

Nigeria UN-REDD+ Programme

Risks-Benefits Analysis of REDD+ related Policies and Measures in Cross River State

Incorporating results from: December 2015 Stakeholder Forum, Cross River State, Nigeria; National Safeguards Working Group meeting, February 2016; UN-REDD Safeguards component working group session, February 2016; Feedback from Safeguards Coordination Group and other reviewers, March 2016; Validation at RTC Meeting, and consolidation by working group, June 2016.

Final - Version 7 July 2016

Abbreviations/Acronyms

AAC – Annual Allowable Cut
 ATF – Anti-deforestation Task Force
 CLUP – Community Land Use Plan
 CRGIA – Cross River Geographic Information Agency
 CRNP – Cross River National Park
 CRS – Cross River State
 CRSFC – Cross River State Forestry Commission
 FPIC – Free Prior and Informed Consent
 FR – Forest Reserve
 MCCF - Ministry of Climate Change and Forests
 MOA – Ministry of Agriculture
 MOE – Ministry of Environment
 MOF – Ministry of Finance
 MOJ – Ministry of Justice
 MOL – Ministry of Lands
 MRV – Measurement, Reporting and Verification
 NP – National Park
 NTFPS – Non-timber forest products
 PAM – Policies and measures
 SEA – Strategic Environmental Assessment
 SFM – Sustainable forest management

No.	Policies and Measures (PAMs)			
1	Regulation on logging (Moratorium)			
	Description of PAM (content and how it will be implemented)	In 2009 the Cross River State government place a total ban on logging in the State, and put in place a task force on anti deforestation to ensure compliance.		
	Expected REDD+ impact	Conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (protecting the forest cover of CRS will encourage conservation and allow natural regeneration).		
	Status of PAM (e.g. existing, planned, future)	Moratorium is ongoing. A new task force has been constituted to enforce the ban, after the disbandment of the previous task force by the new government. It is not clear what the government intends to do with the ban in the longer term. There is ongoing debate about whether the ban has been successful in limiting illegal logging, or to what extent, and there is ongoing agitation for a review on the ban and task force, in order to appraise its effectiveness.		
	Driver/barriers the PaM intends to address	Logging (small-scale and large-scale, informal and formal) in all forests (except clearing land for agriculture on farmers' land).		
Potential benefits	How to promote benefits?	Related Safeguards	Sources of information about benefit/safeguard	Comments / background info
Increased public awareness on conservation	1) Document lessons learned on moratorium across stakeholders and sectors. 2) Hold community meetings and communicate beyond REDD+ pilot areas. 3) Strengthening communication ties within communities as against printed media. 4) Communicate about rights as well as responsibilities.	E, D	Communities; MCCF; Min of Environment	Some relevant points from PGA Report (draft, 2015): As part of awareness raising and communication strategy for REDD, communities should be empowered through appropriate communication on their rights to make complaints and express grievances (p. 12); Awareness raising campaigns should also be extended to other non-participating, but neighbouring communities to the REDD program to avoid displacement of deforestation (p.101). 6. Encourage the CRSFC and other REDD related Agencies at sub-national levels to be more responsive when complaints are made regarding the use of forests and other natural resources. This can be achieved by establishing a Grievance and Feedback Desk to be manned by an officer with a mandate to coordinate the receipt of complaints and grievances as well as provide timely response and feedback. As part of awareness raising and communication strategy for REDD, communities should be empowered through appropriate communication on their rights to make complaints and express grievances. They also need to be aware of mechanisms put in place to entertain and respond to complaints and grievances. A state wide platform of community based groups and organizations such as the FMCs could be encouraged to thrive to share information, experience and articulate issues of common interest. They could serve as appropriate channels and pressure groups to have grievances responded to. (p. 150) 7. Awareness raising campaigns should also be extended to other non-participating, but neighbouring communities to the REDD program to avoid displacement of deforestation. (p. 216) 8. As part of awareness raising and communication strategy for REDD, communities should be empowered through appropriate communication on their rights to make complaints and express grievances. They also need to be aware of mechanisms put in place to entertain and respond to complaints and grievances. A state wide platform of community based groups and organizations such as the FMCs could be encouraged to thrive to share information, experience and articulate issues of common interest. They could serve as appropriate channels and pressure groups to have grievances responded to. (p. 219)
Lessons learned to develop appropriate forest management regime	1) Develop data bank and use information for decision-making. 2) Environmental Summit 3). Consider customary practice and by-laws in forest regime	B, D	GIS/MRV Unit of MCCF, Community Associations, CRGIA	The moratorium has lasted for over 8 years without any review or assessment to inform adaptive management. Without any evaluation, it is difficult to assess the contribution of the moratorium to forest management, and to evolve best practices from the lessons.
Useful data developed for forest monitoring and enforcement	1) Make data accessible. 2) There should be clear definition of functions/synergy among Task Force, Forestry Commission, MCCF and MoE.	B, D	Communities, MCCF	The previous anti deforestation task force collected GPS information of logging sites and revenue generated from fines. The information are not made public.

Enhancement of ecosystem services	1) Develop and analyse data of forest valuation for CRS; there should be periodic, timebound review of impacts on forest values. 2) Prioritise forests providing ecosystem services in implementation. 3) Develop and implement measures to maintain ecosystem services, in synergy with other MDAs.	E, F	Communities. MCCF (e.g. GIS unit). Min of Agric. Min of Environment	Noting that measure 3) may require a complementary/separate program to the Moratorium; because the ban does not currently aim at protecting/enhancing ecosystem services. And other sectors are also involved in deforestation/degradation.
Biodiversity conservation, for wildlife conservation and utilisation importance (e.g. for bushmeat)	1) Develop biodiversity map for CRS to identify hotspots. 2) Encourage reforestation of degraded forest lands and private sector involvement. 3) The moratorium should address issues concerning NTFPs and wildlife, with regulation of exploitation, in the context of REDD+.	E, F	MCCF. MoE. CRNP.	Noting that 1) could potentially be used to target moratorium implementation in future; 2) may require a complementary/separate program to the Moratorium. From PGA (draft, 2015): In Nigeria and Cross River State there are 23 Game Reserves (GR) & Wildlife Sanctuaries, established for the sustainable management of wildlife with controlled hunting. No timber extraction permitted (p. 24). The National Environment Policy (NEP) 2014 statement on Biodiversity and Wildlife Resources "encourage community action to halt the nations biodiversity and wildlife by increasing the devolution of the rights and management of natural resources to indigenous and local communities, communication outreach and capacity building". At the Cross River State level, article 59 of the State Forestry Law recognize inter-alia Community based Forest Management Associations to be established by communities with the rights to develop and manage forest resources sustainably (p. 199). But evidence from the FGDs indicates some severe change in availability of natural resources that support local livelihoods. Hunters and women "Afang" collectors now trek farther into the forest than they did 10 years ago. The decline in the population of wild plants and animals that are harvested as sources of food and income (for example, bush meat, "Afang" and bush mango) was also reported. Decline in the population of wild animals was linked to hunting pressure in the past due to increased demand for bush meat before the Ebola epidemic in West Africa (p. 112). Hunting of endangered species such as monkeys, gorillas and elephants is prohibited in all communities. Strangers require permission to hunt in community forests. Hunters are required to stay a limited number of days in the forest, and must return to the community when expected for security reasons. Hunters must be certain that a target is an animal before shooting to prevent accidental killing of other persons in the forest (p.115). Grievance in PGA include: restriction of community members from hunting and gathering of NTFPs from protected areas (p. 139).
Potential risks	How to mitigate risks?	Related safeguards?	Sources of information about risk/safeguard	Comments / background info
Loss of wood-based livelihoods	1) Review the ban on logging. 2) Transparently develop approaches for alternative/sustainable livelihoods together with communities. 3) Introduce alternative/sustainable livelihood options, e.g. through existing international NGOs (e.g. in Iko Esai, bee keeping and snail farming introduced by CECOPAN in 2011) 4) Also introduce through local CBO (e.g. in Ekuri in 2005 by Kesty Women Movement). 5) Links alternative livelihoods schemes with drivers of deforestation/degradation (i.e. beyond targeting hunters)	C,D,E	MCCF. Communities.	The CRS Forestry Law 2010 recommends a forest sector strategy for CRS. When done, this will encourage SFM in the State. Noting that forest valuation study may help set baseline, but currently lack of info being gathered. Need more info on what are dominant livelihoods in forest dependent communities; how big a role does wood-based products play. Among NTFPs, Gnetum and bush mango gathering dominate. PGA report provides info on some successful examples (e.g. involvement of women, p. 146) and constraints (e.g. lack of community engagement, focus on hunters (p. 83)).
Scarcity of timber	1) Review the ban on logging. 2) Encourage community and private forestry, and establish woodlots. 3) Promote forest business development.	C, D, E	Forest-dependent communities. MCCF. Resource User Groups (RUGs).	Annual allowable cut (AAC) is zero; last AAC was issued in 2007. Some data on actual harvesting levels from previous ATF (?)
Displacement of forest carbon emissions	1) Develop and implement plans/strategies with incentives and sanctions to improve land use across various landscapes. 2) Implement payment of royalties to forest bearing communities as incentive to encourage/sustain forest conservation across landscapes. 3) Strengthen trans-border collaboration with neighbouring States and communities.	C, D, G	MCCF. Communities. Border Commission.	What about displacement across the border to Cameroon? Consider collaboration with neighbouring countries as well.
Limited participation in forest management	1) Develop and implement Stakeholder Engagement Strategy. 2) Capacity building for forest communities on forest protection. 3) Further engage Local Governments in forest governance policy development and implementation.	B, C	Communities. Local Governments. MCCF.	Local Governments are largely excluded from forest governance. Their participation will be fundamental to enhancing participatory forest governance in CRS.

Increased conversion of forest to farms	1) Review ban on logging and replace with SFM. 2) Strengthen inter-agency linkages to promote sustainable agriculture. 3) Build on current extension services to farmers to promote sustainable agriculture. 4) Build and enforce policies that promote sustainable land use across sectors (e.g. SEA).	B, D, E, F	MCCF. Min of Agric. MoE. Communities.	With a sense of deprivation and the demand for survival, communities clear more forest to expand their farms, as farm expansion was not included in the Moratorium.
Corruption (e.g. cabals running illegal timber business, abuse of power, lack of accountability)	1) Review the ban on logging to make forest management more inclusive of especially forest dependent communities. 2) Respect existing regulations and regulatory agencies as defined in the law, including role of by-laws, customary law (to avoid duplication of roles). 3) Strengthen and implement stiff penalties on corrupt officials and local community leaders/members. 4) Establish accessible and responsive grievance redress mechanism to address grievances and resolve conflicts. 5) Records of transactions (arrests, prosecutions, fines, disbursements, sources of wood/species etc) should be made public. 6) Build capacity of Community Associations to enforce forest regulations.	A, B, C, D	Communities. Local Governments. MCCF. Min of Agric. Min of Environment. MoJ. Future grievance redress mechanism.	Green Police will complement the enforcement of moratorium and other regulations.
		B	MCCF. MOJ. Communities.	
Limited access to land, resources	1) Respect for customary laws. 2) Review of Land Use Act; focus on customary laws and other options to address the situation in the meantime. 3) Appropriate land law implementation	A, B	Communities. LGs. CRSHA. MOJ. MCCF. MOA. MOL.	If logging or other forest resources are not providing livelihoods, there will more pressure through agriculture, mining, etc. Noting that review of Land Use Act relevant to other PAMs too.
Recommendations related to this PAM:	Summarise risks for this PAM	The Moratorium on logging limits participation in forest governance, and encourages misuse of power and illegal wood extraction and sales by agencies put in place to enforce the ban. Forest dependent communities and various resource user groups are either restricted or completely deprived of access to their livelihoods base, and timber could become scarce. Further consequence of this is the possibility of conversion of forests to farms, and displacement of emissions as people shift focus to other forest areas beyond CRS.		
	Summarise benefits for this PAM	The moratorium helped to increase public awareness on conservation, directly or indirectly. When evaluated, the lessons learned will help the State to evolve an appropriate forest management regime. In addition, when made available, data by the ATF will help to develop a forest monitoring and enforcement system, and inform approaches to enhancing ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation.		
	Key recommendations on enhancing benefits / reducing risks	<p>Inform improved design of PAM. Recommendations related to the design/implementation of this PAM include: Beyond promoting protection/enforcement, develop SFM approaches. Need to address issues related to the impacts of the Moratorium on livelihoods (from forests and access to land). Invest in sustainable agriculture targeting small scale farmers, or link to other agricultural programs in order to address deforestation for agriculture (as this is not covered by the moratorium). Seek support from others (e.g. through existing international NGOs and through local CBOs. Need also to address risk of displacement of emissions. Establish woodlots to meet wood needs for timber and fuel wood. Link alternative livelihoods schemes with drivers of deforestation/degradation (i.e. beyond targeting hunters). The moratorium should address issues concerning NTFPs and wildlife, with regulation of exploitation, in the context of REDD+. Limited participation is another risk; should build institutional capacity from the grassroots to improve forest management and enforce regulations; noting that communities are likely already enforcing customary laws/norms. Should seek to harmonise/formalise customary by-laws and/or respect these in the application of forest enforcement/protection regulations. Implement payment of royalties to forest bearing communities as incentive to encourage/sustain forest conservation across landscapes. There is a risk of corruption; implement stiff penalties on corrupt officials and local community leaders/members. Establish accessible and responsive mechanism to address grievances and resolve conflicts. Develop data bank and make data accessible for learning from past experience (e.g. monitoring data generated by taskforce, and make documentation transparent (e.g. TOR for taskforce). There should be clear definition of functions/synergy among Task Force, Forestry Commission, MCCF and MoE. Records of transactions (arrests, prosecutions, fines, disbursements, etc) should be made public. A stakeholder engagement strategy should be developed, and regular broad (forest stakeholders) and targeted (timber dealers associations, village councils and the community youth) engagement is recommended. Also recommended to further engage Local Governments in forest governance policy development and implementation. Hold community meetings and communicate beyond REDD+ pilot areas. To improve the PAM's environmental benefits, analyse data of forest valuation for CRS, identify biodiversity hotspots, and prioritise forests providing ecosystem services (with periodic review), in synergy with other MDAs.</p>		

PGA report (draft, 2015): There is much to be learned from traditional management systems. Within the framework we must develop interest in traditional knowledge and customary law of forest-dependent communities, and extract cogent lessons and how this can contribute to more effective forest conservation. Most of the communities studied had land use or forest management plans which contain bylaws to guide the sustainable management of natural resources, and often these are binding on all community members and are respected by all. Participants believed that most of the bylaws were recognized and could be used to prosecute offenders in a customary court since most of the bylaws were consistent with government laws. But the bylaws are yet to be formalized. Formalization and integration of existing community bylaws with customary and state laws will give them increased legal weight and recognition in courts of law and thereby enhance their enforcement. (p. 199). The review of policies, laws and programmes must involve a detailed study and scrutiny of customary laws and land

Improve wider governance arrangements. Risks & benefits analysis suggests improvements can be made to wider governance or policy arrangements: To enable collective and objective decision making, an environmental summit will help highlight key issues, reach consensus on SFM in CRS and make implementable recommendations. Document lessons learned on moratorium across stakeholders and sectors. Review the Moratorium to inform the development of SFM and elaborate the key elements of a potential SFM plan (e.g. forests/species covered, agroforestry and other activities, timeline, etc). Review the Land Use Act; focus on customary laws and other options to address the situation in the meantime; this recommendation emerges for other PAMs too. If the Act cannot be changed, still important to understand tenure situation and customary by-laws, and respect these in the application of forest enforcement/protection regulations. To address risk of displacement, strengthen trans-border collaboration with neighbouring States and communities. Such a PAM can also be complemented by policies that promote sustainable land use across sectors (e.g. SEA).

tenure relations with a view to integrate them into national/state policy and legal frameworks in a manner that reflects the rights of individuals, women and especially forest communities (p. 200).

2 Commercial Agriculture Program

Description of PAM (content and how it will be implemented) *Measure of government to improve value chain of selected products and improve farmers' income, promote best farming practices and protect the environment of CRS. It works with small farmers only, not with large-scale agricultural concessions.*

Initial analysis was related to agriculture more generally rather than a specific PAM.

Expected REDD+ impact *Reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation (through reducing pressure on forests for agricultural expansion)*

Status of PAM (e.g. existing, planned, future) *Ongoing*

Driver/barriers the PaM intends to address *Conversion of forest to agriculture; degradation from agricultural practice (mainly small-scale crop farmers - oil palm, cocoa, poultry, rice, aquaculture)*

Potential benefits	How to promote benefits?	Related Safeguards	Sources of information about benefit/safeguard	Comments / background info
--------------------	--------------------------	--------------------	--	----------------------------

Value addition for selected products (to increase farmers' income)	1) Budget for and expand extension services to farmers, including training and equipping more officers. 2) Collect monitoring information on impacts.	B, E	MOA. Communities.	Inadequate extension services currently; insufficient extension officers, training and equipment.
--	---	------	-------------------	---

Food security	1) Undertake measures to increase productivity, processing, storage and markets (improve value chain), through organising farmers into cooperatives. 2) Collect monitoring information on impacts on food security.	A, E	MOA. Communities.	
---------------	---	------	-------------------	--

Environmental & health benefits	1) Further promote integrated pesticide management, improving health, water outcomes. 2) Education of farmers in environmental/health practices. 3) Promote organic agriculture.	E	MOA	
---------------------------------	--	---	-----	--

Efficient land use	1) Develop and/or implement (other) land use plans as part of program (as it does not currently link to land use planning). 2) Collect monitoring information on impacts of program on land use.	B, C	MCCF. Communities.	Currently educating farmers on best economic practices (demand driven); not working on land use planning, agroforestry as yet. Could be linked to land use plans PAM below.
--------------------	--	------	--------------------	---

Potential risks	How to mitigate risks?	Related safeguards?	Sources of information about risk/safeguard	Comments / background info
-----------------	------------------------	---------------------	---	----------------------------

Decline in agricultural products prices may undermine the objective of Commercial Agriculture project	1) Govt should institute buy-back of excess products for strategic reserve. 2) Organise farmers in cooperatives to leverage on benefits and create synergy to influence prices. 3) Introduce environmental/social standards and brand products to determine prices.	A, E	MOA. Communities. Market Associations. Govt Cooperative Department. Standards Organisation of Nigeria	Feasibility studies, market and value chain analysis, etc, may also help to avoid some risks. Not currently using buy-back in CRS but is used in other States.
---	---	------	---	--

Farmers believe forest land is more productive; there is a risk of encroachment into forest reserves and protected areas.	1) Harmonization of policies and establish synergy among different agencies. 2) Not providing support to farmers encroaching into protected forests.	A, E, F	MOA. MCCF.	In CRS, farmers can clear land in community forests for agriculture; current Commercial Agriculture Program currently checks whether there is encroachment into National Park and forest reserves (related to the small farmers working with the Program). (There is encroachment occurring in FRs and NP due to various drivers.)
---	--	---------	------------	--

Land grab by small farmers (to secure tenure) and large-scale concessions (national & international actors)	1) Develop grievance redress mechanism. 2) Strengthen customary laws and local community institutions. 3) Increase public awareness on citizen's rights. 4) Enforce appropriate penalties on offenders against laws (including community by-laws). 5) Review of Land Use Act/tenure situation.	D, E	MOL. MCCF. MOA. Communities.	Links to review of Land Use Act and tenure situation in communities.
Displacement of small-scale farms	1) Develop land use plan to accommodate various land users.	C, D	MOA	This program is not displacing small farmers; but trend towards concessions may pose risk to small farmers and thus to the program.
Increased profitability leads to increase in demand for agricultural land, leading to more forest clearing	1) Prioritise land use among sectors. 2) Develop and implement integrated agricultural and forest management plan. 3) Regulate and monitor farm expansion.	A, E, F, G	MOA. MCCF. Communities.	
Recommendations related to this PAM:	Summarise risks for this PAM	Increased production may cause a decline in agricultural products' prices. Increased profitability may lead to land grab by more wealthy individuals. In addition, profitable agriculture can attract competition for more land, including forests.		
	Summarise benefits for this PAM	Program offers benefits as tailored towards value addition towards selected crops as well as addressing food security, while adopting effective land use that will be environmentally-friendly.		
	Key recommendations on enhancing benefits / reducing risks	<p>Inform improved design of PAM. Based on risks & benefits analysis, there is scope for the following: Link to land-use planning, so that a land use plan is developed to accommodate various land users, an integrated agricultural and forest management plan. Should regulate and monitor farm expansion, e.g. avoid providing support to farmers encroaching into protected forests. Agricultural intensification, value addition and improved marketing is needed to ensure increase in farmers' income. Organise farmers in cooperatives to leverage and create synergy to influence prices. To consider risk of surplus, there should be government intervention through buy-back of excess products for strategic reserve. To improve potential environmental benefits, promote smart/eco-agriculture and organic farming and leads to sustainable management of environment. Promote integrated pesticide management for better health, water outcomes, and educate farmers in environmental/health practices. Introduce environmental/social standards and brand products to determine prices. Increase consumption preference for local products, as well as farming for export. Need adequate processing and storage facilities to help with food security benefits. Also need to collect and publish monitoring information on impacts of this PAM on land use to ensure benefits provided/risks reduced. The agricultural extension services also needs expansion in terms of personnel, training/capacity building and appropriate incentives/motivation and equipping more officers to ensure good performance. Enforce appropriate penalties on offenders against laws that impact on agricultural and forest land (including community by-laws). Develop/utilise existing grievance redress mechanisms.</p> <p>Improve wider governance arrangements. Based on risks & benefits analysis, suggest to improve policy/governance framework by: Strengthening synergies/collaboration between relevant ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) (e.g. Agriculture, Environment, Climate Change) to avoid conflicts, and harmonize policies. Review of Land Use Act and tenure situation of forest communities to reduce risk of land grab, help motivate farmers invest in sustainable land management. Noting that it may not be possible to revise the Act, but that a review of the situation (drawing on PGA) can highlight opportunities to improve tenure and land use planning within the existing framework. For example, strengthening customary laws and local community institutions, and increasing public awareness on citizen's rights regarding land and natural resources.</p>		
3	Community land use plan (CLUP)			
	Description of PAM (content and how it will be implemented)	Land is zoned into different land uses (at community level); for farming, protection and sustainable forest management, water management.		
	Expected REDD+ impact	Expected to have an impact through all 5 REDD+ activities.		
	Status of PAM (e.g. existing, planned, future)	Existing but weak implementation. Some plans require revision.		
	Driver/barriers the PaM intends to address	Agriculture, logging, harvesting of NTFPs.		
Potential benefits	How to promote benefits?	Related Safeguards	Sources of information about benefit/safeguard	Comments / background info

From PGA Report (draft 2015): The REDD+ process may not be able to change the Nigerian Constitution or Land Use Act, and other regulatory instruments, or easily 'harmonize' them. It may need to work within the statutes and cultural norms in forest management that are practiced, noting that customary laws are often unique to each community. One key challenge for REDD+ implementation in Cross River State is how customary land right and institutions can be formally recognized and upgraded by codification, review and reformed under statutory law in line with RIO declaration on environment and development UNCED 1992. The PGA process highlighted a number of recommendations on how to approach this issue (p. 189-201).

Promote conservation and help to protect ecosystem services (including hydrological services)	1) Enhance understanding to take informed decisions. 2) Build capacity of the community to develop and implement their LUP, including to address different aspects/goals (e.g. livelihoods, ecosystem services, etc). 3) Policy level advocacy to recognise customary law/traditional practice. 4) Adapt land use plans to community realities to address specific REDD+ activities. 5) Enforcement of the plan.	B (3, 5, 6,8,10, 11), C, D, F	MCCF. Communities.	Communities develop LUPs but can be challenged.
Improve productivity through greater security of tenure and greater clarity on land use	1) Clear demarcation and allocation of land, with involvement of all community stakeholders.	C, D	Tracking markets & prices; some crop production data (MOA)	This benefit added through RTC validation.
Reduce conflict	1) Strengthen existing grievance redress mechanism structures such as Council of Chiefs and Elders. 2) Build capacity of existing structures (e.g. Ekpe Society, cult) set up by the chief council for enforcing sanctions on violations of community laws or committee that handles land dispute. 3) Develop and implement new conflict management mechanism if needed, including grievance mechanism; provide training on rights to redress, if needed. 4) Improve local government capacity to handle/facilitate grievances. 5) Develop and implement equitable benefit sharing mechanism. 6) Support sustainable livelihoods development involving various community groups.	B, C	Communities. MCCF. MOA.	PGA Report: The study communities reported both formal and informal complaint mechanisms, but few reported cases using formal complaint mechanisms. The use of letters (to relevant person, institution, agency) as a complaint mechanism was common. Depending on the gravity of the issue, the complaint might be made first to the Paramount Ruler who then takes it up with the concerned agency or organisation. Complaints concerning access to open access land (i.e. excluding protected areas) that involve community members are channelled verbally to the Council of Chiefs. Community bylaws may also set out complaint mechanisms / enforcement processes. This implies that local CSOs, CBOs and forest-dependent communities have the capability to aggregate and convey their interests or grievances through the existing grievance mechanisms that range from the community to state-level platforms. The position of the Local Government to adequately promote community-level demands is however weak. There is therefore the need to strengthen the ties between communities and local government (p. 137/138). A large proportion of community stakeholders are yet to receive any training on rights to seek redress, while only 20 percent of the stakeholders in the communities had received training on rights (Figure 3.26). Despite the high proportion of the Community stakeholders yet to receive training on rights, yet they understand the mechanism to express grievances at the local level (p. 339).
Enhance communal ownership	1) Promote/respect for customary laws. 2) Leverage external support to communities to enable implementation of their plans. 3) Leverage external support to communities to enable them address perceived gaps in their customary laws (e.g. where there is no documentation).	C (2, 4, 6, 7, 8)	Chiefs. Communities.	
Promote development & investment, as it gives equal chances to all sectors	1) Establish a mechanism to involve relevant sectors.	D, E	Investment Promotion Agency. MOF. Statistics Office.	May depend on how impartial are the organisations or people who lead the development of the LUP; community develop plan, with some guidance from forestry sector/NGOs. Other MDAs may be involved if have projects in communities.
Balances development with conservation and enhance sustainable livelihoods	1) Build local capacity to adapt best practices in land use planning, conservation and sustainable livelihoods to local circumstances. 2) Encourage participation of all stakeholders in plan development and implementation. 3) Strict enforcement of the plan. 4) Regular review of plans based on current reality. 5) Provide support for sustainable livelihoods.	B, C, D, E	Chiefs. Communities. MCCF.	LUP can help balance conservation with development, but does there need to be aspects of this built into the process, e.g. guidelines, or a review process, that ensures environmental considerations are included? The same goes for participation and social equity considerations: the process may need to explicitly promote these.
Helps to identify most suitable land for a particular use and thus regulate land use	1) Validate, recognise and respect community land use plans. 2) Carry out land capability assessment. 3) Conduct regular reviews.	A, B, D, E	Chiefs. Communities. CLUP maps.	
Potential risks	How to mitigate risks?	Related safeguards?	Sources of information about risk/safeguard	Comments / background info
Top-down approach that is prescriptive and does not reflect the aspirations and realities of local communities	1) Empower and encourage communities to lead and own the land use planning process (setting the pace, developing their priorities, and deciding on sanctions etc.).	C, D	Chiefs. Communities.	

Community land use plans conflicting with or undermined by government development and investment priorities	1) Respect community land use plans in extant laws. 2) Integrate with government development priorities. 3) Communicate government priorities and plans transparently.	B, C	SPC. Budget Office. Relevant (advisory) MDAs.	
Planning, implementation could be dominated by leaders/elite	1) Full participation of all stakeholders in planning, based on a proper mapping of stakeholders. 2) Encourage due process/consultation on decisions related to the plan. 3) Set up grievance redress mechanism.	B, D	Communities.	
Some social or marginalised groups may be left out in the planning	1) Involve, recognize and integrate all stakeholders in the planning and address gender issues. 2) Validate plan with community, consider FPIC requirement for community land-use plans. 3) Consider incentives for youth involvement in process.	C, D	Communities.	This risk may lead to loss of confidence in the programme, hinder participation and impede on the Cancun agreement of respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous people.
Recommendations related to this PAM:	Summarise risks for this PAM	If uses a top-down approach, planning does not reflect the interests of local communities in all ramifications; planning can be dominated by elites and some stakeholders/groups left out of planning. Community land use plan can conflict with/be undermined by government development priorities.		
	Summarise benefits for this PAM	Can promote conservation/protection of ecosystems, reducing conflict as well as enhancing communal ownership. Improves productivity through greater security of tenure and greater clarity on land use. Enhances sustainable livelihoods and promotes investment as identifies suitable land for particular uses, thereby ensuring optimal and sustainable use of land.		
	Key recommendations on enhancing benefits / reducing risks	Inform improved design of PAM. To reduce risks related to lack of participation and conflicts, full participation in planning of all stakeholders, based on proper mapping of stakeholders and validation of plan is important, as well as following due process. Adequate consultation is needed among all relevant groups in community. Need of clear demarcation and allocation of land, with involvement of all community stakeholders. Address gender issues and consider incentives for youth involvement in process. Validate the plan; consider FPIC requirement for community land-use plans. Encourage participation of all stakeholders in plan implementation as well, and develop and implement equitable benefit sharing mechanism. Local institutions and capacity at community level must be significantly built so they can develop effective LUPs. Needs to be assessment/baseline information to inform plan development. If linked to REDD+, land use plans need to be adapted to community realities to address specific REDD+ activities. Strengthen existing grievance redress mechanism structures such as Council of Chiefs and Elders. Leverage external support to communities to enable them address perceived gaps in their customary laws. Build capacity of existing structures (e.g. Ekpe Society, cult) set up by the chief council for enforcing sanctions on violations of community laws or committee that handles land dispute. Training on rights to redress may be needed. Support sustainable livelihoods development involving various community groups; leverage external support to communities to enable implementation of their plans. Enforcement mechanism needs to be strengthened; this needs to be put in place in areas where enforcement does not exist. Should also be regular monitoring and review of plans based on current reality.		
		Improve wider governance arrangements: To support community land-use planning and improve benefits/reduce risks, some supportive frameworks may be needed. For example, are any policies/frameworks needed to support use of FPIC? Also need to improve local government capacity to handle/facilitate grievances more broadly. Land-use plans should be integrated with government development priorities; communicate government priorities and plans transparently. There should be regular monitoring/review of land-use plans and monitoring of land use at wider scale (e.g. to understand cumulative impacts).		
4 Community Based Management Associations				
Description of PAM (content and how it will be implemented)	Associations formed by the community for effective community forest management, with relevant development partners\MDAs playing supportive and advisory role.			
Expected REDD+ impact	Supports SFM. Community based forest management associations may lead community stakeholders to take leadership of the programme activities and guarantee community ownership of the programme for sustainability.			
Status of PAM (e.g. existing, planned, future)	They are existing but not active (in the process of reactivation)			
Driver/barriers the PaM intends to address	Unsustainable use of the forest by the communities			
Potential benefits	How to promote benefits?	Related Safeguards	Sources of information about benefit/safeguard	Comments / background info
Promotes or enhances participation in forest management; can involve all stakeholders	1) Provision of incentives / recognition to the people to be involved in associations. 2) Develop approach/membership based on community circumstances/dynamics. 3) Full participation of relevant stakeholders, based on a proper mapping of all stakeholders.	B (5,6,8, 9, 10, 11)	CRSFC (MCCF). Communities.	Should consider community dynamics/features of participation.

Potential link to other PAMs, as a governance structure for SFM.

Shared ownership and responsibilities, and benefits from forest	1) Institutional capacity building. 2) Ensure all groups are part of benefit sharing.	C (5, 6), E	CRSFC (MCCF).	Regulation sets out permit fees, percentage to govt and community. Community decides how to invest funds; FC would monitor that is used for community development.
Promotes application of indigenous knowledge and skill.	1) Respect for traditional systems should be demonstrated in rules formulation and enforcement. 2) Leverage external support to document and apply traditional knowledge/customary laws.	C, D (1, 4)	CRSFC (MCCF).	E.g. sacred forest sites
Facilitates equitable distribution and allocation of resources.	1) Develop and implement benefit sharing mechanisms that respect traditional structures and processes.	E (4)	CRSFC (MCCF).	Previously gathered info on royalty/loyalty payment information; tree inspection report (communities were also involved).
Strengthens local community organising, governance and contribution to land/forest resources management	1) Build capacity of community associations and include in developing and enforcing land/forest resources regulations. 2) Provide incentives to support local community associations to enforce land/forest regulations. 3) Enforce penalties against defaulting members and/or associations.	B, D	CRSFC (MCCF).	E.g. loyalty payments, percentage of fees
Ensures/contributes to? sustainability because of community ownership of the process.	1) Develop/implement appropriate communication strategy; strengthen communication within community and with govt & other stakeholders. 2) Strengthen local governance structures and processes, and consult broadly with all families in communities to ensure inclusive decision-making. 3) Document processes and decisions, and encourage regular feedback and review of progress. 4) Enhance understanding to take informed decisions.	B, C, D	CRSFC (MCCF).	Local governance structures referring to structures for community governance (e.g. village councils) Used to collect meeting minutes; status unclear in future, could also keep records of communication strategies?
Maintenance of forest-related law and order	1) Capacity building on understanding of regulations and how to enforce. 2) Information sharing between communities and police/govt agencies.	A, B, F	CRSFC (MCCF).	Communities have power to enforce regulations.
Increase in supply of forest products, NTFPs	1) Sustainable management plans for forest products. 2) Land use plans, identification/demarcation of harvesting areas.	B, E	CRSFC (MCCF).	Have systems/by-laws currently in some communities, e.g. setting out open/closed seasons, designated areas, harvesting techniques.
Multiple forest types could benefit from management (mangrove, tropical high, savannah, etc) (benefit for conservation/ ecosystem services)	1) Spatial planning to ensure forest types are covered. 2) Adapt management plan to own area/forest type.	E	CRSFC, GIS data	
Improved management of community forest	1) Dialogue between govt & communities to advise on forest management. 2) Training & capacity building on forest management, livelihood options. 3) Incorporate/recognise customary law/bylaws and local knowledge in forest management.	A, B	CRSFC, future NFMS	Noting role of community by-laws to govern management of community forests. Some support provided to communities from govt, e.g. fertilisers, soft loans, etc. The impacts of these need monitoring too.
Potential risks	How to mitigate risks?	Related safeguards?	Sources of information about risk/safeguard	Comments / background info
Inadequate gender representation (favouring men more than women).	1) Equitable and effective representation of all stakeholders (by sex, groups, status, etc). 2) Rotational representation. 3) Quotas for participation.	B (9), D	CRSFC, association meeting minutes	This risk if not mitigated will hinder participation cause conflict and eventually frustrate the programme. In past, women have not been well-represented. Noting forest resources type/richness and community influences gender involvement. Basic standards for associations set out women's participation.

Potential discrimination against families or groups (e.g. youth, elders, migrants)	1) Develop of a chronicle of groups and families. 2) Open dialogue for collective decision regarding representation and set procedures for accountability. 3) Apply law regarding respecting of persons and establish accessible, transparent and efficient feedback and grievance redress mechanisms.	C (6), D	CRSFC. Grievance redress mechanism. Meeting minutes?	
Corruption; extortion of money from permittees and vice-versa; mismanagement of resources & processes	1) Effective supervision/monitoring by village council 2) Rotating principal positions 3) put in place a process to ensure accountability and reporting 4) management capacity building	B	CRSFC. Monitoring data. Grievance redress mechanism.	Decided to keep in (even though deleted in previous session).
Can adversely affect the development of the community; regulations do not differentiate according to needs of some people/groups (e.g. for NTFPs)	1) Membership should rotate and every group should be involved in decision-making/planning. 2) Documentation and review of by-laws/management plans according to necessities.	B, D		
Recommendations related to this PAM:	Summarise risks for this PAM	Discrimination against families and groups as well as gender could occur. Vices such as corruption and extortion of money results in non-implementation of rules and regulations; along with enforcement of regulations this could affect the development of communities.		
	Summarise benefits for this PAM	It enhances effective participation by all community stakeholders in forest management, thereby promoting local/indigenous knowledge. Can be complemented by equitable distribution of forest resources. Local governance is strengthened to facilitate SFM, which enhances ecosystem services from all forest types. It ensures sustainability as a result of ownership by community. It enhances implementation of forest laws and regulations to foster the sustainable supply of forest resources.		
	Key recommendations on enhancing benefits / reducing risks	Inform improved design of PAM: To improve participation, all stakeholders should be involved in implementation of the program, with reference to community circumstances. There should be a full participation of relevant stakeholders, based on a proper mapping of all stakeholders. Deliberate measures may be needed to enhance the participation of women and other vulnerable groups in decision-making, in order to address issue of gender/other discriminations. Suggestions include using rotational representation, quotas for participation of vulnerable groups, incentives/recognition to the people involved in associations. Document processes and decisions, and encourage regular feedback and review of progress. Establish accessible, transparent and efficient feedback and grievance redress mechanisms, as well as supervision/monitoring by village council. All complaints about the program/associations must be addressed transparently. Enforce penalties against defaulting members and/or associations. Community management associations will need technical support from MDAs and/or external organisations to deliver sustainable management/use of forests (registration with MDAs, advisory role for MDAs). Build capacity of community associations and include in developing and enforcing land/forest resources regulations. Incorporate/ recognise customary law/bylaws and local knowledge in forest management, and leverage support to document and apply traditional knowledge/customary laws.		
		Improve wider governance arrangements: To facilitate effective CBMAs, there should be regular information flow between government and communities, and a strengthening and recognition of local governance structures and processes. There are numerous links to other PAMs, e.g. land use planning, sustainable management plans for forest products should be developed (linking to NTFPs regulation below). Regular and detailed monitoring & evaluation will be needed of different aspects of this PAM, and the PAMs linked to it. For example, the impact of enforcement of regulations & penalties issued; effectiveness of participation and engagement of different groups (e.g. women) in associations and planning; how new skills/capacity/support is put to use; and harvesting of NTFPs.		

PGA report (draft, 2015): Establish state-community forest management arrangements to combine the flexibility and responsiveness of traditional forest resource management with the authority of state laws. This will guarantee the effectiveness of enforcement of rules and regulation of forest use rights. Required efforts include documentation and formalisation of existing community bylaws as well as harmonisation of customary laws with statutory laws (p.201).

5 Green Police				
Description of PAM (content and how it will be implemented)	Forest monitoring and protection initiative of Cross River State government to complement the work of forest guards, largely community based and aims to reduce unemployment and enhance sustainable forest management.			
Expected REDD+ impact	The green police will enforce the State government's policy on forest protection. Through the Green Police unsustainable forest use will be minimized helping to further UN-REDD+ goal of climate change mitigation; involvement in enhancement activities as well.			
Status of PAM (e.g. existing, planned, future)	1000 GP already recruited in the first phase (indefinite program). GP duties will include 1) nursery development; 2) Regeneration of forests; 3) Forest policing; and 4) Environmental sanitation. Voluntary but get stipend.			
Driver/barriers the PaM intends to address	Logging & clearing of forests (small-scale and large-scale, informal and formal) in all forests; to help with lack of manpower for protection/enhancement. In community forests and forest reserves. [check against ToR/GP proposal]			
Potential benefits	How to promote benefits?	Related Safeguards	Sources of information about benefit/safeguard	Comments / background info

Increased manpower to enhance forest protection	1) Integrate forest management and rules enforcement with sustainable livelihoods development (in the context of a Green Economy). 2) Integrate with existing forest management structures; avoid parallel administration.	A, B, C, D, E	CRSFC. MCCF.	GP report to Commissioner of MCCF. Green Police would not operate inside CRNP.
Create employment opportunities for host communities	1) Ensuring accountability and transparency in selection of members of the Green Police. 2) Direct involvement of community members in REDD programme activities, plus training/capacity building for them. 3) Ensure sufficient funding for Green Police in communities.	B, E	MCCF.	
Help to enforce Government laws and regulations on forest management.	1) Ensure public acceptance of the Green Police. 2) GP must operate under existing structure in MCCF; complement existing structures in communities. 3) Employ community members. 4) Ensure adequate training, capacity building & equipment. 5) Clarify roles/overlap with other actors engaged in enforcement.	A, B, C	MCCF.	Forestry Law empowers CRSFC to enforce laws, which will be maintained now by MCCF. GP operating under existing structure and framework of MCCF. They have a mandate to enforce the law.
Greater participation of forest communities in forest protection	1) Involve, recognize and integrate all stakeholders in the planning, decision making process & implementation of Green Police.	D	MCCF. Communities.	Communities recommend names for GP; further monitoring of community engagement not clear yet.
Provide help to communities in forest governance/ protection (including dealing with drivers of deforestation/degradation from inside & outside of community)	1) Recruitment from the community and placement in own communities. 2) Supervision by existing Forest Guards. 3) Enhance training of Green Police for effectiveness.	A, B	MCCF.	Reporting/accountability will be to State (MCCF).
Promote sustainable forest management, afforestation and reforestation	1) Monitoring & reporting of field activities by existing MCCF authority. 2) Measures needed to select sites, ensure maintenance/ sustainability of (re)planting.	A, E, F	MCCF, MRV.	Linked to 5 Million Trees proposal; reforestation and afforestation focus. Other, past reforestation efforts focused on degraded areas and planting in communities. The 5 million trees proposal is to primarily focus on degraded areas of forest reserves. The indigenous species should be planted at the reserve (for ecological restoration). For the woodlots for fuel wood, fast growing trees should be planted. If included as REDD+ PAM, 5 Million Trees program may need own risks & benefits analysis.
Create more awareness among public on forest conservation	1) Use of educational materials, mass media, local town criers, etc. 2) Green Police to help educate communities about conservation (TOT model).	B, E	MCCF	GP training includes 'community relations'. This will build capacity for them to educate the communities. Review meetings will be held to brief superiors.
Potential risks	How to mitigate risks?	Related safeguards?	Sources of information about risk/safeguard	Comments / background info
Increase in cost of governance/forest management	1) Strengthen existing local community institutions and empower to take ownership of forest governance processes. 2) Streamlining of roles between Task Force and GP to avoid duplication, and to be more efficient financially. 3) Work within existing structures of MCCF as the overarching body. 4) Strengthen synergy between local community institutions and statutory government agencies in rule enforcement.	B, D	CRSFC. MCCF. MOE.	Risk refers to chance that Green Police will be seen as another government law enforcement agency or task force, their activities may distract community people from understanding the need for them to voluntarily manage the forest by themselves for their benefit.
Abuse of power and corruption (fostering distrust)	1) Effective monitoring & supervision by MCCF. 2) Effective training. 3) Grievance redress mechanism. 4) Enhance GP allowances.	B (1,2,5, 6, 9, 10 ,11)	MCCF.	Could be abuse of power by Green Police or others (community leaders/guards) taking advantage of new recruits? Or GP members aiding and abetting violations within own communities.
Inequitable representation / participation in Green Police program	1) Ensure adequate representation of community members & impartial recruitment. 2) Monitoring & supervision to check representation of whole community.	B, D	MCCF.	

Conflict of roles and/or interests, and distrust between actors and distrust between GP and the public, leading to ineffective forest governance	1) Streamline roles between different agencies & actors. 2) Ensuring bottom-top mgt. approach (clear reporting line to MCCF).	B	MCCF. Communities.	Green Police reporting to Forest Guard and then up chain. Distrust may include local people distrusting Green Police, making it hard for them to do their job.
Disregard for rule of law	1) Observe due process in forest management/governance in line with existing law. 2) Review law as appropriate to accommodate current situation. 3) Build capacity of relevant institutions to create synergy, be more coordinated and proactive in operations.	A, B	MCCF. CRSFC. Communities.	Relating to implementation of Green Police and how they carry out duties.
Weak institutional arrangement affecting sustainability of Green Police	1) Conduct lessons learned from similar structures to inform government's decision on Green Police. 2) Compare options and if considered best option, develop clear terms of reference and legislation to support the formation and operation of the Green Police.	A, B	MCCF.	ToR has been developed.
Some areas may have stronger protection/ coverage from Green Police than others	1) Training and capacity building. 2) Performance review & incentives/ rewards for good performance. 3) Monitoring and evaluation of program by MCCF.	G	MCCF. MRV.	GP will cover all forest communities. But how to ensure all receive same standard of implementation?
Recommendations related to this PAM:	Summarise risks for this PAM	Expansion of forest conservation units will lead to higher costs in governance. Conflicts between institutions, and potentially as a result of competing interests and/or corruption. Inequitable participation and distribution of personnel, and weak institutional arrangement may affect sustainability of Green Police, plus risk of leakage.		
	Summarise benefits for this PAM	Increase manpower to facilitate forest protection and enforcement of forest laws & regulations, and to raise awareness on forest conservation. Creates job opportunities for host communities, and opportunity to participate in forest protection and governance. May help to deal with drivers of deforestation and degradation, promote SFM, improve monitoring, afforestation and reforestation.		
	Key recommendations on enhancing benefits / reducing risks	<p>Inform improved design of PAM. Based on the analysis, recommendations related to the design of this PAM include: To maximise benefits for forest law enforcement/protection, the Green Police initiative should operate under the existing structure in MCCF, and complement existing structures in communities, with supervision by Forest Guards. There should be a clear policy statement on the engagement of the Green Police, specifying their responsibilities as well as their limitations, with emphasis on how they can complement existing government and community structures for forest management and avoid parallel administration. Build capacity of relevant institutions to coordinate and be proactive in operations. Ensuring accountability and transparency in selection of members of the Green Police, including grievance redress mechanism. Also enhance the Green Police allowances. There should be regular and transparent monitoring & reporting of field activities by existing MCCF authority. Involve, recognize and integrate all stakeholders in the implementation of Green Police. Ensure sufficient funding for Green Police implementation in communities. Effective training is also needed, with capacity building and adequate equipment to facilitate their performance in afforestation, reforestation and enforcement. Use performance review & incentives for good performance and ensure the monitoring and evaluation of the program by MCCF. To reduce conflicts, need to ensure public acceptance of the Green Police, and promote role to help educate communities about conservation. Importantly, this analysis has focused on the potential risks and benefits associated with the enforcement role of the Green Police, and their capacity needs. They are also expected to play a role in delivering proposed reforestation/ afforestation initiatives (e.g. 5 Million Trees proposal). If these Reforestation/ afforestation initiatives are included in the REDD+ strategy, they may need risks & benefits analysis as separate PAM. For example, measures will be needed to select appropriate sites, and ensure maintenance/ sustainability of (re)planting, and safeguards issues need to be understood.</p> <p>Improve wider governance arrangements: As with other PAMs, recommendations suggest benefit from strengthening existing local community institutions and empowering them to take ownership of forest governance processes. This should strengthen synergy between local community institutions and statutory government agencies in rule enforcement. There should be a streamlining of forest management and enforcement roles between Task Force and Green Police to avoid duplication, and to be more efficient financially. It is important to work within the existing structures of MCCF as the overarching body. In addition, before proceeding with this PAM, conduct lessons learned from similar structures (including linking to review of Moratorium) to inform government's decision on Green Police and enforcement measures more widely. If considered the best option, develop clear terms of reference and legislation to support the formation and operation of the Green Police. Also important to consider livelihood issues and integrate forest management and rules enforcement with sustainable livelihoods development (in the context of a Green Economy).</p>		
6	Regulation of NTFPs within community and protected forests			
	Description of PAM (content and how it will be implemented)	Regulation on collection of NTFPs in community and protected forests that has effect on carbon stock and social benefits. CRSFC tariff have specifications on extraction permit. The forest tariff is where NTFPs in forests are listed, with tariff on specific amount collected. Most eligible will be <i>Gnetum Africanum</i> (Salad), <i>Capolobia</i> (Fulani cattle rod), <i>Randia</i> species (chewing sticks).		
	Expected REDD+ impact	If well implemented will guard against forest degradation, promote sustainable forest management.		

Status of PAM (e.g. existing, planned, future)		<i>Inactive due to the ban on logging (Task Force affected NTFPs collection, beyond the mandate of the ban).</i>		
Driver/barriers the PaM intends to address		<i>Drivers: 1. Unsustainable exploitation of forest resources. Barriers: 1. Strict legislation in protected areas that allows no form of exploitation e.g. the wildlife sanctuary permits no form of forest resource exploitation. 2. Conflicting regulations from government and communities that owns forest.</i>		
Potential benefits	How to promote benefits?	Related Safeguards	Sources of information about benefit/safeguard	Comments / background info
Reduces forest degradation	1) Provision of alternative livelihoods. 2) Build capacity for domestication of NTFP, and provide training on sustainable exploitation and value addition.	A, B, C, E	CRSFC. MRV.	
More equitable access to NTFPs, better regulation of prices/return to local people from NTFPs sale	1) Enforcement of regulation. 2) Management plans that allow equitable access.	C, E	MCCF. CRSFC (forest inventory?). Reviewed draft CRSFC Tariff.	<i>National forest inventory includes some NTFP species data collection (?)</i>
Improved value chain for NTFPs	1) Build capacity of the local exploiters. 2) Access to/promotion of processing and value-added techniques.	E	CRSFC. Community forestry reports on livelihood options training.	
Potential to institute more sustainable long-term supply of NTFPs	1) Enforcement of regulation. 2) Management plans for sustainable harvesting & support for sustainable harvesting techniques, incorporating traditional practice where appropriate. 3) Monitoring of NTFP use and supply. 4) Ex-situ propagation of NTFPs.	C, E	MCCF. CRSFC. Forest inventory.	
Enhance biodiversity conservation	1) Appropriate legislation and enforcement. 2) Implementation of the CRS biodiversity conservation strategy. 3) As above - sustainable harvesting, as well as look for synergies with alternative livelihoods schemes, in order to reduce pressure on wild populations. 4) Develop and implement strict policies on domestication for wild species that are facing extinction (including Gnetum, Randia, etc).	A, E	MCCF. CRSFC. Forest inventory. CRNP biodiversity data.	
Secure livelihood base and improve well-being, especially for the rural communities	1) Better regulation of prices/return to local people from NTFPs sale, e.g. improving information sharing on market prices. 2) Monitor role of NTFPs in supporting improved food security, well-being.	A, E	MCCF. CRSFC. Statistics Office.	
Potential risks	How to mitigate risks?	Related safeguards?	Sources of information about risk/safeguard	Comments / background info
Potential to generate conflicts between enforcement institutions	1) Clarify regulation and roles of different actors.	C, D, E	CRSFC Forest Law 2010, National Park Act 2006.	
Poor monitoring/enforcement, and difficulties in regulating amount harvested	1) Provide resources/framework for monitoring of NTFPs/sustainable use, including stocktaking/inventory. 2) Punishment to defaulters. 3) representation of all community group especially the vulnerable group in decision making, e.g. about harvesting plans.	B	CRNP, MCCF, CRSFC.	
Conflict between local people over access to NTFPs, including risk of corruption (e.g. to secure permits) and elite capture	1) Impartial system to allocate harvesting permits/rights. 2) Link to existing grievance redress mechanisms; develop new channels if needed. 3) Involvement of all stakeholders in development of management plan.	C	Communities' bylaws.	

Loss of livelihoods	1) Respect the challenges and rights of all stakeholders especially the poor. 2) Environmental and social impact assessment prior to introduction of scheme, including identification of vulnerable groups. 3) Make provision for alternative livelihoods.	C, E	Communities. Forest Inventory. If reactivated, there would be records of permits.	
Recommendations related to this PAM:	Summarise risks for this PAM	Regulation of NTFPs collection within community and protection forests, if not properly managed, is likely to affect livelihoods and generate conflict between community members over access to NTFPs and among enforcement institutions if there are overlaps in administrative rules. Also if rules and responsibilities of enforcement agencies are not clearly streamlined it will impact negatively on enforcement of regulations regarding NTFP collections. Also potential to restrict NTFP-based livelihoods.		
	Summarise benefits for this PAM	If well-regulated, it can reduce forest degradation and promote sustainable forest management. It could add value through increasing prices of NTFPs and value chain. It serves as potential to institute more sustainable and continuous supply of NTFPs, and enhances biodiversity conservation. It fast-tracks the security of livelihood options.		
	Key recommendations on enhancing benefits / reducing risks	<p>Inform improved design of PAM: To reduce risks and enhance benefits of this PAM, recommendations include: When it comes to a common resource base, most times the interest of the vulnerable (poor) are not taken into consideration. Recommend that the regulation should clearly protect the interest of the vulnerable, and include environmental and social impact assessment prior to its (re)introduction. Since sources of livelihood is focus, is vital that formulation of regulation affecting NTFPs should be carried out after due consultation with all groups of community stakeholders, for consideration of all interests. Whatever regulation or system is put in place should not deprive people of the ability to access NTFPs and to earn a livelihood. Representation of all community group especially the vulnerable group in decision making, e.g. about harvesting plan. Needs an impartial system to allocate harvesting permits/rights. There should be capacity building for domestication of NTFP, sustainable exploitation and value addition. Respect the challenges and rights of all stakeholders especially the poor; link to existing grievance redress mechanisms; develop new channels if needed. To further improve livelihoods, should be access to/promotion of processing and value-added techniques and capacity-building for local exploiters of NTFPs. To avoid the loss of livelihoods, it is important to provide alternative ones. Management plans for sustainable harvesting should allow equitable access & support for sustainable harvesting techniques, incorporating traditional practice where appropriate. Plans, quotas, harvesting amounts should be monitored regularly. Better regulation of prices/return to local people from NTFPs sale should be promoted, e.g. improving information sharing on market prices. In addition to conservation through sustainable use, there should be ex-situ conservation and domestication of NTFPs, in order to ensure its continued availability (building on existing experiences), especially for the domestication for wild species that are facing extinction (including Gnetum, Randia, etc).</p> <p>Improve wider governance arrangements: As with other forest protection related PAMs, there needs to be clarification of the NTFPs regulation and roles of different actors. In order to minimise conflicts, corruption and overlaps of functions between enforcement institutions, it is imperative that roles and responsibilities of institutions be clearly defined. To ensure environmental benefits, it should be linked to formulation of CRS Biodiversity Strategy. Monitoring the role of NTFPs in supporting improved food security, community well-being, will also provide information about social benefits from improved NTFPs management. Evaluate synergies with alternative livelihoods schemes, other livelihoods related PAMs, in order to reduce pressure on wild populations of NTFPs. Recommend to reactivate the Regulation on NTFPs collection.</p>		
7	Cross River National park (Participatory Management plan)			
Description of PAM (content and how it will be implemented)	<i>The Participatory Management plan provides information on the Park (including maps), inventory of the resources of the park (wildlife, cultural and related natural resources), and assessment of wildlife population trends. It spells out plans for the development of the park, creation of buffer zone, public participation in activities of the park, participation of local communities in park management, support for zone development, infrastructural development, etc. it is subject to review at intervals of not more than 10 yrs.</i>			
Expected REDD+ impact	<i>Reducing emission from forest degradation, conservation of carbon stock.</i>			
Status of PAM (e.g. existing, planned, future)	<i>Existing and operational within limited budget, expanded budgetary provision needed.</i>			
Driver/barriers the PaM intends to address	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak government – community relationship • Poor governance • Limited collaboration across stakeholders groups • Restricted livelihoods and economic development 			
Potential benefits	How to promote benefits?	Related Safeguards	Sources of information about benefit/safeguard	Comments / background info
Increased community participation in protected area management	1) Identify and involve target groups in the communities e.g. youths, women, men. 2) Ensure adequate representation in decision-making body and that community views are taken into account. 3) Community validation of management plan. 4) Increase community participation in park functions (e.g. monitoring/surveying).	B, C, D	National Park Act 2006.	

Reduced conflict between community/park management	1) Strengthen traditional institutions and recognise role of customary law, e.g. where goals of NP and community and mutually supported. 2) Develop/implement plan for sustainable use in buffer zone. 3) Develop/implement conflict management system.	B, E	CRNP. Communities.	Buffer zone is immediately around PA (5 km of boundary; no communities in buffer zone); support zone communities refers to communities around the periphery of park. There is a support zone development program. Enclave communities are within park. Traditional institutions include town councils, elders' forum, youth wings, women groups, age grades (age classes have meetings).
Useful data development for forest monitoring and enforcement	1) Develop data bank and promote information sharing among stakeholders. 2) Develop and implement knowledge management plan.	C,D	CRNP	Park is currently collecting ranger/patrol data in sheets, minutes of meetings with communities, etc, but lack of database, processing of data.
Protection and maintenance of ecological integrity of the park via zonation into core area, public use zone	1) Assessment/analysis & consultation to carry out zonation. 2) Proper delineation of the respective zones on ground.	E	CRNP	Any monitoring information being gathered on ecological values in park? Some; see comment above.
Potential risks	How to mitigate risks?	Related safeguards?	Sources of information about risk/safeguard	Comments / background info
Reduction in available farmland for the community (e.g. in buffer zone)	1) Encourage and facilitate sustainable farming system in support zone communities. 2) Provide functional and effective extension services to farmers. 3) Consultation on impacts on farming. 4) Review National Park Act (e.g. processes/consultation for buffer zone creation).	C, E	CRNP. MRV/GIS unit.	Farming is not allowed in buffer zone; allowed in support zone communities on community land (this is a Forestry issue).
Loss of livelihoods	1) Provide alternative livelihood options, that are adaptable to community needs.	C, E	CRNP. Communities.	
Risk that info/knowledge will be used to extract resources from park	1) Regulation and monitoring of NTFPs collection should be strengthened 2) Link to provision of alternative livelihoods 3) Intensive and far-reaching sensitization of community, Park staff and relevant officers on conservation values.	C, E	CRNP. Communities.	
High expectations / demands for benefits and incentives from the communities for provisions of basic social amenities from Park management	1) Improve govt budgetary provision for support zone development. 2) Collaboration with relevant government agencies for the provision of social amenities. 3) Develop appropriate communication strategy. 4) Leverage support from development partners.	C, E	CRNP. Communities.	
Recommendations related to this PAM:	Summarise risks for this PAM	National Park participatory management plan, if not well thought-out, is likely to deprive members of communities of farmlands or restrict their livelihoods in the buffer zone, leading to loss of livelihoods. Management plan that is not people-centred is likely to lead to agitation for the provision of basic social amenities and incentives for community members.		
	Summarise benefits for this PAM	Increase community participation in management of protected areas, as well as reduce conflict between communities and park management. Develop a database for monitoring and evaluation, for effective enforcement and management. Protection and maintenance of ecological integrity in parks, including through zonation into core and other areas.		
	Key recommendations on enhancing benefits / reducing risks	Inform improved design of PAM: To address risks and benefits related to participation in planning, investigate further whether current levels of participation in PMP is sufficient and promote community participation park functions (e.g. surveying). Identify and involve target groups in the communities (e.g. youths, women, men). There should be an intensive and far-reaching sensitization of community, Park staff and relevant officers on conservation values. Linked to the CRNP LAC (below), ensure adequate representation in decision-making body and that community views are taken into account. Consider securing community validation of PMP, and implement conflict management system. The plan should also recognise traditional institutions and the role of customary law, e.g. where goals of NP and community and mutually supported. Since the National Park has higher protection status, which restricts community access to livelihoods, the PMP should make provisions for alternative livelihoods for community members that are adaptable to community needs and to address issue of demand for farmland; should clearly outline capacity building in eco-friendly agriculture and other alternative livelihoods in support zone communities, synergizing with the CRS Ministry of Agriculture in her smart agriculture programs, and providing functional and effective extension services to farmers. To help deliver livelihoods goals, improve collaboration with relevant government agencies for the provision of social amenities to communities in/around the Park, and leverage support from development partners. Develop appropriate communication strategy, to enhance sensitization of community, Park staff and relevant officers and reduce conflict. Ensure collection of monitoring data to assess effectiveness and develop database, utilising collected data, to allow effective processing/evaluation of data. Monitoring of NTFPs collection should be strengthened (link to NTFPs PAM). PMP should also include zoning to protect park's ecological integrity.		

Improve wider governance arrangements: The law that establish the National Park should be reviewed (e.g. processes/consultation for buffer zone creation), in order to conform with current circumstances and times (increasing population and pressure on land). If revision of the law cannot be secured, opportunities to make improvements within the current framework should be explored. The Act also needs to clearly define a monitoring strategy as it regards management plan implementation. As with other related PAMs, suggest to strengthen traditional institutions and customary law. Regulation of NTFPs collection should also be strengthened. Embark on strategic environmental assessment of all infrastructural development projects expected to be undertaken in and around the CRNP to cumulatively assess impacts, solicit community input and proffer a balancing solution of effects holistically. Improve government budgetary provision for support zone development.

8 Cross River National park (Prescribed offences and penalties)

Description of PAM (content and how it will be implemented)		<i>The National Park Act prescribes what constitute offences in the park to include: entry into the park without permission; erecting a building/camp inside the Park and residing therein; hunting, capturing or destroying of animals; uprooting, stripping of bark of plant or leaves from plants; setting of fire, making of farms/plantation inside the park; introduction of chemicals or any form of pollution, fishing/attempt to kill fish; removal or damage of nests of birds/reptiles or other mammals; drilling/mining, etc, inside the Park. There are prescribed penalties for every offence ranging from payment of fines of various amounts to imprisonments for varied periods, with some exceeding five years depending on the offence.</i>		
Expected REDD+ impact		Reducing emission from forest degradation and deforestation, conservation of carbon stock.		
Status of PAM (e.g. existing, planned, future)		Operational but requires review; it needs effective enforcement.		
Driver/barriers the PaM intends to address		Multiple drivers and barriers, e.g. illegal logging, forest fire for forest conversion to farmland, weak law enforcement, weak sanctions		
Potential benefits	How to promote benefits?	Related Safeguards	Sources of information about benefit/safeguard	Comments / background info
Promote compliance to laws and regulations	1) Strict enforcement. 2) Education about law provisions. 3) Communications/awareness raising as way to promote compliance/conservation. 4) Review offences & penalties to ensure penalties are sufficient to serve as a deterrent.	A, B	CRNP.	Current penalties may be too low
Promote conservation and help to ensure sustainable supply of forest products	1) Effective Park policing. 2) Integration with/application of laws aligned to park zones.	A, E	CRNP.	
Increase forest carbon stock	1) Enhance enforcement/protection to allow natural regeneration. 2) Identify areas to zone for regeneration. 3) Monitoring of enhancement impact.	E, F	CRNP. MRV/GIS unit.	
Enforcement coupled with provision of alternative livelihood to offenders	1) Provide employment to hunters and loggers in patrolling/monitoring.	A, E	CRNP.	
Protection of useful plant and animal species	1) Assess potential for sustainable harvesting in the park. 2) Collaboration with pharmaceutical companies for possible ex-situ propagation. Encourage planting of useful plant species outside the park. 3) Strengthen monitoring. 4) Develop ecotourism to enhance protection of these species.	B, E	CRNP.	
Potential risks	How to mitigate risks?	Related safeguards?	Sources of information about risk/safeguard	Comments / background info
Increased conflicts between Park management and communities	1) Intensive conservation education in support/buffer zone communities. 2) Develop conflict management strategy.	A,C, D, E	CRNP.	
Loss of livelihoods	1) Provide support to develop alternative livelihood options.	C, E	CRNP.	Buffer zone is 5 km around boundary of Park. Support zone refers to communities around the park. Enclave communities are within park and have an area demarcated for livelihood activities.
Hindered passage between support zone communities, especially enclave communities	1) Dialogue between CRNP, govt & communities to protect the interest of the enclave communities. 2) Review National Park Act. 3) Clearly delineate all boundaries between buffer zone, support zone and enclave communities.	A, C, E	CRNP.	Review of NP Act relevant to more than one PAM

Connivance of park officials	1) Effective supervision. 2) Adequate remuneration and motivation for Park rangers and reintroduce hazard allowance. 3) Enforce appropriate sanctions against defaulters.	B	CRNP.	
Recommendations related to this PAM:	Summarise risks for this PAM	Enforcement of prescribed offences and penalties may lead to loss of livelihoods, and impacts negatively on enclave communities by restricting their access through the Park. Officials of the Park may mismanage or abuse the administration of penalties. These negative impacts combined may increase conflict between communities and the Park.		
	Summarise benefits for this PAM	Promotes conservation of flora and fauna, including useful plant and animal species, and can improve carbon sequestration, through compliance to laws and regulations, which could be enhanced by sustainable livelihoods development options.		
	Key recommendations on enhancing benefits / reducing risks	<p>Inform improved design of PAM. In order to reduce risks and enhance benefits for this PAM, recommendations include: Increasing education for communities and park staff about relevant regulations, offences and penalties. Develop a conflict management strategy, including regular training in engaging with communities, which may assist with other PAMs too. Problems like passage through the park for communities also need to be addressed (see below). Explore other correctional options such as training and engaging offenders in enforcement/patrolling/surveying (e.g. employing hunters and loggers in patrolling). Implementation of the regulations under this PAM needs effective Park policing; should also be integrated with/application of laws aligned to park zones. This should include identifying areas to zone for regeneration and enhanced enforcement to allow for regeneration. To help protect useful plant & animal species, explore options for sustainable harvesting, ecotourism and ex-situ propagation (e.g. collaboration with pharmaceutical companies for possible ex-situ propagation).</p> <p>Improve wider governance arrangements: As above, it is recommended that the National Park Act should be reviewed, in this case to update offences and penalties, and to address issue of passage through the park. A dialogue between the Park and communities may help find solutions for passage in the meantime. It is also important to clearly delineate all boundaries between buffer zone, support zone and enclave communities. Adequate funding for staff development and remuneration, for effective enforcement and engaging with communities is needed for all CRNP PAMs. As with other PAMs, there are possible links and synergies with NTFPs regulation and existing agriculture/livelihood programs.</p>		

Current funding levels for the NP unlikely to be enough for all the expected operations.

9 Cross River National park (Establishment of Local Advisory Committee (LAC))				
Description of PAM (content and how it will be implemented)		Local Advisory Committees are established in the National Parks to enhance participation of local communities in the management of National Parks. Support zone communities are divided into blocks of cells and LAC members are drawn from the cells rather than from individual communities because of large number of support zone communities in CRNP (total 105 communities).		
Expected REDD+ impact		Conservation of forests, by aligning protected forest management more with the priorities of the communities, to enhance the support of the communities towards the better management of the park.		
Status of PAM (e.g. existing, planned, future)		Operational.		
Driver/barriers the PaM intends to address		Reduce barriers to improved management? Involve the community in park management so as to give them sense of belonging both the park and the community to improve conservation.		
Potential benefits	How to promote benefits?	Related Safeguards	Sources of information about benefit/safeguard	Comments / background info
Improved Park/community relationship	1) Segment the committee to cover both sectors effectively. 2) Ensure community views are addressed, taken into account, in decision-making. 3) Make ToR/responsibilities clear for LAC.	C, D	National Park Act 2006.	
Reduced conflict between Park and communities	1) Empower LAC members to resolve conflict at community level. 2) Establish grievance redress mechanism.	C, E	CRNP. Communities.	
Promote participatory park management	1) Awareness creation and provision of incentives within and outside the park, provision of incentives to the local communities. 2) Promote eco-tourism through public-private partnership (PPP).	C,E,F	Evaluation and verification by the park rangers and other personnel.	Is provision of incentives enough to lead to participatory management?
Economic benefit to members	1) Sustained regular meetings. 2) Provide capacity development to LAC members (based on community needs assessment).	B, E	CRNP. LAC meeting minutes.	They are paid allowance to attend the meetings.

Potential risks	How to mitigate risks?	Related safeguards?	Sources of information about risk/safeguard	Comments / background info
Disagreements among communities within the cell/blocks on membership	1) Membership should be qualified and rotational.	D	CRNP. Communities. LAC membership lists.	
Expectations of financial/economic incentives by LAC and communities	1) Develop appropriate communication strategy. 2) Leverage support from development partners to support community development management plan.	A, C, D	From the park personnel. Communities.	Expectation of incentives by LAC members for selves, beyond stipend, but also for their communities.
Benefit capture	1) Strengthen local governance system through holistic approach. 2) Effective representation on LAC.	B	CRNP.	Benefit capture by both the park elites and community members.
Recommendations related to this PAM:	Summarise risks for this PAM	Constitution of the LAC, if not representative of whole community (families), is likely to lead to conflicts or disagreements within the communities, and may jeopardise the work of the LAC. LAC may also result in unrealistic expectations of financial incentives and in benefit capture by powerful members of the LAC/Park.		
	Summarise benefits for this PAM	The LAC can promote participatory park management to improve community relationship for conflict resolution, and can enhance economic benefits to park stakeholders.		
	Key recommendations on enhancing benefits / reducing risks	<p>Inform improved design of PAM: To ensure an improved relationship between the Park and communities, the LAC needs to fulfil its responsibility in communicating with communities and linking the objectives of the Park and communities. There should be frequent collaboration between communities and park in decision-making. To reduce impacts of conflicts, adopt more transparent way of conflict resolution between Park management and community stakeholders, and empower LAC members to resolve conflict at community level. Also recommend a formulation of park policy with clear and realistic expected benefits/advantages for the committee, and clarified expectations for communities, linked to a communications strategy. It is also recommended to promote eco-tourism through public-private partnership and to provide capacity development to LAC members (based on community needs assessment). Review the MoU/agreement between Park and LAC, and ToR for LAC members to ensure roles, responsibilities, etc, are clear. The LAC also needs to well-briefed. Membership of LAC should be qualified and rotational to address issues related to conflicts in the community and benefit capture.</p>		
		<p>Improve wider governance arrangements: This PAM is closely linked to the other CRNP PAMs, which should be well-coordinated. The community development management plan plays a role in the relationship between Park, LAC and communities; leverage support from development partners to support it. As with other PAMs, provide a supportive framework to strengthen local governance system through holistic approach. The Park also needs to take steps to correct past inaccurate impressions about expectations/development plans for communities. This should involve awareness creation and provision of incentives to communities within and outside the park.</p>		

