonnes? Value? Production systems? Land area?

		<u>Reports will be available</u> reports annually on <u>regional</u> -GDP and changes in human development <u>for the jurisdiction</u> .	<u>indicators or</u> reporting is less frequent than annual <u>and/or not specific to the entire jurisdiction and/or not endorsed by government</u> .			
	<u>1.9.5</u> <u>Monitoring information is available and used</u>	<u>Monitoring systems provide information to local actors, organizations and/or subnational governments that is used for local planning and management activities.</u>	<u>Monitoring systems provide limited information or only to some local actors, organizations or subnational governments and/or these stakeholders do not have the capacity or resources to use it.</u>	<u>Monitoring information is not provided or used within the jurisdiction.</u>	<u>1</u>	
<u>1.10910</u> Policies across sectors that affect land use	<u>1.10910.1</u> Policies exist for relevant sectors	Policies exist at national and/or at sub-national level for all relevant sectors that affect land use E.g. national development plan, forests, agriculture, mining, infrastructure development, energy, tourism, urban planning etc.	Policies exist for some but not all the key sectors that affect land use.	Policies are under development or do not exist for <u>most-nearly all</u> of the relevant sectors that affect land use.	1	

	1.10910.2 Coherence of policies across sectors	Sector policies are mutually reinforcing with no major conflicts.	There are some conflicts between sector policies.	There are major conflicts between sector policies.	2		
	1.10910.3 Coherence of national and sub-national policies	Any applicable sub-national land use policies are approved by national government and/or confirmed as consistent with national policies.	There are some conflicts between land use policies at sub-national and national levels.	There are major conflicts between land use policies at sub-national and national levels.	2		
2. Land and resource tenure							
2.1 Inventory and map maps of land rights	2.1.1 Covers the entire jurisdiction	Inventory and map maps of land tenure rights updated in last 5 years covers all <u>resource rights (including private land and public land with different resource rights eg concessions, collectively owned land, protected areas) in the entire jurisdiction and is are publicly available.</u>	Inventory and map maps of land tenure rights covers <u>only some resources and/or some areas of the jurisdiction and are publicly available.</u>	Inventory of map and maps of land tenure rights in development or does not exist or are not publicly available. May be under development.	1		Questions on exists/quality and then secondly is it publically available Land rights not even exist? Response: added publicly available for A. The inventory or map does not address rights that are not recognised in law. <u>Guidance (please delete): Different land tenure rights for different resources may be found on different maps, eg for forest, mining, petroleum and other resources</u>
	2.1.2 Includes overlapping rights	Inventory and map of all types maps of land tenure rights <u>in the</u>	Inventory and map maps of some land tenure rights include some	Inventory and map maps of some land tenure rights exists but do not	1		<u>NATIONAL ISSUE</u> Response: the existence of the map is jurisdictional. The existence of overlapping rights is likely to be national – see 2.2.2 below

Commented [CD47]: Is this commonly done in this format? I've seen assessments, but not inventories or maps.

Commented [JD48R47]: Yes, inventories and maps are important, eg of concessions

Commented [JD49]: Tenure means ownership. Removed 'tenure' as that would not include concessions which are not owned by the concessionaire but would be classed as public land?

Commented [AL50]: most often there will be different maps in different agencies for different resources (parks, forests, mines, concessions, petroleum, land tenure). Very hard to find places with all resource rights georeferenced onto a single map.
Joanna: changed to plural maps and added guidance

ALL, Or all surface and sub-soil resource rights?
may want to exclude water?
Joanna: If we use the term 'land tenure' doesn't that exclude water eg fishing rights?

Or did you intend for 2.1 to be only land and 2.2 to be land and resources? It seems to me that one is the map and the other is the clarity, and both should refer to both land and resources? 2.1 is meant to be

		<u>jurisdiction</u> include all overlapping rights.	types of overlapping rights.	include overlapping rights.			
2.2 Clarity of land and resource tenure and use rights	2.2.1 Land and resource tenure, <u>management, exclusion</u> and use rights are <u>clearly defined</u>	Land and resource tenure, <u>management, exclusion</u> and use rights are clearly defined by law (private and collective property, public property, concession, etc).	Land and resource tenure, <u>management, exclusion</u> and use rights are clear for some property types but not all.	Land and resource tenure, <u>management, exclusion</u> and use rights are not clearly defined by law.	1		<i>Strength of land rights and consistency with national law?</i> <i>Conflicted rights — mining cadastre Peru and rights under forestry cadastre — 2 different systems.</i> <i>NATIONAL ISSUE</i> <i>Simpler indicator to flag if this is relevant or not e.g. NA if no indigenous territories</i>
	2.2.2 Absence of overlapping rights	<u>Tenure Management</u> and use rights <u>are not in conflict</u> for land and resources <u>are consistent with land tenure</u> , including for above ground and below ground resources (no overlapping rights).	Land and resource <u>tenure management</u> and use rights <u>are consistent with land tenure</u> for all above ground resources <u>are not in conflict</u> from rights <u>not</u> for below ground resources (some overlapping rights).	Land and resource <u>tenure management</u> and use rights for above ground rights <u>are in conflict</u> , as well being <u>different from rights and</u> for below ground resources <u>are often not consistent with land tenure</u> . (significant overlapping rights).	1		<i>Is there a conflict resolution mechanism or grievance mechanism?</i> <i>Or track record of deadling</i> <i>Maybe indicator 4 on land use grievance should be in this section</i> <i>Response: added 2.2.3 on process to resolve conflicts related to land use — this is more specific and in addition to a grievance mechanism for all types of grievances.</i>
	2.2.3 Includes carbon rights	Carbon rights (rights to own and transact GHG emissions reductions and removals) related to land use change are	Some precedent exists for national government approval of individual carbon rights transactions	Carbon rights related to land use change are not legally defined and no precedent exists for national government	1		<i>Response: propose to remove clarity carbon rights as so complex and investors are unlikely to invest directly in REDD Projects with a view to transacting carbon rights under current move to jurisdictional/national accounting</i>

Commented [AL51]: Do you mean that the rights associated with each type of right regime is clearly stated? Do you mean the whole bundle of rights is clearly stated? Use, mgmt., exclusion... ? This will probably need more explanation.

Commented [AL54]: I think “conflict” will depend on who you ask.

I find these terms confusing. “in conflict” and “different” need better definition. Do you mean different tenure regimes/ institutions?

Commented [JD55R54]: Changed to consistent

Commented [AL52]: Honestly not sure what this means. Do you mean that if you have rights to the land you also have rights to the subsoil resources? ‘In conflict’ sounds too subjective.

Commented [JD53R52]: I think the key issue here is whether management (which includes exclusion) and use rights are controlled by the same individual/organisation/group as the land ownership (tenure). Problems/conflicts occur when one Govt department can give mining rights on private or public land controlled by another entity etc. Is there a better way of expressing this?

Commented [CWM56]: Better to understand whether there is the right to “benefit” than “own”. Similar to Acre’s system. Individual rights are more of a project issue and not a jurisdictional issue, which assumes the government to be the holder/grantor of GHG results.

Commented [CD57]: May want to check FCPF Methodological Framework, and with their lawyers, on language. Turns out right to transact is only part of the story, and it is difficult to get language that covers all variations.

		clearly defined by law.	without a clear legal framework.	approval of transactions.			
	2.2.3 Process to address conflicts related to land and resource rights	A public report of conflicts registered and resolved over the last five years demonstrates existence and functioning of an accessible, transparent process to resolve conflicts related to land and resource rights.	A process to address conflicts related to land and resource rights exists but public reports of conflicts registered and resolved over the last five years are lacking.	There is no evidence of a process to address conflicts related to land and resource rights.	1		
2.3 Customary rights to land and resources	2.3.1 Collective customary rights are recognized	Rights to land and resources established through customary use are recognized and protected by law including collective rights of indigenous peoples and local communities.	Customary rights to land and resources including collective rights of indigenous peoples and local communities are recognized in guidelines approved by government.	Customary rights to land and resources including collective rights of indigenous peoples and local communities are not recognized in any particular form.	1		Question: Maybe we should change this to an optional module for indigenous peoples? Response: there will always be customary rights of some sort. Need to add note to explain that IP collecting rights are a specific case but there may be other individual or collective customary rights that need to be addressed
	2.3.2 Free, prior and informed consent is required for activities affecting indigenous peoples	Free, prior and informed consent is required by law for activities that affect indigenous peoples' collective customary and	Free, prior and informed consent is required by guidance guidelines recognized by government and/or only for some activities	Free, prior and informed consultation eConsultation is required by law but not consent, or no consultation or consent is required for	1		Question: should we restrict FPIC to Indigenous Peoples. Response: propose to make FPIC applicable only to IPs.

Commented [CD58]: What if not relevant in a jurisdiction?

Commented [AL59]: 2.3.1 is only by recognized by law, can another row be added such that customary rights have been granted?? 1) to at least half of the indigenous and/or community lands claimed in the jurisdiction? 2) to some but less than half 3) none have been granted

Commented [JD60R59]: If the customary rights are granted – that means they become statutory – I added a new indicator below on securing collective statutory rights based on collective customary rights – I think that is what we are talking of. May only be relevant in Latin America?

Commented [JD61R60]: There will always be customary rights of some sort.

Commented [AL62]: I assume you mean lower level regulations short of law
Joanna: yes – does this make sense/need clarification?

Commented [CWM63]: This seems relevant to 2.5 , section 1, etc.. Also hypocritical because even in the US, we don't have it. I would map it as "consultation" with adequate judicial process/recourse as being more realistic and fair.

Commented [NC64]: By international convention FPIC only applies to indigenous people but is there a way to broaden it to other communities, which commonly are also demanding something similar? (or are also indigenous but not legally classified as such).
Joanna – I agree this would be an interesting indicator – I propose to focus it on collective rights of non-indigenous communities 0 see new 2.3.3 below

Commented [AL66]: Or no consent or consultation is required?

	statutory rights to lands and resources.	but not all that affect <u>indigenous peoples'</u> collective customary and statutory rights to lands and resources.	activities that affect <u>indigenous peoples'</u> collective customary and statutory rights to lands and resources.			
<u>2.3.3 Free, prior and informed consent is required for activities affecting collective rights of local communities</u>	<u>Free, prior and informed consent is required by law for activities that affect non-indigenous communities' collective customary and statutory rights to lands and resources.</u>	<u>Free, prior and informed consent is required by guidelines recognized by government and/or only for some activities but not all that affect non-indigenous communities' collective customary and statutory rights to lands and resources.</u>	<u>Consultation is required by law but not consent, or no consultation or consent is required for activities that affect non-indigenous communities' collective customary and statutory rights to lands and resources.</u>			
<u>2.3.234</u> Customary rights to land and resources are respected including collective rights	Customary rights to land and resources, including collective rights, are <u>mostly</u> <u>nearly always</u> respected in practice.	Customary rights to land and resources, including collective rights, are sometimes not respected in practice.	Customary rights to land and resources, including collective rights, are often not respected in practice.	2		
<u>2.3.5 Collective customary rights to land and resources are secured through</u>	<u>Statutory land and resource rights have been granted for 50% or more of the land claimed</u>	<u>Statutory land and resource rights have been granted for less than 50% of the land claimed</u>	<u>No statutory land and resource rights have been granted for land claimed through</u>	<u>1</u>		

Commented [CD65]: You might have collective rights for communities other than indigenous peoples. Is FPIC applied the same way?

Commented [AL67]: Mostly seems pretty weak. "are respected the vast majority of the time"

	<u>statutory land rights</u>	<u>through collective customary rights of indigenous peoples and local communities in the jurisdiction.</u>	<u>through collective customary rights of indigenous peoples and local communities in the jurisdiction.</u>	<u>collective customary rights of indigenous peoples and local communities in the jurisdiction.</u>			
2.4 Land titling/registration process	2.4.1 Process for land titling/registration and establishing concessions is clear	Process for land titling/registration and for establishing concessions is clearly defined by law for each type of property (private/collective) and type of land (forest, non-forest).	Process for land titling/registration and for establishing concessions is clearly defined by law for some property types (private/collective) and type of land (forest, non-forest).	Process for land titling/registration and establishing concessions is not clearly defined by law.	1		
	2.4.2 Land titling/registration is feasible in less than a year	<u>Nearly Private land titling/registration</u> is <u>nearly</u> always takes less than a year to achieve land use title/registration .	<u>Sometimes Private land titling/registration</u> is <u>sometimes</u> takes less than a year to achieve land use title/registration .	<u>Rarely Private land titling/registration</u> is <u>rarely</u> takes less than a year to achieve land use title/registration .	2		
	2.4.3 Establishing a concession is feasible in less than 6 months	Establishing legal rights to a <u>private</u> concession nearly always takes less than 6 months.	Establishing legal rights to a <u>private</u> concession sometimes takes less than 6 months.	Establishing legal rights to a <u>private</u> concession rarely takes less than 6 months.	2		
2.5 Protection from involuntary resettlement	2.5.1 <u>Measures Protections</u> exist and include a	Measures exist in law to protect people from involuntary	Measures exist in law to protect people from involuntary	No legal protection from involuntary resettlement.	1		

Commented [AL68]: For whom? For anyone? Private or community?
This could be misleading because it might nearly always take a short time because the vast majority of titles will be private individual or company; but the vast area of LAND will be communal or indigenous, and these may take forever...

I suggest adding another row under 2.3 that is only for community, customary or collective titling on the process taking less than one year. It would fit with my other suggestion above on customary rights granted, but it complements and does not replace it.

Commented [JD69R68]: But if we consider that this tool is mostly to facilitate private/public investment then indicator on time to establish 2.4.2 is specifically focused on their needs. Not convinced that the speed of for communities is key for investment risk? Collective (community) rights are covered in clarity of process 2.4.1

Commented [AL70]: This is good language, better than "mostly"

Commented [CWM71]: I think this could go either way... concession for what? Mineral extraction we might hope takes longer. This seems more like an ease of doing business indicator rather than good governance as what a "concession" is needs to be defined.

Commented [AL72]: Protections exist?

	process for compensation	resettlement including a process for compensation.	resettlement but do not require compensation.				
	2.5.2 Include <u>protection from</u> restriction of access to resources important for livelihoods	Legal measures exist to protect people from involuntary resettlement include restriction of access to resources important for livelihoods as well as physical displacement.	Guidance exists on protection against restriction of access to resources important for livelihoods as well as physical displacement and is recognized by government.	Restriction of access to resources important for livelihoods as well as physical displacement is not taken into consideration.	1		
	2.5.3 Measures are implemented	Measures are being fully and consistently implemented to protect people from involuntary resettlement <u>and restrictions on access to resources important for livelihoods??</u> – no known cases of involuntary resettlement with little or no compensation.	Measures are being partially implemented to protect people from involuntary resettlement <u>and restrictions on access to resources important for livelihoods</u> – some cases of involuntary resettlement with little or no compensation.	Measures are often not being implemented to protect people from involuntary resettlement <u>and restrictions on access to resources important for livelihoods</u> – many cases of involuntary resettlement with little or no compensation.	2		<i>Require information on how implemented? Response – this information will have to be provided in order to justify an A or B rating.</i>
3. Biodiversity and other ecosystem services							
3.1 Map and strategy to maintain biodiversity and other ecosystem	3.1.1 Map <u>and assessment</u> exist	A detailed map <u>and assessment</u> exist of areas important for different biodiversity and other ecosystem	The map <u>and assessment</u> is based on national and global data but not on data and analysis from	No map Map <u>and assessment</u> of areas important for biodiversity and other ecosystems	1		

Commented [AL74]: Doesn't this repeat previous?

Commented [JD75R74]: I meant in addition to but probably less confusing to remove

Commented [AL73]: Not sure why protections from restricting access would necessarily be part of involuntary resettlement measures rather than separate? This would preclude them from being separate.

services values		service values including water regulation across the entire jurisdiction.	observations in the jurisdiction.	services do not exist for the jurisdiction.			
	3.1.2 Strategy and/or action plan exists	A strategy and/or action plan for to maintain biodiversity and other ecosystem service priorities has been formally approved and adopted by government, potentially integrated into other land use strategy/action plan(s).	The strategy and/or action plan for biodiversity and other ecosystem service priorities has been developed but is incomplete and/or not formally approved or adopted by government.	Does not exist. May be or under development.	1		
	3.1.3 Developed through a participatory process	Consultations were held with all groups of stakeholders in the jurisdiction (including all levels and relevant departments of government, relevant private sector organizations, large and small producers, NGOs, local communities and indigenous peoples where present) on	-Some consultations were held on some elements but were not comprehensive, and/or not documented, and/or the strategy, plan and map were not validated by stakeholders, and/or not meeting all other conditions for A.	No consultations were held with stakeholders on mapping and prioritization of biodiversity and ecosystem services or on the strategy/action plan.	1		<i>Guidance (please delete): Users should provide a reference for the analysis of stakeholder groups used for the rating and evidence of stakeholder groups that were invited to and participated in consultations. Evidence that stakeholder input influenced the strategy and action plan may include a written statement or minutes of a meeting explaining of how stakeholder input was taken into account or other relevant documentation.</i>

Commented [CD76]: Is a map the important thing? Or an assessment? Or both?

Commented [JD77R76]: Both – geospatial information is important

Commented [CD78]: Is this necessarily stand-alone? Might biodi be incorporated into all relevant strategies?

Commented [JD79R78]: Could be integrated – added this point – but needs to be addressed

Commented [CD80]: What about monitoring?

Commented [JD81R80]: Monitoring included in new 1.9.3

		mapping and prioritization of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and on the strategy and action plan. Comments have been published and taken into account and with <u>evidence they influenced</u> the strategy, plan and map were validated by stakeholders.					
3.2 Protection of areas important for biodiversity and other ecosystem services	3.2.1 Legally protected	Legally designated protected areas ensure <u>some</u> protection of <u>for</u> all major biodiversity and ecosystem service <u>priorities</u> .	Some major biodiversity and ecosystem service priorities are not included in legally protected areas but are protected by other measures established by government (e.g. payment for ecosystem services).	Some major biodiversity and ecosystem service priorities are not protected by measures established by government.	1		
	3.2.2 17% or more of the jurisdiction land area in protected areas	17% or more of the jurisdiction area is legally protected (in line with <u>Aichi</u> Target 11 of the Convention on	8.5% or more of the jurisdiction area is legally protected.	Less than 8.5% of the jurisdiction area is legally protected.	1		

Commented [CD82]: This may not be feasible, depending on how “priority” is defined.

Commented [JD83R82]: Not implying that all values are fully protected, just that they are represented in the legal PA network

Commented [CD84]: This is a global threshold. May not make sense in all jurisdictions. (Some may have lost most of their primary habitat already, some may really warrant far higher levels of protection.)

Commented [JD85R84]: This indicator focuses on the extent to which the jurisdiction contributes to this global target. 3.2.1 considers representation of key values in PAs. Can make an argument in the justification why this target is not realistic for this jurisdiction.

		Biological Diversity).					
	3.2.3 Sufficient resources for management and protection	Management and protection of protected areas are little affected by availability of financial and other resources.	Management and protection of protected areas are somewhat affected by availability of financial and other resources.	Management and protection of protected areas are greatly affected by availability of financial and other resources.	2		<i>Response – indicator added on budget and resources for protected areas in response to 3.09 (see accompanying response to comments) Guidance (please delete): This rating should be assessed through confidential surveys of people outside government with direct experience of protected areas. The justification should provide information on the number of people surveyed from different stakeholder groups and organizations, and should explain how bias was avoided and confidentiality maintained.</i>
	3.2.4 Effectively protected	Forest cover and/or other relevant priority habitat type has mostly been maintained in the protected areas.	Forest cover and/or other relevant priority habitat type is reducing in protected areas but at lower levels than the average reduction in all areas outside protected areas.	Forest cover and/or other relevant priority habitat type is reducing in protected areas at the same or greater levels than the average reduction in all areas outside protected areas.	12		
3.3 Protection from pollution and contamination	3.3.1 Laws or other legal measure	Legal measures Regulations exist to protect against pollution and contamination and to clean up any damage.	Guidelines exist to protect against and clean up pollution and contamination.	No requirements exist to protect against and clean up pollution and contamination.	1		
	3.3.2 Implementation	There have been no legal evidence exists of complaints or investigations in Public Public evidence exists of complaints or investigations in investigation of complaints and	There have been some legal cases or response to complaints related to pollution or contamination and but public	There have been numerous and/or major cases or complaints of pollution or contamination in the last 5 years without	21		

		<u>enforcement of regulations protecting against pollution or contamination and of inadequate clean up in the last five years.</u>	<u>evidence is lacking demonstrating enforcement of regulations and inadequate clean up in the last five years.</u>	<u>official government response.</u>			
4. Stakeholder coordination and participation							
4.1 Coordination of <u>land use policies, planning and management</u> across sectors, levels, and jurisdictions	4.1.1 Includes government ministries/agencies responsible for all sectors affecting land use	An inter-ministerial commission or <u>similar other platform structure representing all sectors affecting land use</u> is in place and functioning (<u>public reports show regular meetings and relevant decisions</u>).	There is <u>an effective</u> mechanism for <u>government cross-sectoral coordination for some but not for all sectors and/or on specific issues</u> <u>lacking</u> <u>ing evidence of effective functioning through platforms or coordination meetings.</u>	Only ad-hoc coordination.	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Comment from SM: coordination can be information but functional. make clearer not all sectors</u> <u>Response: addressed</u>
	4.1.2 Includes government institutions at national and sub-national level	A <u>sub-national/national level</u> commission or <u>similar other platform structure</u> is in place and functioning <u>for coordination on policies affecting land use between</u>	There is <u>effective</u> coordination <u>between sub-national and national level</u> on <u>specific some but not all</u> issues affecting <u>land use and/or</u> <u>lacking evidence of effective functioning</u> <u>through</u>	Only ad-hoc coordination.	1	<u>1</u>	

Commented [CD86]: This may be too broad. Complaints or legal cases could be unwarranted.

Commented [JD87R86]: Refocused on response to complaints and evidence of enforcement

Commented [JS88]: In (a brutal) summary - This is a great category to include in here but I see nothing on the actual outcomes of these consultations, forums, platforms, etc. Is it worth highlighting these spaces for participation (or 'participation' at times) if the outcomes of these consultations lead to BAU practices or confirm the decisions of the/in favour of those with power/mainstream economic interests?

The theory behind MSIs goes that getting people together will lead to more democratic decisions that are then easier to implement/manage and thus are more sustainable. But if the decisions are only 'informed' by 'consultations' then they run the risk of falling apart at the implementations stage, or of being marched through in detriment of local populations that may not have been able to take part or may have taken part and not had the technical knowledge/economic funds to fully participate, etc, or perhaps were not invited in the planning stages of the participatory mechanism (and thus had not say on the agenda or on how it would be ran).

This is a question of the quality of participation, the political will attached to it (and to its transformative potential), and the connection of these variables to the kind of outcomes that can be arrived at from it.

Commented [JD89R88]: Added more requirement of evidence of influence and a level 2 indicator asking stakeholders whether they think their participation is effective

Commented [AL90]: Need to add more "implementation" questions to these different aspects.

Commented [CD91]: Coordination for what? Program development? Policy implementation? Regulatory frameworks?

Commented [JD92R91]: Of land use policies, planning and management

Commented [JS93]: Does it have to be named as dealing with the topic?

Commented [JD94R93]: Added relevant – although may be hard to judge objectively?

		<u>national and sub-national levels (public reports show regular meetings and relevant decisions).</u>	<u>gh-platforms or coordination meetings functioning</u>				
	4.1.3 Includes government institutions across jurisdictions	A <u>permanent commission or other structure</u> mechanism is in place and functioning <u>that for coordinates coordination of</u> government institutions across jurisdictions, <u>where relevant for important for-landscape sustainability goals.</u> <u>(public reports show regular meetings and decisions).</u>	There is cross-jurisdictional coordination on specific issues through platforms or coordination meetings.	Only ad-hoc coordination.	1		
4.2 Consultations with stakeholders for land use policies, <u>and</u> planning <u>and</u> management	4.2.1 All stakeholders for land use change have been identified	A comprehensive stakeholder mapping of all relevant stakeholders potentially affected by, or that can <u>affect influence in fluence</u> , land use <u>change</u> has been developed	Stakeholders have been identified for some sectors affected by, or that can <u>affect influence in fluence</u> , land use <u>change</u> but not all.	Stakeholders potentially affected by, or that can <u>affect influence in fluence</u> , land use <u>change</u> are not clearly identified.	1	±	

Commented [JS95]: Is this to highlight that the meetings are more than top-down communication? Any thoughts about the potential influence of local government in decision-making?

Commented [CD96]: Does this imply the landscape is not a jurisdiction?

Commented [JD97R96]: That depends on the landscape sustainability goals and the extent to which it is acknowledged that other jurisdictions may be important.

		or updated in last 5 years.					
4.2.2 Including women, indigenous peoples, local communities and other marginalized groups	Women, indigenous peoples, local communities and other potentially marginalized groups have consistently participated effectively in meetings to develop consultations on and there is evidence of their influence on land use policies, and planning and management evaluation.	Women and/or indigenous peoples and/or local communities and/or other potentially marginalized groups have participated intermittently in meetings to develop consultations or there is no evidence of the influence of each group on land use policies, and planning and management evaluation.	Women, indigenous peoples, local communities and/or other potentially marginalized groups have not participated in meetings to develop consultations or there is no evidence of any influence from these groups on land use policies, and planning and management evaluation.	1	1	SM comment: Note: it would be good that this point be subdivided by each marginalized group. Ex: Are women included enough? Sub-division 2: are indigenous communities sufficiently included? Etc. Why what if communities are included and women are not, how is everything evaluated as a whole? Should we include quality of participation. Maybe remove 'effectively' because too subjective. Or their self-identified representative Response: creates too many indicators if separate them all. Added and/or so if one group less included then reduces to lowest relevant rating for that group. Removed 'effectively'. Guidance (please delete): Users should provide a reference for the analysis of marginalized stakeholder groups used for the rating. Evidence input from these stakeholders influenced the land use policies, planning and evaluation may include a written statement or minutes of a meeting explaining of how stakeholder input was taken into account or other relevant documentation.	
4.2.3 Influenced land use policies, planning and evaluation management	Comments Stakeholder input from all consultations with all groups of stakeholders in the jurisdiction (including all levels and relevant departments of government, relevant private sector organizations, large and small	Comments on draft policies, plans and evaluations were collected but there is incomplete public documentation of comments collected stakeholder input from all consultations with all stakeholder groups and how	No consultations were conducted or no evidence of their influence.	1		Reword B Response: Addressed Guidance (please delete): Users should provide a reference for the analysis of stakeholder groups used for the rating and evidence of stakeholder groups that were invited to and participated in consultations. Evidence that stakeholder input influenced the policies, plans and evaluations may include a written statement or minutes of a meeting explaining of how stakeholder input was taken into account or other relevant documentation.	

- Commented [AL98]:** ... and/or their organizations and federations have received capacity building to help level the playing field and support effective participation...?
- Commented [JS99]:** It might be an idea to think about why this kind of participation takes place or not. As in, a lack of participation could have to do with apathy, previous experiences of not being heard, lack of funds to attend meetings, etc.
- Commented [JS100]:** What is the point of these consultations? Gage opinions, tick a box, appease protests, create spaces for negotiation? Or does it depend on the kind of land use change initiative at play?
- Commented [CD101]:** Isn't this captured earlier?
- Commented [JD102R101]:** 1.1.3 asks if all stakeholder groups have participated in development of 'the land use plan'. This covers more aspects of land use policies, planning and implementation, and focuses on marginalized groups.
- Commented [AL103]:** Or consultations were conducted but with no influence?

		producers, NGOs, local communities and indigenous peoples where present) consultations on draft policies, plans and evaluations were was published and clearly addressed in final versions with evidence of the resulting influence.	they were this input addressed was addressed evidence of the resulting influence.				
	<u>4.2.4 Perceived as effective by stakeholders</u>	<u>Representatives from all groups of stakeholders in the jurisdiction (including all levels and relevant departments of government, relevant private sector organizations, large and small producers, NGOs, local communities and indigenous peoples where present) confirm that their input influenced land use policies,</u>	<u>Representatives from some but not all groups of stakeholders in the jurisdiction (including all levels and relevant departments of government, relevant private sector organizations, large and small producers, NGOs, local communities and indigenous peoples where present) confirm that their input influenced land use policies,</u>	<u>Representatives from one or more stakeholder groups (including all levels and relevant departments of government, relevant private sector organizations, large and small producers, NGOs, local communities and indigenous peoples where present) affirm that their group was not consulted or</u>	<u>2</u>		<i>Guidance (please delete): This rating should be assessed through confidential surveys of people in all stakeholder groups (including all levels and relevant departments of government, relevant private sector organizations, large and small producers, NGOs, local communities and indigenous peoples where present) who have been involved in consultations on land use policies, plans and evaluations. The justification should provide information on the number of people surveyed from different stakeholder groups and organizations, and should explain how bias was avoided and confidentiality maintained.</i>

		plans and evaluations.	plans and evaluations.	that their input has not influenced land use policies, plans and evaluations.			
4.3 Multi-stakeholder platform structure(s) exists for coordination on land use policies, and planning and management	4.3.1 Formal Multi-stakeholder platform structure(s) exist	Multi-stakeholder platform(s) or other structure for coordination on land use policies, and planning and management is has been formally established and recognized by government and functional (public reports show regular meetings and relevant output).	Multi-stakeholder platform or other structure for coordination on land use policies and planning has been formally established and recognized by government and/or but is not functioning not active (met less than twice in last year public reports not do not show regular meetings and relevant output) or only exists informally).	Multi-stakeholder platform or other structure for coordination on land use policies, and planning and management does not exist.	1	±	Important Not formal but active. Does government need to be involved? In Liberia there is cso network that invites govt and meets with govt to discuss LUP Response: removed requirement to be formal. Govt does not need to be member but does need to recognise and value existence.
	4.3.2 Multi-stakeholder platform(s) cover all sectors affecting land use	Multi-stakeholder platform structure(s) exist covering for coordination on all sectors affecting land use	Multi-stakeholder platform structure(s) exist covering for coordination on some but not all sectors affecting land use.	Multi-stakeholder platform structure exists for only one sector.	1		Add but note II — stage in process Response — added option to explain expected progress on changing a rating in this
	4.3.3 Include all key	All key stakeholder	Major Some but not all	Only a few one		1	

- Commented [JS104]:** IS this about implementation of the decisions that were/were not informed by previous consultations?
- Commented [JD105R104]:** Multi-stakeholder structures can have many roles including sharing information, advisory and/or deliberative. All are useful.
- Commented [CD106]:** Isn't this captured earlier?
- Commented [JD107R106]:** See comment above
- Commented [JS108]:** And includes government participation?
- Commented [JD109R108]:** In some countries they have multi-stakeholder structures that exclude government as members but that act as interface with government, suggesting that government participation in the body is not the requirement, but that government recognizes them
- Commented [AL110]:** Problem: is annual a "regular" meeting?

Commented [JS111]: Or cross-sector multi-stakeholder initiatives?

	stakeholder groups	groups that are affected by or influence land use <u>change</u> (including all levels and relevant departments of government, relevant private sector organizations, large and small producers, NGOs, local communities and indigenous peoples where present)-are included in the multi-stakeholder platform structure(s).	stakeholder groups that are affected by or influence land use <u>change</u> are included in the multi-stakeholder platform structure(s).	stakeholder groups group that are is affected by or influence land use <u>change</u> are included in the multi-stakeholder platform structure(s).		Response: addressed Guidance (please delete): Users should provide a reference for the analysis of stakeholder groups used for the rating.
	4.3.4 Support coordination at local level	Multi-stakeholder platforms structure(s) enable coordination among stakeholders use (government, producers, NGOs, local communities and indigenous peoples where present)(including local communities, producers,	Multi-stakeholder platforms structure(s) enable coordination among stakeholders at local level and are functioning across more than 50% or more of the jurisdiction.	Multi-stakeholder platforms structure(s) enable coordination among stakeholders at local level and are functioning across less than 50% of the jurisdiction.		Added in response to comment from EcoAgriculture Partners about importance for coordination at local level.

Commented [AL112]: Similar problem to above. 4.2.2 What is done to level playing field for these actors.

Commented [JS113]: As I've mentioned before, would these be open-invitation meets? Or who would be invite to carry out the stakeholder analysis?

Commented [JS114]: Will any do? Or are you also measuring how active they are rather than how much space they cover?

		<u>government, technical services, NGOs etc) at local level (smallest administrative units) and are functioning across more than 90% of the jurisdiction.</u>					
	4.3.4-5 <u>influences land use policies, planning and evaluation management</u>	<u>Notes of meetings from the platform structure(s) are published, including government response to issues raised with evidence of influence on land use policies, planning and management.</u>	<u>Some information output from the platform structure(s) is published about meetings of the platform but without government evidence of influence response.</u>	<u>No information is published about meetings output of the platform structure(s).</u>	1		<u>Body not platform. Sometimes information is sensitive if published. Sometimes Response: changed meeting notes to output so platform can decide what information is published. Some may be transferred to government confidentially, but should be able to explain what type of information and how it affected land use policies, planning and management. Something needs to be published so the role and input of the platform is transparent. Platform or other structure has been used in 4.3.1 Guidance (please delete): Evidence that the multi-stakeholder structure influenced the policies, planning and management may include a written statement or minutes of a meeting explaining how input from the committee was taken into account or other relevant documentation.</u>
4.4 <u>Access to Information disclosure related to land use</u>	4.4.1 Land use information is publicly disclosed	<u>All non-confidential information related to land use policies, planning, and management implementation and evaluation of strategies and actions affecting land use is</u>	<u>Major-Some but not all non-confidential information related to land use policies, planning, implementation and evaluation of strategies and actions affecting land use and</u>	<u>Little-No information related to land use policies, and/or planning, implementation and evaluation of strategies and actions affecting land use and/or management is</u>	1		<u>Need to add somewhere about information reaching stakeholders Response: hard to provide evidence that stakeholders receive and understand information without conducting surveys, which are expensive. Decided not to add such an indicator.</u>

Commented [JS115]: This is the first time you include this kind of specificity on who the 'stakeholders' are.

Commented [AL116]: Add 4.3.6 for implementation... platforms are successful... Platforms are widely viewed as a success... platforms are viewed by some actors as a success... platforms are widely viewed as unsuccessful.

Commented [JD117R116]: This is very subjective and not really in line with rest of the tool. Instead, have added a need for evidence of influence to all relevant indicators. Do you agree with this approach?

Commented [JS118]: A written response is not proof of influence/impact (might actually be proof that it has no influence/impact)...

Commented [JD119R118]: Have changed all the consultation and platform indicators to 'published evidence of influence' – is this too vague?

		publicly disclosed.	management is publicly disclosed.	publicly disclosed.			
4.5 Requests for information, Feedback and grievance redress mechanisms related to land use	4.5.1 Mechanisms exist to address requests for information and resolve grievances	Mechanisms exist and are functioning, for addressing requests for information and resolving grievances related to land use, (public reports demonstrate that the mechanisms are functioning). Requests and responses are published.	Mechanisms exist but information is lacking about their functioning.	No information exists about Mechanism(s) addressing requests for information and/or resolving grievances mechanisms related to land use do not exist.	1		
	4.5.2 Grievances are addressed in a timely way with redress	Grievances are addressed. The vast majority of Grievances are resolved with redress where appropriate within the set timeframe set for the mechanism, in the law and includes redress measures.	Grievances. The majority of Grievances are resolved with redress where appropriate not addressed but often not within the set timeframe, in the law but do include redress measures.	Grievances are not addressed being rarely resolved, within the set timeframe in the law and do not include redress measures.	2		<i>Guidance (please delete): This rating should be assessed through confidential surveys of people in all stakeholder groups (including all levels and relevant departments of government, relevant private sector organizations, large and small producers, local communities and indigenous peoples where present) involved in land use. The justification should provide information on the number of people surveyed from different stakeholder groups and organizations, and should explain how bias was avoided and confidentiality maintained.</i>
4.6 Labor rights, forced and child labor	4.6.1 Laws and regulations ban forced and child labor	Laws and regulations in place exist banning forced and child labor, with evidence of effective	Laws and regulations exist banning child or forced labor but not both or no evidence of	Laws and regulations do not exist or no evidence of enforcement.	1		

Commented [JS120]: This sounds pretty cool on paper, but I guess it is also a matter of scale. Or maybe im just jaded from my experiences in the Amazon!

Commented [CD121]: Again, are laws enforced?

Commented [JD122R121]: Covered in 4.6.4 and 4.6.5 which are transferred to 5. to apply to specific production systems

		enforcement, are enforced! (and the initiatives to enforce them are funded).	effective enforcement.			
	4.6.2 Laws and regulations promote worker safety	Regulations concerning worker safety are in place: with evidence of effective enforcement. (and enforced).	Laws and regulations exist but do not cover all <u>land use</u> workers (such as temporary/informal agricultural workers)-) <u>or no evidence of effective enforcement.</u>	Laws and regulations do not exist <u>or no evidence of enforcement.</u>	1	
	4.6.3 Laws and regulations protect from discrimination	Protection from discrimination is in place- <u>with evidence of effective enforcement. (and enforced)</u>	Protection from discrimination covers some <u>but not all</u> of gender, race, creed, <u>ethnicity etc. but not all, or no evidence of effective enforcement.</u>	Laws and regulations do not exist <u>or no enforcement.</u>	1	
	4.6.4 No forced labor in land use Laws are implemented	No reported cases or complaints of forced labor in land use sector in last 10 years.	A few reported cases or complaints of forced labor in last 10 years.	Frequent cases or complaints of forced labor in last 10 years.	<u>2</u>	<i>Moved to section 5 to apply to specific production systems in response to 3.16 (see accompanying response to comments).</i>
	4.6.5 No child labor in land use	No reported cases or complaints of child labor in land use sector in last 10 years.	A few reported cases or complaints of child labor in last 10 years.	Frequent cases or complaints of child labor in last 10 years.	<u>2</u>	<i>Moved to section 5 to apply to specific production systems in response to 3.16 (see accompanying response to comments).</i>
5. Commodity production systems						
5.1 Commodity 1	5.1.1 Organizations	Organizations exist	Producer organizations	No organizations	1	

Commented [JD123]: Occurrences/confirmed cases of child/forced labour are covered in the commodity production system 5.1.7 and 5.1.8 since we received comments that this could vary by commodity.

What do you think about this solution? Evidence of enforcement is open to interpretation but would need to justify the rating.

Commented [CD124]: Again, is “confirmed” more appropriate than “reported or complaints”?

(repeat these indicators for other commodities)	exist representing and coordinating producers including smallholders	representing and coordinating all <u>types of</u> producers across the jurisdiction, including smallholders, <u>local communities</u> , indigenous peoples <u>as where</u> relevant.	exist but not representing and coordinating all <u>types of</u> producers across the jurisdiction (such as smallholders).	exist representing and coordinating producers.			
	5.1.2 Data available on <u>trends in</u> productivity compared with national/international norms	Comprehensive data on <u>trends in</u> productivity <u>in the jurisdiction</u> compared with national/international norms are available.	Partial or preliminary data on <u>trends in</u> productivity <u>in the jurisdiction</u> compared with national/international norms are available.	No data on <u>trends in</u> productivity compared with national/international norms are available.	1		
	5.1.3 Data and analysis available on impacts on <u>forests/ecosystem services, economic and social landscape</u> sustainability goals	Data and analysis on impacts <u>of the production system</u> (positive and negative) on <u>jurisdictional landscape sustainability</u> goals (forests/ecosystem services, economic and social) are available, <u>including data on extent of sustainability certification</u> .	Partial or preliminary data and analysis on impacts (positive and negative) on sustainability goals (forests/ecosystem services, economic and social) are available.	No data and analysis on impacts (positive and negative) on sustainability goals (forests/ecosystem services, economic and social) are available.	1		

Commented [CD125]: Cumulative? By farm? Done by who?

Commented [JD126R125]: Across the production sector – ie coffee and deforestation, or contribution of coffee to growth in GDP or smallholder incomes etc

5.1.4	Data and analysis available on potential for growth in <u>adoption of sustainable practices</u>	Data and analysis are available on potential for growth in <u>adoption of sustainable practices</u> including <u>potential increases in productivity, investments needed, time frame and limitations, (including potential impacts of climate change) and potential impacts.</u>	Partial or preliminary data and analysis are available on potential for growth including limitations and potential impacts.	No data and analysis are available on potential for growth including limitations and potential impacts.	1	<i>Response: added "including potential impacts of climate change" in response to 3.08 (see accompanying response to comments) and potential increases in productivity, investments need and time frame in response to 3.19 (see accompanying response to comments).</i>
5.1.5	<u>Level of sustainability certification</u>	<u>More than 50% of production is certified against an international sustainability standard.</u>	<u>10-50% of production is certified against an international sustainability standard.</u>	<u>Less than 10% of production is certified against an international sustainability standard.</u>	1	<i>Response: propose to remove this criterion as not comparable across commodity production systems, and tends to exclude small holders – in response to 3.18 (see accompanying response to comments).</i>
5.1.6	Extension/technical services available for sustainable practices	Extension/technical services for sustainable practices are widely available including for smallholders.	Extension/technical services for sustainable practices are available for some producers.	Extension/technical services for sustainable practices are not generally available.	1	
5.1.7	Financial support available for sustainable practices	Financial support (credit, tax breaks) is readily available to support/incentivize sustainable	Financial support (credit, tax breaks) is available to support/incentivize sustainable	Financial support (credit, tax breaks) is not generally available to support/incentiv	1	

Commented [CWM127]: For some commodities there isn't a viable certification... beef and rubber for example. It also closes some jurisdictions because of historic deadlines. Should be removed.

Commented [CD128]: Certification is not always necessary to ensure good practice. And it is really expensive, so smaller producers are often left out.

		ize sustainable practices.	practices for some producers.	ize sustainable practices .			
	5.1.87 No forced labor	No confirmed cases of forced labor in in last 5 years.	A few confirmed cases of forced labor in last 5 years.	Frequent confirmed cases of forced labor in last 5 years.	2		<i>Guidance (please delete): This rating should be assessed through confidential surveys of people involved in this commodity production system. The justification should provide information on the number of people surveyed from different stakeholder groups and organizations, and should explain how bias was avoided and confidentiality maintained.</i>
	4.6.5.1.8 No child labor	No confirmed cases of child labor in last 5 years.	A few reported cases of child labor in last 5 years.	Frequent confirmed cases of child labor in last 5 years.	2		<i>Response: reduced to 5 years from 10 years</i> <i>Guidance (please delete): This rating should be assessed through confidential surveys of people in all stakeholder involved in this commodity production system. The justification should provide information on the number of people surveyed from different stakeholder groups and organizations, and should explain how bias was avoided and confidentiality maintained.</i>

Commented [CD129]: Again, is "confirmed" more appropriate than "reported or complaints"?

Commented [JD130R129]: Changed to confirmed

Annex 1. List of interviews
