

**Ministry of Agriculture and Rural
Development**

FCPF Emission Reduction Program Vietnam

Ethnic Minority Planning Framework

October, 2018

FCPF

Room 403, 4th floor, 14 Thuy Khue Street Tha Ho District Hanoi Vietnam

Tel +84 4 3728 6495 Fax +84 4 3728 6496

www.Vietnam-redd.org

Contents Amendment Record

This report has been issued and amended as follows:

| Issue | Revision | Description | Date | Approved by |
|-------|----------|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|
| 1 | Ver. 0 | 1 st Draft | August | |
| 2 | Ver. 1 | Draft | August | |
| 3 | Ver. 1.1 | Draft | Oct/ Nov 17 | |
| 4 | Ver 1.2 | Draft | Mar 18 | |
| 5 | Ver 1.3 | Review for QES | Oct 19 | |

| Acronyms and Abbreviation | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| ACMA | Adaptive collaborative management approach |
| BAU | Business-as-Usual |
| BCS | Broad community support |
| BSA | Benefit Sharing Arrangements |
| BSM | Benefit Sharing Mechanism |
| BSP | Benefit Sharing Plan |
| CEMA | Committee for Ethnic Minority Affairs |
| CF | Carbon Fund |
| CFM | Community Forest Management |
| CLIP | Community Livelihoods Improvement Program |
| CPC | Commune Peoples Committee |
| CPMU | Central Project Management Unit |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation |
| DARD | Dept. of Agriculture and Rural Development (at the Province) |
| DLA | Department of Legal Affairs of MONRE |
| DPC | District Peoples Committee |
| EM | Ethnic minority/ indigenous peoples |
| EMG | Ethnic minority group |
| ER | Emission Reduction |
| ER-P | Emission Reduction Program (area) |
| ER-PD | Emissions Reduction Programme Document |
| ESIA | Environmental and Social Impact Assessment |
| ESMF | Environmental Social Management Framework |

| | Acronyms and Abbreviation |
|--------|--|
| FCPF | Forest Carbon Partnership Facility |
| FGRM | Feedback Grievance Redress Mechanisms |
| FLA | Forest Land Allocation |
| FLEGT | Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade |
| FMC | Forest Management Council |
| FME | Forest Management Entities (SUFMBs, PFMBs and SFCs) |
| FPD | Forest Protection Department |
| FSC | Forest Stewardship Certification |
| FSDP | Forest Sector Development Project |
| GAD | Gender and Development |
| GMG | Grassroots Mediation Groups |
| GOV | Government of Vietnam |
| GRM | Grievance redress mechanisms |
| GSO | General Statistics Office |
| HHs | Households |
| HPP | Hydro Power Project |
| LUP | Land use planning |
| LURC | Land Use Right Certificate (“Red Book” in Vietnam) |
| MB | Management Board |
| MBFP | Management Board of Forestry Projects |
| MDRI | Mekong Development Research Institute |
| MOLISA | Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs |
| MONRE | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment |
| MPI | Ministry of Planning and Investment |
| MRV | Measurement reporting and verification system |
| NCB | Non-Carbon Benefits |
| NCC | North Central Coast region of Vietnam i.e. the ER-P region |
| NFIMAP | National Forest Inventory, Monitoring and Assessment Program |
| NP | National Park |
| NR | Nature Reserve |
| NRAP | National REDD Action Plan |
| NTFP | Non-timber forest products |
| PA | Protected areas |
| PFMB | Protection Forest Management Board |
| PPMU | Provincial Project Management Unit |
| PRAP | Provincial REDD+ Action Plan |
| RL/REL | (Forest) Reference Level; Reference Emission Level |
| RNA | REDD+ Needs Assessment |
| SEDP | Socio-Economic Development Plan |
| SERNA | Social and environmental REDD+ needs assessment |
| SESA | Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment |
| SFC | State forest company |
| SFM | Sustainable Forest Management |
| SOE | State owned enterprise |
| SSR | Social Screening Report |
| SUF | Special Use Forest |
| TORs | Terms of reference |
| TSHPP | Trung Son Hydropower Project |
| TWG | Technical working group |
| UXO | Unexploded ordinance |

| Acronyms and Abbreviation | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| VBARD | Vietnam Bank of Agriculture and Rural Development |
| VBSP | Vietnam Bank of Social Policies |
| VFD | Vietnam Forest and Delta Project (funded by USAID) |
| VNForest | Vietnam Forest Administration |
| VRO | Vietnam REDD Office |
| VWU | Vietnam Women's Union |
| WB | World Bank |
| | Weights and Measures m = meters; ha = hectares |
| | Currency M = million; k = thousand Currency Unit = US\$ Dollar US\$1 = VND 22,000 |

Executive Summary

This Draft EMPF has been prepared in accordance with the World Bank's OP4.10 relating to Indigenous Peoples (in the context of Vietnam reference is made to Ethnic Minorities but the same safeguard policy is applicable irrespective of the term utilized). The ER-P will impact on ethnic minority peoples living in the targeted areas of the ER-P Provinces (six coastal provinces of Northern Central Coastal Vietnam) because the geographic focus is the forested areas of the midlands and uplands of these provinces where most ethnic minority peoples are to be found.

The objective of the ER-P is to reduce carbon emissions and ethnic minority people who live in and around the Forest Management Entities (Protection Forest Management Boards, Special Use Forests and State Forest Companies) have an important role to play in contributing to a reduction in carbon emissions because they are dependent on forest resources (defined not just as natural forests but also production forests) to a much larger extent than the major ethnic group (the Kinh), especially for the harvesting of Non-Timber Forest Products. Ethnic minority people also rely on the forests for watershed protection and socially and culturally the forests are symbolically more important to ethnic minority peoples than to the Kinh.

To ensure that ethnic minority groups can play this important role, receive both carbon and non-carbon benefits, the EMPF outlines how processes associated with the establishment of a collaborative approach to forest management, known as the Adaptive

Collaborative Management Approach (ACMA) is central to the successful implementation of the ER-P. To ensure that ER-P impacted forest-dependent ethnic minority peoples can participate in the ACMA a participatory Socio-Economic and Environmental REDD+ Needs Assessment (SERNA) will be facilitated. This will quantify the existing uses and misuses of the forests by local communities with a focus on hotspot villages. As part of the process of establishing the ACMAs two village representatives will be elected by other villagers agreeing to participate in the ACMA.

This is a potential “game changer” for ethnic minority peoples living in the ER-P impacted areas of the six NCC provinces because for the first time they will be able to communicate directly with the Forest Management Entities and assist in deciding what activities should be undertaken. The EMPF is designed to ensure that the ACMAs include ethnic minority women and there are greater possibilities for poorer and more vulnerable ethnic minority people to have their voices heard. The ACMA will also be the platform for any benefit sharing arrangements associated with ER-P including equitable and transparent access to and use of forest resources, economically realistic forest protection contracts, and small grants to reduce the poverty of ethnic minority households involve in non-sustainable uses of the forests. Explicitly embedded in this EMPF is the notion that the ER-P should result in the greater empowerment of ethnic minority women and men.

The EMPF outlines the range of non-carbon benefits that should accrue as a result of the ER-P and they include a range of socio-economic, environmental and governance benefits: maintenance of sustainable livelihoods, cultural identity and community cohesiveness; Improved access to cultural services and strengthening of traditional knowledge resources; valuation for forest resources, including and especially NTFPs using socio-cultural accounting methods rather than simply conventional resource economic methods; modest income generation and employment opportunities; promotion of climate smart agriculture; conservation and protection of biodiversity; protection and proliferation of medicinal plants and curative practices; water use regulation and watershed management; strengthening of village level socially inclusive governance; improved forest governance and management; and, participatory land use planning.

However, it is also recognized that there might be some negative impacts, such as when ACMAs decide to restrict land use for specific purposes (e.g. reforestation of degraded forest land used for the cultivation of cassava by many ethnic minority households), which will need to be addressed. The EMPF identifies the linkages with the RPF and how such negative impacts can be mitigated. The same applies to when actions designed to maximize carbon emissions reduction (e.g. increasing the harvesting cycle of

production forestry) and the EMPF addresses the actions that will mitigate such negative impacts. It can also be stressed that once more reference needs to be made to the very important role of the ACMA in the ER-P.

As with any EMPF cultural and social issues specific to different ethnic minority groups are also addressed. The EMPF requires that consultations be undertaken in the language a specific ethnic minority group feels comfortable in using. The EMPF also requires that all information specific to the ER-P and the impacts on the lives of ethnic minority people be disseminated in ways that are considered culturally appropriate and effective. The EMPF also identifies how the ER-P via the ACMAs can facilitate social learning approaches where the accumulated knowledge of and understanding of the forests by ethnic minority people is valued by forest owners and managers and penultimately by the Government at the national level.

The EMPF introduces a Feedback Grievance Redress Mechanism based on the recommendation of UN-REDD+ that should go a long way to complying with UNFCCC and CF requirements vis-à-vis FGRM. It is proposed that Grassroots Mediation Groups (GMGs) be established but the EMPF identifies the need for mechanisms to ensure that hitherto excluded groups (women and poorer and more vulnerable groups) be accorded a greater voice in the GRMs than they have at present. The EMPF also notes that existing “GRMs” based on traditional cultural practices that are not “formal” to the extent that for instance, a written Registry of Grievances (to be referred to as the Mediation Monitoring Registry) is not maintained although resolutions disclosed on a village-wide basis primarily via meetings at in the Village Cultural House where one exists, including those practices that have been modified in recent times to take account of changes to access to and use of forests and other natural resources be retained. The ER-P will contribute to an improvement in transparency by preparing a written Registry of Grievances (which includes the names of villagers lodging the grievance, the date the grievance was lodged, a summary of the grievance, feedback from the GRM entity, description of actions undertaken to resolve the grievance, the date an agreement was reached, and if not, what was the next course of action, and the signature or thumbprint of all parties).

The EMPF outlines the institutional processes necessary for the implementation of the EMPF from the national level (CPMU) to the provincial level (PPMU) and then to the ACMA level, with the latter of course driving the EMPF based on decisions reached by its members. An EMDP will be developed to mitigate any risks associated with the implementation of the program. The EMPF provides guidance as to the steps that will be necessary More specific detail on how to prepare an EMDP is included in the

Annexes of this EMPF. The EMPF makes it clear that the use of terminology associated with “projects” and “sub-projects” is misleading in the context of the ER-P because the emphasis is on activities associated with interventions as decided by the ACMA. The Appendix also includes details of consultations facilitated by FCPF-REDD+ to be used to influence the specific design of this EMPF.

Finally, the preliminary costs of implementation of the ER program interventions are estimated to total US\$312.84 million of which US\$43.4 million for activities that will specifically target for the most part upland ethnic minority groups.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Introduction | 11 |
| 1.1 | <i>Program overview</i> | 11 |
| 1.2 | <i>The Program objectives</i> | 11 |
| 1.3 | <i>The four Components of the Emission Reduction-Program</i> | 11 |
| 1.4 | <i>Ethnic minority people in the ER-Program area</i> | 13 |
| 1.5 | <i>Objective of the EMPF</i> | 17 |
| 2 | Legal and policy framework | 19 |
| 2.1 | <i>National legal and policy framework for ethnic minority peoples</i> | 19 |
| 2.2 | <i>World Bank's Operational Policy on Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10)</i> | 21 |
| 3 | Potential impacts of the ER-P | 24 |
| 3.1 | <i>Overview</i> | 24 |
| 3.2 | <i>Positive impacts</i> | 28 |
| 3.3 | <i>Negative impacts</i> | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4 | Consultation and information disclosure | 35 |
| 4.1 | <i>Consultation and information disclosure</i> | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4.2 | <i>Preparation prior to conducting free, prior, and informed (FPIC) consultation</i> | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4.3 | <i>Conducting free, prior, and informed consultation (FPIC)</i> | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4.4 | <i>Broad Community Support (BCS)</i> | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4.5 | <i>Information disclosure</i> | 37 |
| 5 | Grievance mechanisms | 38 |
| 5.1 | <i>Overview</i> | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 6 | Monitoring and Evaluation | 39 |
| 6.1 | <i>Overview</i> | 39 |
| 6.2 | <i>Internal monitoring</i> | 39 |
| 6.3 | <i>External monitoring</i> | 39 |
| 7 | Guidelines for the EMDP | 41 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 7.1 | <i>EM screening</i> | 41 |
| 7.2 | <i>Social assessment</i> | 41 |
| 7.3 | <i>The requirement for the preparation of an EMDP</i> | 43 |
| 7.4 | <i>Procedure for review and approval of an EMDP</i> | 43 |
| 7.5 | <i>Implementation of an EMDP</i> | 44 |
| 8 | Costs and budget | 45 |
| 9 | Annexes | 46 |
| 9.1 | <i>Annex 1- Summary of Main Issues Related to ER-P and Ethnic Minorities</i> | 46 |
| 9.2 | <i>Summary of Consultations with PPCs, DPCs, and CPCs</i> | 52 |
| 9.3 | <i>Annex 2 - Outline and Elements of an EMDP</i> | 66 |
| 9.4 | <i>Annex 3 The Adaptive Collaborative Management Approaches (ACMA) and social inclusion of ethnic minority groups</i> | 68 |

Tables

| | | |
|-----------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Table 1.1 | The ER-Program area, population and growth rates | 14 |
| Table 1.2 | Ethnic minority population data by group and ER-P province (Persons) | 14 |
| Table 1.3 | Correlation between high forest area and ethnic minority populations..... | 17 |
| Table 2.1 | Legal documents relating to ethnic minorities | 20 |
| Table 3.1 | Positive and Negative Social and Environmental Impacts | Error! Bookmark not defined. |

1 Introduction

1.1 *Program overview*

The World Bank through the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) is assisting Vietnam with financial and technical support focused on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, forest carbon stock conservation, the sustainable management of forests, and the enhancement of forest carbon stocks (activities commonly referred to as REDD+). Assistance from the FCPF is provided through the Readiness Fund, which supports participating countries in the development of REDD+ strategies and policies, reference emission levels, measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) systems and institutional capacity to manage REDD+ including environmental and social safeguards.

As part of the REDD+ Readiness Preparation process, the FCPF Readiness Grant in Vietnam requires a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA). The SESA is a tool which is designed: to ensure that environmental and social concerns are integrated into the development and implementation processes for the National REDD+ Action Plan (NRAP)¹ and the Provincial REDD+ Action Plans (PRAPs); offer a platform for consultation with and participation of relevant stakeholders to integrate social and environmental concerns into the decision-making process related to REDD+; and to enhance the country's NRAP and PRAPs by making recommendations to address gaps in relevant policy and legal frameworks, and institutional capacity to manage environmental and social impacts/risks associated with REDD+.

1.2 *The Program objectives*

The development objective of the ER-P is to support REDD+ in Vietnam to have an effective system for REDD+ implementation that contributes to sustainable forest management, green economic growth and poverty reduction, and helping to mitigate climate change at regional and global levels.

1.3 *The four Components of the Emission Reduction-Program*

The specific objective is to contribute to successful implementation of the Emission Reduction Program (ER-P) in the six Northern Central Coastal Provinces of Vietnam but the ER-P does not include all forested areas in these provinces but rather the 69 Forest Management Entities (PFMBs, SUFs and SFCs). The reason for this as explained in Section 4 of the Emissions Reduction Program Document (ER-PD) to be submitted to the Carbon Fund in December 2017 is that within the human, financial and logistical constraints of the ER-P more significant impacts are likely to be achieved by focusing only on areas where Business-as-Usual (BAU) scenarios can be transformed.

The proposed Emission Reduction Program (ER-P) continues from the World Bank (WB) project that was approved by the Minister of Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development

¹ Decision 799/QĐ-TTg, 27/6/2012 approved the National REDD Action Plan (NRAP).

at Decision No.58/QD-BNN-HTQT on 10th January 2013. Vietnam Administration of Forestry (VNFOREST) is assigned to be the Project Owner and responsible for the Project. The ER-P is expected to project last for six years (2018-2024).

REDD+ is an initiative to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect global climate system through forest development and protection, utilization and sustainable management of forests in developing countries with technical and financial supports of international community. The COP16 decision No. 1/CP16 (the Cancun Agreement) of the Conference of Parties of United Nations Framework Convention to Climate Change (UNFCCC) identifies five key activities: i) reducing emissions from deforestation, ii) reducing emissions from forest degradation, iii) conservation of forest carbon stocks; iv) sustainable management of forests and v) enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

In Vietnam, REDD+ implementation is fully consistent with Government's policies on responding to climate change, on green growth. It is expected that REDD+ will create new financial resources, contributing to forest development and protection, increase in value of forests and socio-economic development. Furthermore, REDD+ preparation and implementation shows willingness of Vietnam to join hands with the international community to protect global climate system.

The development objective of the ER-P is to support REDD+ in Vietnam to have an effective system for REDD+ implementation that contributes to sustainable forest management, green economic growth and poverty reduction, and helping to mitigate climate change at regional and global levels. This will be achieved through four components:

Component 1: Strengthening of the Enabling Conditions for Emission Reductions. This component is designed to support improved conservation of natural forest and strengthen sustainable forest management and the expected outcomes are better policy guidelines, coordination mechanisms and enhanced forest governance for minimizing the conversion of natural forests to rubber and infrastructure development (primarily energy and transport projects). The activities proposed for the two sub-components are as follows: 1) adopt a legal framework to control the conversion of natural forests to rubber and infrastructure development; 2) enhance cross-sector coordination at central and provincial levels between the National Program on Sustainable Forestry Development and REDD+; 3) develop regulations to enable information on conversion of natural forests and improve public access to environmental impact assessments on proposed conversion; 4) improved protection for FMEs through collaborative approaches involving all stakeholders and including especially local forest-dependent communities via systemic dissemination of relevant legal decrees and guidelines; identification of hotspots and implementation of the ACMA approach via proposed Forest Management Councils (FMC); 5) use of improved technology to monitor forest conversion activities by NGOs/CSOs, FMEs and local communities; and 6) cross-border collaboration with the Lao PDR to prevent illegal logging and export thereof.

Component 2: Promoting the Sustainable Management of Forests and Carbon Stock Enhancement. This component is designed to reduce deforestation and enhance forest carbon stock and the expected outcomes are the improved management of natural forests, increased forest cover and enhanced productivity and values of planned forest in the ER-P area. The activities proposed for the three sub-components are largely based on the adoption of the ACMA approach and include: 1) resolution of conflicts between FMEs and local forest-dependent communities; 2) forest protection contracts, benefit sharing and clarification of user rights over forest resources; 3) allocation of natural protection forest managed by CPCs to local communities and/or groups within these local communities 4) improved forest management

plans to develop supply chains leading to higher value production forests through longer rotations and higher value timber species for harvesting; and 5) reforestation of coastal protection forests (mangroves and other tree species suitable for coastal dune protection, minimization of coastal erosion and protection from storm damage)² and protected and special use forests in the upland and mountainous areas of the ER-P area.

Component 3: Promotion of Climate Smart Agriculture and Sustainable Livelihoods for Forest-Dependent People. This component is designed to provide support for climate smart agriculture and improvements to sustainable livelihoods and the expected outcomes are improved climate resilience agricultural practices and livelihoods for forest-dependent people in the ER-P area. The activities proposed for the two sub-components include: 1) scaling up of successful climate-smart agricultural practices, financial access to revolving funds in the VBSP and VBARD and technical support; 2) identification of deforestation free production models, extension outreach to improve the value of crops such as cassava and other food crops, and support producers organizations in the different supply chains; 3) identification of and support for the harvesting of NTFPs with high value added potential; and 4) provide incentives for off-farm based income generation activities.

Component 4: Program Management and Emissions Monitoring. The expected outcome from this component is the coordinated management of the ER-P in such a way that an enhanced capacity for managing the results based performance is both accountable and transparent. The activities proposed for the three sub-components include: 1) management and coordination of the ER-P implementation across all levels; 2) provision of operational costs for implementation; 3) development of an effective M&E system, robust data collection and compliance with social and environmental safeguards; 4) development of MRV that includes data collection modalities and training; 5) preparation of required reports on a semi-annual and annual basis; and 6) facilitation of meetings, workshops, and presentations to share knowledge gained during the implementation of the ER-P.

Total costs for the Program are estimated to be USD312.84 million (USD6.84 million for Component 1; USD240.4 million for Component 2; USD60.9 million for Component 3 and USD4.7 million for Component 4). Program management and implementation costs for the central, province and district level are included as are costs associated with the establishment of Forest Management Councils based on the established forest management entities (Protection Forest Management Boards, Special Use Forest Management Boards and State Forest Companies) and local forest-dependent communities living in the buffer zones of these entities.

1.4 Ethnic minority people in the ER-Program area

At present, the Government of Vietnam's Census states there are 54 different ethnic groups. . The ER-P area is home to some 13 of them, including the Kinh.³ The largest EM populations are found in the two northern provinces of Thanh Hoa and Nghe An. According to the last

² Reference is made here to the World Bank financed *Forest Sector Modernization and Coastal Resilience Enhancement Project* that was approved in June 2017. The project communes for this project were excluded from the SESA in 2015 for the following reasons: 1) Systemically high incidence of land disputes; 2) Very poor-quality forests; 3) Poor soil quality; 4) Lack of water; 5) Slow growth rates and poor survival rates of existing species; 6) Presence of UXOs; and 7) Probability of very high costs. The decision to exclude the lowland coastal areas of the ER-P provinces was agreed upon in discussions between the GoV and WB and this decision has been adequately documented.

³ In the course of its investigations the SESA team found out about several groups not listed in the Census: Dan Lai, Pa Co and Pa Hy.

population census,⁴ these two northern provinces are home to 88% of the ER-P ethnic population.⁵ The predominant groups in all six provinces by population are Thai (45%), Muong (29%), Bru-Van Kieu (6%), Tho (6%), Hmong (4%), Ta Oi (4%) and Kho Mu (3%). The other groups present in the area (Co Tu and Chut in the South, Dao and O'Du in the North) have a still smaller share of the EM population. Only the Thai and Muong have populations over 100,000 persons. In Vietnam, as a whole, the 53 EM groups comprise about 14% of the population. In the six ER-P provinces, the EM groups form some 11.5% of the total population of over 10 million in 2017. (See Table 1.1)

In ethno-linguistic terms, the Muong and Tho belong to the Viet-Muong group (along with the Kinh), Bru-Van Kieu and Ta Oi belong to the Mon-Khmer groups, the Thai are in the Tai-Kadai, the Hmong in the Hmong – Lu Mien, while the Kho Mu (also spelled Khmu) belong to the Austro-Asiatic (or Khmuic) ethno-linguistic group. Presented below is Table 1.2 based on the population census published by the General Statistics Office (GSO) in 2009. While the numbers would have increased, it is unlikely that the proportions would have changed much on a provincial basis (there do not appear to have been any large, inter-provincial movements of people affecting the ER-P area unlike, for instance, in the Central Highlands Region of Vietnam where there has been a large in-migration of both ethnic minority groups from Northern Vietnam and Kinh people).

Table 1.1 The ER-Program area, population and growth rates

| ER Province | Area (km ²) | % of area | Population 2013 | % of population | Average annual growth rate % |
|----------------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| Thanh Hoa | 1,1130.5 | 21.6 | 3,476,600 | 33.8 | 0.33 |
| Nghe An | 16,492.7 | 32.1 | 2,978,700 | 28.9 | 0.38 |
| Ha Tinh | 5,997.3 | 11.1 | 1,242,400 | 12.1 | 0.12 |
| Quang Binh | 8,065.3 | 15.7 | 863,400 | 8.4 | 0.39 |
| Quang Tri | 4,739.8 | 9.2 | 612,500 | 5.9 | 0.44 |
| Thua Thien Hue | 5,033.2 | 9.8 | 1,123,800 | 10.9 | 0.59 |
| Total | 51,458.8 | | 10,297,700 | | 0.36 |
| | (5,145,800 ha) | | | | |

Source of data is General Statistics Office (GSO) 2013.

Table 1.2 Ethnic minority population data by group and ER-P province (Persons)

| Ethnic Group | Province | | | | | | Total |
|--------------|-----------|---------|---------|------------|-----------|----------|---------------|
| | Thanh Hoa | Nghe An | Ha Tinh | Quang Binh | Quang Tri | TT Hue | |
| Thai | 225,336 | 295,132 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 520,968 |
| Muong | 341,359 | | 549 | | | | 549 |
| Bru-Van Kieu | | | | 14,631 | 55,079 | 720 | 70,430 |
| Tho | 9,652 | 59,579 | | | | 0 | 0 |
| Hmong | 14,799 | 28,992 | | | | 0 | 0 |
| Ta Oi | | | | | 13,961* | 33,385** | 47,346 |
| Kho Mu | 781 | 35,670 | | | | 0 | 0 |

⁴ A new census of ethnic minority populations was carried out in 2015, but the official results as of late October 2018 are not yet available

⁵ In Nghe A there are, additionally, very small groups such as Phong and Dan Lai that have not been recognised in the 2009 Census. There is a group called Pa Co in the South (TT Hue and Quang Tri) that also does not have separate recognition and is generally classified under Ta Oi. The Pa Co and Ta Oi consider themselves to be somewhat culturally different to one another but often in practice they do not explain what these differences are and many non-Pa Co or Ta Oi simply assume they are one and the same ethno-linguistic group.

| Ethnic Group | Province | | | | | | Total |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|---------------|
| | Thanh Hoa | Nghe An | Ha Tinh | Quang Binh | Quang Tri | TT Hue | |
| Co Tu | | | | | | 13,812 | 13,812 |
| Dao | 5,465 | | | | | 0 | 5,465 |
| Chut | | | | 5,095 | | 0 | 5,095 |
| Tay | 795 | | | | | 0 | 795 |
| Lao | | | 433 | | | 0 | 433 |
| O'Du | | 340 | | | | 0 | 340 |
| Other | | | | | | 651^ | 651 |
| Total EM Population | 795 | 340 | 433 | 5,095 | 55,079 | 13,812 | 665,884 |
| % EM to Total by Province | 17.6 | 14.4 | 0.1 | 2.3 | 11.5 | 4.4 | 11.5 |

Table Notes: Source is GSO Census Data 2009 for all provinces except TT Hue where the data are from the provincial CEMA, 2015 (unofficial): *The Ta-Oi in Quang Tri are almost all Pa Co according to CEMA. **Ta-Oi in TT Hue includes Pa Co (21,138); ^Pa Hy, another group not recognized by the Census 2009. According to CEMA Quang Tri, the ethnic minority population there has gone up to 76,951 Van Kieu and Pa Co people, but the total population of the province was not given.

In the ER-P area the ethnic minority groups are found in the largely mountainous districts and communes that also have higher percentages of land classified as forest. The partial exception to this is Thanh Hoa Province where, with its large Muong and Thai populations (essentially paddy cultivators often occupying the midlands rather than highlands); there, the EM people are not highly concentrated in a very few districts or even in just a few communes of a few districts (as is the case in Quang Binh, parts of Quang Tri and Thua Tien Hue).

Table 1.3 below shows the high correlation between forest cover and presence of EMs. In the four provinces where there are few ethnic minority people compared to the total provincial population, they are concentrated in the two to three districts per province with the highest forest cover. Despite their overall low to very low (Ha Tinh especially) populations in the four southern provinces of the ER-P area, they still form a majority of the population in several target districts, and are represented to a greater degree in several higher forest districts compared to the province as a whole.

To illustrate the different upland livelihood systems in the ER-P provinces FCPF undertook a study of the least marginalized ethnic minority group, the Thai, and the most marginalized ethnic minority group, the Hmong. Between 300 and 600 meters above sea level some Hmong villagers can be found using steep, rocky slopes, with a high degree of water scarcity. They grow one crop per annum of maize and upland rice and beans or pumpkins after maize harvesting. They also have fruit trees in their home gardens and raise pigs. The Thai villagers at the same elevation generally have flat lands where they grow one crop of maize, paddy and upland rice, sugar cane, cassava, beans inter-cropped with maize and cassava and have home fruit gardens where they grow fruits like longan, plum and mango. They also raise buffalo, cows, pigs and poultry.

Where there is some agroforestry it is primarily either hybrid acacia or hybrid eucalyptus but at present in a short rotation production cycle. In elevations above 800 meters there are no ethnic Thai to be found or other ethnic minority groups with the exception of the Hmong. In some villages with moderate slopes they can grow terraced rice two times per year, intercrop maize with pumpkins, grow cassava, pine and *son tra* trees but in villages with steep sloping land and natural forest surrounding the village they grow maize, upland rice, local cassava, scattered fruit trees and *Amomum* under the forest canopy. Both Hmong villages raise pigs. Ethnic Thai

women are far more likely to be involved both in agroforestry and harvesting of NTFPs than
Among women.

Table 1.3 Correlation between High Forest Area and Ethnic Minority Populations

| Province ⁶ | 20 Highest Forest Area Districts in the ER-P Provinces | Total HHs No. | Total Kinh HHs No. | Total EM HHs No. | EM HHs to Total District Population % |
|-----------------------|--|----------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Thanh Hoa | Quan Hoa/30a | 10,000 | 800 | 9,200 | 92 |
| | Quan Son/30a | 7,373 | 392 | 6,981 | 95 |
| | Thuong Xuan/30a | 19,075 | 7,504 | 11,571 | 61 |
| Nghe An | Tuong Duong/30a | 17,246 | 1,679 | 15,567 | 90 |
| | Con Cuong | 17,406 | 4,351 | 13,054 | 75 |
| | Que Phong/30a | 15,321 | 1,662 | 13,659 | 89 |
| | Ky Son/30a | 15,200 | 765 | 14,435 | 95 |
| | Quy Chau | 14,309 | 3,596 | 10,713 | 75 |
| Ha Tinh | Huong Khe | 25,033 | 24,813 | 220 | -- |
| | Huong Son | 30,006 | 29,882 | 124 | -- |
| | Ky Anh | 46,807 | 46,766 | 41 | -- |
| Quang Binh | Bo Trach | 38,620 | 38,071 | 549 | 1.4 |
| | Minh Hoa/30a | 9,940 | 8,073 | 1,867 | 19 |
| | Le Thuy | 33,495 | 32,389 | 1,106 | 3.3 |
| Quang Tri | Dak Rong/30a | 9,023 | 2,195 | 6,828 | 76 |
| | Huong Hoa | 13,462 | 3,484 | 9,978 | 74 |
| | Vinh Linh | 17,957 | 17,361 | 596 | 3.3 |
| TT. Hue | A Luoi | 11,888 | 2,783 | 9,105 | 77 |
| | Phong Dien | 25,565 | 25,414 | 151 | -- |
| | Nam Dong | 6,015 | 3,459 | 2,556 | 42 |
| Grand Total | | 383,741 | 255,439 | 128,301 | 33% |

Table Notes: This table has multiple sources for the data, so it should be taken as indicative of trends only. District-wise forest areas to determine districts with most forest land were taken from the Provincial Statistical Yearbooks 2014. Population data are either from the provinces visited in 2015, or gleaned from the Agricultural Census (2011) commune level data base.

1.5 Objective of the EMPF

This EMPF is developed in accordance to OP 410. The main objective of the EMPF is to ensure that the development process fosters full respect for their dignity, human rights, cultural uniqueness and that ethnic minorities do not suffer adverse impact during the development process and they will receive culturally – compatible social and economic benefit.

The EMPF provides a framework for not only mitigate negative impacts, but ensure the EMs will benefit from the Project. This EMPF is also based on the free, prior informed consultations with affected ethnic minority people. The EMPF ensures:

(a) How to avoid potential adverse impacted ethnic minority communities; or

⁶ For the sake of consistency these data are taken from the six provincial Statistical Yearbooks 2014. The area is only that defined as “forest land,” without any implication of actual forest cover or its quality.

(b) When potentially adverse impact on ethnic minority people are unavoidable, be minimized and mitigated or compensated; and

(c) Ensure that EMs receive social and economic benefits in a culturally appropriate manner that are inclusive in both gender and intergenerational terms, and obtain broad community support for the proposed sub – project.

This EMPF was prepared on the basis of a) Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA); b) social assessment conducted for the pilot provinces; c) consultation with ethnic minorities groups present in the Program areas; and d) consultation with key Program stakeholders, including Provincial Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, Protection Forest Management Boards, District Forest Protection Department, the Provincial and District Department for Ethnic Minority Affairs. District/Commune Women Unions.

2 Legal and policy framework

2.1 *National legal and policy framework for ethnic minority peoples*

Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (2013) recognized the equality between ethnic groups in Vietnam. Article 5 of the Constitution states:

- (i) Socialist Republic of Vietnam is the unified state of all nationalities living in the country of Vietnam.
- (ii) The nationalities equal, unite, respect and help each other to develop; prohibits any discrimination, ethnic division.
- (iii) The national language is Vietnamese. The nation has the right to use voice, text, preserving the national identity, promoting traditions, customs, traditions and culture.
- (iv) The State implements a comprehensive development policy and creates reasonable conditions for the ethnic minorities to mobilize resources, along with the development of the country.

The Government of Vietnam has developed a series of policies to develop, enhance socioeconomic condition of ethnic minorities in the mountainous and remote regions. After the program 134 and phase 1 and phase 2 of the program 135 the government has launched phase 3 of program 135 to enhance socio-economic development in poor communes located in mountainous areas or areas inhabited by ethnic minorities. Besides the overall development program for ethnic minorities, the Government assigned the Committee for Ethnic Minorities Affairs to guide provinces to prepare projects Development Assistance for ethnic groups with less than 1,000 people, i.e. Si La, Pu Peo, Ro Mam, Brau, O Du. The government also conducted Rapid and Sustainable Pro-Poor Program in 61 poor districts, where many ethnic minorities live.

The Prime Minister promulgated the Decree No. 84/2012/ND-CP by dated 12 October, 2012 on the functions, tasks, powers and organizational structure of the Committee for Ethnic Minorities Affairs (CEMA). The Decree stipulated that the CEMA, a ministerial government, performs the function of state management of ethnic affairs in the country; state management of public services under the jurisdiction of CEMA as stipulated by law. Along with Decree 05/2011/NDCP dated 14 January, 2011 on the work of EM, Decree 84/2012/ND-CP was issued as a legal basis for CEMA to continue concretizing guidelines and policies of the State on ethnic minorities in the period of industrialization and modernization; promote the power to unite the whole nation for the target rich people, strong country, social justice, democracy and civilization, in order to ensure and promote equality, solidarity, respect, help each other to develop and preserve the cultural identity of the peoples in the great family of ethnic groups of Vietnam.

The documents of the Government on the basis of democracy and the participation of local people are directly related to this EMPF. Ordinance No. 34/2007/PL-UBTVQH11, dated 20 April, 2007 (replaced for Decree 79/2003/ND-CP dated 07 July, 2003) on the implementation of democracy in communes, wards, and town provides the basis for community involvement in the preparation of development plans and supervision of community in Vietnam. Decision No. 80/2005/QD-TTg by the Prime Minister, dated 18 April, 2005 regulates the monitoring of community investments. Legal Education Program of CEMA (2013 - 2016) aims to improve

the quality and effectiveness of legal education, awareness raising on self-discipline, respect, strictly abiding law of officials and public servants, the employees of the organizations for EMs.

Development of socio-economic policies for each region and target group should consider the needs of ethnic minorities. Socio-economic development plan and strategy of Vietnam call for special attention to ethnic minorities. Policies on education and health care for ethnic minorities have also been issued. The legal framework was updated in 2014, all legal documents related to EM are shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Legal documents relating to ethnic minority

| Year | Name and type of legal instrument |
|-------------|--|
| 2013 | Land Law No.45/2013/QH13 dated November 29 th 2013 National Congress of Vietnam. This law is the sole legal instrument for recognizing the right of land users in Vietnam to be issued with a Land User Rights Certificate. Protection forest land or special use forestland cannot be legalizable for such purposes and the Law does not recognize customary land. |
| 2013 | Decision No. 29/2013/QĐ-TTg dated 20 May, 2013 by the Prime Minister on some policies for supporting land and occupation for poor ethnic minorities with difficult life in Mekong Delta in period of 2013 – 2015. |
| 2013 | Decision No. 449/QĐ-TTg dated 12 March, 2013 by the Prime Minister on approving the ethnic minorities strategy until 2020. |
| 2013 | Decision No. 2356/QĐ-TTg dated 4 December, 2013 of the Prime Minister on promulgating the action plan for implementation of the ethnic minorities' strategy until 2020. |
| 2013 | Joint Circular No. 05/2013-TTLT-CEM-ARD-MPI-TC-XD dated on November 18, 2013 guideline of program 135 on support infrastructure investment, production development for extremely difficult communes, border communes, particularly difficult villages. |
| 2013 | Joint Circular No. 05/2013-TTLT-CEM-ARD-MPI-TC-XD dated on November 18, 2013 guideline of program 135 on support infrastructure investment, production development for extremely difficult communes, border communes, particularly difficult villages. |
| 2012 | Decision No. 54/2012-QĐ-TTg of the Prime Minister dated on December 04, 2012 on promulgation of lending policy for development for particularly difficult ethnic minorities in period 2012-2015. |
| 2012 | Decree No. 84/2012 / ND-CP of the Government dated on December 10, 2012 on functions, tasks, powers and organizational structure of the Committee for Ethnic Minorities also known in the past as the Committee for Ethnic Minority Affairs. |
| 2102 | Joint Circular No. 01/2012 / TTLT-BTP-CEM date on January 17, 1012 of the Ministry of Justice and the Committee for Ethnic Minorities on guideline and legal assistance for ethnic minorities. |
| 2011 | Decree No. 05/2011 / ND-CP of the Government dated on January 14, 2011 on ethnic minorities affairs. |

| Year | Name and type of legal instrument |
|-------------|---|
| 2010 | Decree No.82/2010/ND-CP of government, dated 20 July 2010 on teaching and learning of ethnic minority languages in schools. |
| 2009 | Decision No 102/2009 / QD-TTg dated on August 07, 2009 of the Prime Minister on directly policy assistance for the poor in difficult area. |
| 2008 | Resolution No.30a/2008/NQ-CP of government, dated 27 Dec. 2008 on support program for rapid and sustainable poverty reduction for 61 poorest districts. |
| 2007 | Circular No.06 dated 20-September-2007 of the Committee for Ethnic Minorities Affair guidance on the assistance for services, improved livelihood of people, technical assistance for improving the knowledge on the laws according the decision 112/2007/QD-TTg. |
| 2007 | Decision No. 05/2007/QD-UBND dated 06-September-2007 of the Committee for Ethnic Minorities Affairs on its acceptance for three regions of ethnic minorities and mountainous areas based on development status. |
| 2007 | Decision No.01/2007/QD-UBND dated 31-May-2007 of the Committee for Ethnic Minorities Affair on the recognition of communes, districts in the mountainous areas. |
| 2007 | Decision No.06/2007/QD-UBND dated 12-January-2007 of the Committee for Ethnic Minorities Affair on the strategy of media for the Program 135-Phase 2. |

However, it is important to also note that the Draft 2017 new Forestry Law, which is scheduled to be approved by the National Assembly before the end of the 2018 Session provides some very clear new provisions that have the potential to impact favorably on ethnic minority groups and are also of direct relevance to the ER-P. The new law introduces and updates clear support for the use of Benefit Sharing Mechanisms that includes local communities (Articles 3,4 and 860. It also provides clear support for the involvement of local communities in Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) activities that requires existing State Forest Enterprises (SFEs) to collaboratively work with and prioritize livelihood improvements that can be linked to these SFM activities (Article 182). But this new law emphasizes collaborative management and not co-management and seeks to avoid confusion surrounding the two different approaches. Thus, the new law recognizes the importance of the ACMA and establishment of Forest Management Councils (FMCs) to achieve these objectives.

Moreover, to clarify issues surrounding customary land tenure the new law does not over-ride the Land Law of 2013 that does not recognize customary land tenure and when the emphasis is on tenure of forest land the context in Vietnam relates to tenurial rights to production forestry land, as evidence by the issuance of a Land User Rights Certificate (LURC) or the legalizable prospect of this being possible. It is necessary to clarify this confusion because in the past there have been some REDD assessments that state customary land tenure exists: if it does it not recognized in law and is unlikely to be ever recognized in Vietnamese law as Vietnam has opted for a land tenure regime based on the Torrens System that was first developed in South Australia.

2.2 *World Bank's Operational Policy on Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10)*

The OP 4.10 aims to avoid potentially adverse impacts on indigenous people and increase activities to bring to projects benefits considering their cultural demands and needs. The Bank requires indigenous peoples, (here refer as Ethnic Minorities), to be fully informed and able to

freely participate in projects. The Program has to be widely supported by the affected EMs. Besides, the Program is designed to ensure that the EMs are not affected by adverse impacts of the development process, mitigation measure to be defined if required and that the EM peoples to receive socio-economic benefits that should be culturally appropriate to them.

The Policy defines that EM can be identified in particular geographical areas by the presence in varying degrees of the following characteristics:

- a) Self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous cultural group and recognition of this identity by others;
- b) Collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the program area and to the natural resources in these habitats and territories;
- c) Customary cultural, economic, social, or political institutions that are separate from those of the dominant society and culture; and
- d) Indigenous language, often different from the official language of the country or region.

As a prerequisite for an investment Program approval, OP 4.10 requires the borrower to conduct free, prior and informed consultations with potentially affected EM peoples and to establish a pattern of broad community support for the Program and its objectives. It is important to note that the OP 4.10 refers to social groups and communities, and not to individuals. The primary objectives of OP 4.10 are:

- To ensure that such groups are afforded meaningful opportunities to participate in planning Program activities that affects them;
- To ensure that opportunities to provide such groups with culturally appropriate benefits are considered; and
- To ensure that any Program impacts that adversely affect them are avoided or otherwise minimized and mitigated.

In the context of the sub-project, the EM groups (equivalent to indigenous peoples) in the ACMA jurisdiction likely to receive long term benefits through a range of socio-economic, environmental and governance non-carbon benefits as follows:

- Maintenance of sustainable livelihoods, cultural identity and community cohesiveness;
- Improved access to cultural services and strengthening of traditional knowledge resources;
- Valuation for forest resources, including and especially NTFPs using socio-cultural accounting methods rather than simply conventional resource economic methods;
- Modest income generation and employment opportunities;
- Promotion of climate smart agriculture;

- Conservation and protection of biodiversity;
- Protection and proliferation of medicinal plants and curative practices;
- Water use regulation and watershed management;
- Strengthening of village level socially inclusive governance;
- Improved forest governance and management; and
- Participatory land use planning.

Further details are included in the matrix of Non-Carbon Benefits are provided in Table 16.1 Section 16 of the ER-PD.

Potential impacts of the ER-P

2.3 Overview

The major socio-linguistic groups are included below as with the major socio-linguistic ethnic minority groups living in the ER-P provinces:

i) Viet – Muong groups: Most residents of this group are distributed in Vietnam, including four ethnic groups: Viet, Muong, Tho, Chut, with a population of nearly 75 million people (2009), accounting for over 87% of the population in the whole country. The Muong mainly live in the provinces of Hoa Binh, Thanh Hoa and Son La and partly in Nghe An, Quang Binh; the Cuoi group occupies in Tan Hop - Tan Ki (Nghe An); a group of 120 people A Rem now reside in Tan Trach (Bo Trach - Quang Binh); the Chut group resides in Minh Hoa and Tuyen Hoa (Quang Binh); Ma Lieng groups distribute in two districts of Minh Hoa and Tuyen Hoa (Quang Binh) and Huong Khe (Ha Tinh province); the Pong group is mainly distributed in two districts of Con Cuong and Tuong Duong (Nghe An).

ii) Tay – Thai groups: In Vietnam, there are eight ethnic groups with a total population of nearly 4.4 million people (2009). The Tay, Nung, San Chay, Giay, Bo Y reside in the Northeast Region, the Thai, Lao, Lu are distributed from northwest to west of Thanh Hoa and Nghe An. The Tay – Thai ancestors have been in Vietnam for more than 2,000 years. Residents of these groups are very sophisticated valley-based wet rice cultivators who have been using a variety of approaches for more than 1,000 years to cultivate at least two rice crops per annum. Historically, draft animals were used for rice cultivation but increasing machine operated plows, rice seeding machines and mechanical harvesters are being utilized.

iii) Tibetan-Burman groups in Vietnam include of six ethnic minorities: Ha Nhi, La Hu, Lo, Cong, Si La and Phu La with the total population of nearly 50,000 people (2009), mainly live in Son La, Lao Cai, Lai Chau, Dien Bien. They are distributed in small villages scattered across the mountainous areas, with major subsistence through shifting cultivation, or terraces (largely rice and now increasingly maize), combined with hunting, fishing and gathering.

iv) Hmong – Dao groups, including three groups of Hmong, Dao, Pa Then with 4,174,989 people live in the mountainous provinces of North West, North East and Northern Central Vietnam. They mainly cultivate on upland areas and slash and burn shifting cultivation is associated with scattered local groups. They also take advantage of rocky land, utilizing upland areas for cultivation. In the upland areas, they cultivate dry rice, maize, vegetables, beans, cucurbits, medicinal plants, fruit trees and cash crops.

v) Mon-Khmer groups include of 21 ethnic minorities: Bana, Brau, Bru-Van Kieu, Cho Ro, Kor, Co Ho, Co Tu, Gie-Triêng, Hre, Khang, Mang, Mnong, O Du, Ro Mam, Ta Oi, Xinh Mun, Xo Dang, Xtieng, Ma, Khmer, and Kho Mu with the total 2.6 million people (2009). They extend from the Northwest through the Truong Son - Central Highlands to the South. Except the Khmer people reside mainly in the Mekong Delta, more than 1.2 million remaining people live in the mountains of the Central Highlands, which are the most numerous of the Bahnar with 228,000 people; even some smaller ethnic minority groups with the populations of less than 500 people, including the Ro Mam, Brau and O Du. Most of the smaller ethnic minority groups are still involved with shifting cultivation although it is incorrect to argue they rely on slash and burn techniques but rather more on rotational cultivation techniques where land is left fallow after crop harvesting to regenerate. vi) Malayo – Polynesian groups: include of five ethnic minorities: the Champa, Jarai, Ede, Raglai and Churu, with a total population of more

than 1 million people (2009). They reserve the matrilineal tradition. The Hroi ethnic minority and four other groups (Jarai, Ede, Raglai, Churu) live in the four coastal provinces of Phu Yen, Khanh Hoa, Ninh Thuan and Binh Thuan and all the Central Highlands. These groups traditionally have practiced a mixture of upland and river valley agricultural cropping but in recent times with the arrival of large-scale plantation activities, especially coffee and rubber are also involved in such activities.

The majority of EM residents in the ER-P area depend on the forest for their livelihoods. It is estimated that 76.3% of surveyed households are involved in forestry and forest-related income-earning activities, including the main sectors of planting/protecting forests, harvesting timber/NTFPs, forestry services and processing timber/NTFPs, with 45.5% of households involved in more than one major sector. For some EM groups, such as Ta Oi-Pa Co, Co Tu, and Hmong, forest dependent livelihoods account for up to more than 90% of the households' livelihoods, even reaching 100% for Hmong people. Poor and near-poor households have higher percentages of involvement in forestry and forestry-related activities – at 83% and 79.6%, respectively – than non-poor households, who have 71% involvement. The economically poor are more dependent on the forests for their livelihoods than their non-poor counterparts. 5 criteria of forest dependency by the EMs on livelihood, income, female role, subsistence, and cultural values were also identified in the report. (MDRI - Mekong Development Research Institute 2016, *Quantitative socio-economic survey for Emission Reduction Program (ER-P) provinces area - Project "Support for the REDD+ Readiness Preparation in Vietnam"*. Final Report, Hanoi July, 2016, p.50).

Program components:

Component 1 Strengthening enabling conditions for emission reductions (USD 6.84 million): The first component of the ER Program includes actions to strengthen the enabling conditions for emissions reduction. In particular, the activities seek to address the drivers and underlying causes of conversion of degraded forest land to higher-value land uses and factors contributing to inadequate implementation of policies to protect natural forests, as shown in Figure 4.6 of the ERPD. The proposed activities support implementation of ambitious and far reaching government policies and plans, described in Section 4.3 of the ERPD, which will be implemented in the NCC during the lifetime of the ER-Program. Strengthening the enabling conditions is expected to have a transformative impact across the NCC. Table 2.1 summarizes the sub-components and key activities of Component 1. The details of activities, justification for these activities and expected outcomes for the different activities are elaborated in this section. Indicators, institutional arrangements and financing of the key activities are fully described in the detailed Table 4.8 in the ERPD.

Table 1: Component 1 subcomponents and key activities

| Sub Components | Key activities | Scale of intervention |
|---|---|---|
| 1.1. Strengthening and implementing policies controlling conversion of natural forests | 1.1.1. Adoption of legal framework to control the conversion of natural forests to rubber and infrastructure development | All NCC Provinces |
| | 1.1.2. Enhancing cross-sector coordination of the Steering Committees for the National Program on Sustainable Forestry Development/REDD+ at central and provincial levels | National and province coverage (all NCC provinces) |
| | 1.1.3. Develop regulations on publication and access to information on conversion of natural forests and environmental impact assessment reports | National, NCC provinces |
| 1.2. Strengthening forest governance and law enforcement | 1.2.1. Dissemination of legal guidelines on controlling conversion of natural forests by local authorities, forest entities, local communities and other stakeholders | All NCC provinces |
| | 1.2.2. Improve capacity of stakeholders to monitor the conversion of natural forests, verification of timber legality and activities to address violations of forest law | All NCC provinces |
| | 1.2.3. Implement independent monitoring of forest conversion by local communities and civil society organizations | Scale: National, NCC provinces |
| | 1.2.4. Strengthening regional collaboration among provinces in the NCC and with Lao PDR on effective measures to control illegal logging and manage legal timber trade | NCC provinces; with focus on Quang Binh, Quang Tri, Nghe An and Ha Tinh |

Component 2 Promoting sustainable management of forest and carbon stock enhancement (USD 240.4million): The forest sector has been undergoing restructuring to enhance the effectiveness of land use and forest protection. A master plan for restructuring the forest sector was approved in July 2013 to strengthen competitiveness of the forest sector to effectively mobilize investment, and to promote its development. A set of new policies and programs have since been introduced, some of which are described in Section 4.3. ER program activities build on these efforts to support government priorities in the NCC for: 1) conservation of existing natural forests; 2) enhancement of carbon stock of plantations and 3) the restoration and enhancement of poor natural forests. This is the core component of the ER Program and is estimated at USD240.4 million (about 77% of the total ER Program budget) for the total program implementation period. This component is divided into three sub-components.

- **Sub-component 2.1: Conservation of existing natural forests (USD 113.2 million)** will support the development and operation of the adaptive collaborative management of natural forests involving forest management entities and communities. It is expected that about 884,215 ha of existing natural evergreen forest and 33,017 ha of coastal/sandy forests will be protected from deforestation and forest degradation.

- **Sub-component 2.2: Enhancement of carbon stock of plantations (USD 70.5 million)** is devoted to the enhancement of carbon stock through improved productivity and long rotation forest plantations. This will include the transformation of 37,515 ha from short to long-term rotation of plantations and planting of 27,750 ha of long-rotation plantations. This sub-component also includes technical support and capacity development for forest certification and plantation management.
- **Sub-component 2.3: Enhancement and restoration of natural forests (USD 56.6 million)** will focus on regeneration and restoration of natural forests. About 91,915 ha of evergreen natural forests will be regenerated or reforested with native tree species, and about 11,348 ha coastal sandy inland forests will be regenerated and restored. Forest land specific investments will unfold on about 50% of the remaining natural forest (1 million ha) and 11% of the plantation area (82,838 ha). The Table 2.3 summarizes the area proposed to be covered under the interventions described under ER-P (see Section 4.2 in the ER-PD) and is used in development of the financing plan.

Component 3 Promotion of climate smart agriculture and sustainable livelihoods for forest dependent people (USD60.9 million): Recognizing that long term sustainable development depends on the improved livelihoods of local populations living in and around the forest areas highlights the critical need for diversifying and sustaining livelihoods for forest dependent people, particularly in hotspot areas. As described in Activity 2.1.2 above in Table 2.2 and shown in Figure 4.7 of the ER-PD forest conservation is dependent on providing benefits to local communities.

The interventions under this component will focus on the adoption of improved agricultural practices and diversification livelihoods of forest dependent people. These two sub-components will address the key agricultural drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and support the adoption of climate-smart and deforestation free agricultural practices in mountainous and coastal areas of the ER-P provinces. It includes the promotion of climate-smart agricultural practices on about 60,300 ha of agricultural land through improved extension services and training of households in proximity to the deforestation and forest degradation hotspots and strengthening cooperatives that engage in deforestation free commodity value chains. The estimated cost is USD43.4 million. The remaining USD17.5 million will be devoted to livelihood development activities in the coastal areas as part of the WB supported Forest Sector Modernization and Coastal Resilience Enhancement Project.

Assessments at the participating PFMBs, SUFs and SFCs identify the most vulnerable and forest dependent actors that need to be targeted to reduce deforestation and forest degradation. Based on that, a collaborative management activity will be developed. A grant mechanism will support diversifying and sustaining livelihoods for forest dependent people of vulnerable and forest dependent communities. These efforts will be complimented with funds from current government programs targeting poorer communes (see Table 4.7 of the ER-PD) as well as PFES payments. This can contribute to improving the socio-economic conditions of ethnic minorities and other poorer groups while reducing deforestation and forest degradation.

For Component 3 the main Sub Components are broken down into improving climate smart agriculture (Activity 3.1) and diversifying and sustaining livelihoods for forest dependent (Activity 3.2). Key activities are shown in Table 2.4 below.

Table 2. Component 3 sub-components and key activities

| Sub Components | Key Activities | Scale of intervention |
|---|---|---|
| 3.1 Improve climate smart agriculture | 3.1.1. Implementation of climate-smart agriculture and agroforestry through the ACMA in deforestation and forest degradation hotspots | In key hotspot areas (estimated at ~ 50,000 ha) |
| | 3.1.2. Support to deforestation free agricultural value chains | In key hotspot areas (estimated at ~ 50,000 ha) |
| 3.2. Diversifying and sustaining livelihoods for forest dependent people | 3.2.1. Promotion of sustainable use and development of NTFPs in the forest areas | Across NCC provinces (link to ACMA in 60 SFC and management boards) |
| | 3.2.2. Improve alternative off-farm income for forest dependent people | In key hotspot areas (linked to ACMA and around 60 SFC and management boards) |

Component 4 Program management and emission monitoring (USD4.7 million):

Potential Impacts of the ER program:

The implementation of the Program is expected to bring positive effects related to social and economic development of those areas. However, it will also cause negative impacts because of the forest dependence of the EMs, demands on production forest land for livelihood, for food security and different demands on forest products and non-forest products for everyday life of the EMs, especially for women and the poor; and the demand for land that can be used for a range of uses including production forestry from outsiders is generating uncertain outcomes because many ethnic minority groups lack the capital resources or technical knowledge of market-driven approaches to economic development and hence are being left behind.

The potential impacts are assessed on the basis of extensive consultations, prior consultation and consultations for disseminating information to ethnic minority communities in the ER-P areas. Evaluation results are also based on the basis of consultations and key informant interviews of stakeholders in the ER-P areas. Information on the consultations have been conducted and shown in Annex 1 and demonstrate the extensive nature of these consultations, the numbers of all different ethnic minorities consulted, the issues raised and the locations where these consultations were undertaken

2.4 Positive and Negative Social Impacts

Positive social impacts of the program:

The results from the SESA combined with intensive consultations with EM in the ER program area revealed potential positive impacts to include:

Comp.1:

- EM participation in supporting policies to control the conversion of natural forest mainly to include their engagement and consultation in the participatory process in carrying out a policy gap analysis and providing inputs to drafting legal guidelines
- Benefiting from the implementation of, and public participation in social and environmental impact assessments for land use planning and development projects.

All legal guidelines will be public disseminated to the local authorities, forest entities, local communities and other stakeholders through meetings, workshops, public media and communication campaigns in local languages and simple format for easy understanding and implementation.

- EM through ACMA will work with MBs SFCs, DPC, CPC, on implementation of the legal guidelines. Table 3. identifies the positive and negative social impacts of the ER-P on ethnic minority groups and is consistent with the ESMF and ER-PD.

Comp.2 EM will benefit from the promotion of sustainable management of forest and carbon stock enhancement through:

- Clarification of forest and land boundaries through demarcation
- Ethnic minority development planning
- Resolving conflict between forest companies and EM communities to include improve capacity for grass-root reconciliation units and forest management capacity for the commune authorities, along with other basic facilities
- Collaboration with SUFMBs, PFMBs and SFCs in implementing livelihood programs, and forest restoration activities
- Benefiting of forest land allocation
- Implementing community-based forest management activities
- Provision of nursery accreditation and improved seedling quality
- Livelihood training and land use rights certificate processing
- Benefiting through improvement in non-carbon benefits (water retention, soil fertility, biodiversity)

Comp.3 EM will benefit from the promotion of climate smart agriculture and sustainable livelihoods for forest dependent people through:

- Better integration of smallholder farmers into markets through building and enhancing linkages between the ‘middle’ of the value chain (processors, traders, exporters and farmers’ organizations) and the market; (ii) strengthening the relationship between the same ‘middle’ of the value chain and smallholder farmers and, (iii) strengthening the supply capacity (ability to produce increased volumes of goods or services with particular attributes).
- Benefiting from deforestation free agriculture and aquaculture
- Promotion of sustainable use and development of NTFPs in the forest areas and improving alternative off-farm income for forest dependent people

There are also potential negative risks and impacts associated with the components

Table 3.1 Summary of approach to the mitigation of social risks through processes included in the ER-P

| ER-P Activities | Potential socio-economic risks | Proposed mitigation measures |
|--|---|---|
| Component 1: Enabling conditions for emission reductions | | |
| <i>1.1 Strengthening and implementing policies controlling conversion of natural forests</i> | Potential for reduced access to forest and NTFP resources for forest dependent communities through improvements to forest governance. | Improved forest monitoring providing feedback into planning and management process and discussion with local communities through the ACMA approach and utilization of the FMCs to improve forest protection and management and agree to designate areas for livelihood related activities including NTFP collection. OP 4.12 and OP 4.10 will apply |

| ER-P Activities | Potential socio-economic risks | Proposed mitigation measures |
|--|---|---|
| 1.2 Strengthening forest governance and law enforcement | Similar to above but some possible impacts on livelihoods i.e. Improved governance may not include unfettered or continued access to all forest areas. | Ensure that ethnic minority people who agree to participate in the FMC are in broad agreement with the FMEs as to whether it is necessary to restrict access to the forests and if necessary no household should be worse off as a result. In such instances OP4.12 will apply. A similar provision must apply to those ethnic minority households who do not agree to participate in the FMC. |
| | | Identification of conservation orientated livelihood and sustainable forest use models designed not to impact on natural forest in SUFs, PFMBs and SFCs. However, where they do households that are negatively impacted are able to secure livelihoods by being offered alternative livelihoods within the provisions of OP4.12. |
| Component 2: Promoting sustainable management of forests and carbon stock enhancement | | |
| 2.1 Conservation of natural forests | Generally positive, some clarifications of forest natural forest boundaries, some possible impacts on livelihoods, i.e. improved conservation of natural forest may not include unfettered or continued access to all forest areas. | Implement collaborative management of natural forests between FMBs, SFCs and communities through the ACMA approach and the FMC improved forest planning and management process and discussion with local communities through the ACMA approach and utilization of the FMCs to improve forest protection and management and agree to designate areas for livelihood related activities to reduce pressure on critical forest areas. OP4.10 will be triggered to ensure all ethnic minority groups who agree to participate in the FMC will benefit but if not OP4.12 will apply to ensure that involuntary resettlement impacts – such as when boundaries between core and buffer zones are resolved by the FMC – will be mitigated. |
| 2.2 Enhancement of carbon stock in plantations | Generally minor socio-economic impacts expected see review of various models below | Implement collaborative management of natural forests and plantation areas between FMBs, SFCs and communities (through the ACMA). OP4.10 will apply where there is more than one ethnic minority group or where there is at least one ethnic minority group and the Kinh ethnic majority group (are not so many instances) but this is specific to ethnic minority groups who either have legal or legalizable access to plantation forest land or are employed to maintain the plantation land. |
| Forest and plantation models proposed under 2.2 | | |
| Forest protection of existing natural forest through contracts; around SUFs, PFMBs, and SFC (economic model 1) | Possible gender and exclusion, issues; Possible social impacts if land was previously used for agriculture or restrictions placed on accessing forest for NTFP collection | To ensure ethnic minority women or other poor and vulnerable groups are not excluded the provisions of OP4.10 apply and the GAP highlights how it is necessary to ensure full gender exclusion. However, where restrictions are to be imposed restricting access to forests to collect NTFPs and this negatively impacts on women and their households then the provisions of OP4.12 will apply because the impact results in loss of livelihoods. |
| Natural assisted regeneration of medium quality forest / avoiding degradation (no planting); located mainly in SUFs (model 2) | Possible gender and poverty issues related to access to forest; Possible change or impact on livelihoods if restrictions placed on accessing forest for NTFP collection | As Above |
| Natural regeneration and enrichment planting of poor natural forest. Located mainly in SUFs, i.e. normally uninhabited (model 3) | Possible gender and poverty issues related to access to forest; Livelihood issues | As Above |
| Transformation of Acacia plantation (models 6 and 7) target area is SFC PFMBs and some smallholders | Possible boundary demarcation issues; Limited impact as expected that area already planted to <i>Acacia</i> | If and where there are boundary demarcation issues and the livelihoods of ethnic minority groups either living in existing FMEs (not too many according to the SESA) or in contested buffer zones (likely to be more instances) then OP4.12 will apply because affected persons may lose all or a portion of their livelihoods, especially if production forestry is one of the main sources of livelihood. |

| ER-P Activities | Potential socio-economic risks | Proposed mitigation measures |
|---|---|---|
| Afforestation Reforestation with pure Acacia and mixed species and offsetting of infrastructure and development (models 4,5,8) | 1) None expected in areas already having plantations; 2) Offsetting of infrastructure possibility of some land acquisition; Most offsetting to occur in a SUFs or PFMBs | If land is to be acquired by the FMC to ensure that it can meet targets agreed upon for the reduction of carbon emissions than OP4.12 will apply. However, as per the ER-P design and articulated in the ER-PD it is preferred that land is not acquired. If there is “voluntary gifting” by individuals or groups or whole villages this made be explicitly stated as per the principle of Broad Community Support but where one or more households do not agree with this principle than OP4.12 applies to such households. |
| Coastal forest and mangrove protection, enrichment planting of degraded forest and mangroves, afforestation/ reforestation coastal and mangrove forest (Models 9, 10, 11) | Possible boundary and resource access and use issues; Possible social impacts if land previously used as agriculture; or restrictions placed on NTFP collection | Where there are restrictions on access to the use of land whether to harvest NTFPs in the forests or on land that has been converted, whether legally or not, from forest land to agricultural land, the provisions of OP4.12 apply if affected households are impacted negatively. |
| 2.3 Enhancement and restoration of natural forests | Possibility of very limited impacts on livelihoods, i.e. potential reduced or planting time access to forest areas under regeneration. | Implement collaborative management of natural forests between FMBs, SFCs and communities (through the ACMA) to reduce effects of the reduced access to certain part of forest i.e. identify alternative areas and or reduced access could include rotation of area or use of areas at particular time (depending on NTFP) agreements for a period of time. Where this occurs the provisions of OP4.12 will apply but also the provisions of OP4.10 will apply if one or more ethnic minority group are likely to be marginalized during the processes associated with the ACMA. |
| Component 3: Promotion of climate smart agriculture and sustainable livelihoods for forest dependent people | | |
| 3.1 Improve climate smart agriculture | Possible gender and poverty issues; Possible access to forest issues; | Selection of the livelihood support should be targeted to contribute to reduce forest dependency; Similar to above discussions through the ACMA with FME to design best approach that fits with local forest dependency and use and climate smart agriculture that best suits the local area and market conditions. OP4.12 will apply if there are any restrictions to be imposed that lead to households not been able to reduce their dependency on the forests and unable to increase their dependency on climate smart agriculture. |
| 3.2. Diversifying and sustaining livelihoods for forest dependent people | Possible gender and poverty issues; Possible access to forest issues; | Selection of the livelihood support should be targeted to contribute to reduce forest dependency; Similar to above discussions through the ACMA with FME to design specific approaches that reflect local forest dependency and use and climate smart agriculture that best suits the local area and market conditions. The provisions of OP4.12 will apply where necessary. |

It needs to be emphasized all the policy measures that trigger social safeguards (OP4.10 and OP4.12) will be applied to ensure that all categories of affected ethnic minority households, whether they agree to participate in the ER-P or not, will be compensated according to the entitlements outlined in the RPF and reflected in the locality-specific RAP. Thus, any restrictions on access and use to forest land by affected ethnic minority households will be mitigated by ensuring these households are compensated for loss of access and use. This applies to protection forest land. Where there are restrictions on access to and use of production forest all affected ethnic minority households will similarly be compensated. The difference between protection and production forest land is that the latter is legal and can result in the issuance of the LURC whereas the former does not. Thus, where production forestry land is affected the ethnic minority affected households will be compensated for loss of land, not just access to and use of such land. This is consistent with the Land Law of 2013.

Examples of policy measures with negative impacts such as restrictions on forest land use will be mitigated through the opportunities afforded by alternative livelihoods and ACMA.

Impacts on Gender: based on the SESA and gender analysis EM women had limited voice in the public domain in relation to natural resources management, as a result has little or no ownership. EM in terms of protection forest they have problematic access to the harvesting of NTPF, in terms of production forestry, there are issues as to whether EM women are fully able to realize their legal rights to access LURCs. Furthermore, EM women's priorities are generally not reflected in the design of programs to improve the living standards of upland EM. In addition, Women's' traditional knowledge about the forests is generally not recognized in the design of programs

As a result, a Gender Action Plan (GAP) was developed as part of the ESMF it aims to promote women's participation in the ER program and share in the benefits, in order to maximize positive gender equality impacts as well mitigate possible risks and negative impacts. The GAP has three approaches: (1) provide opportunities for and strengthen the role of women in local economic activities; (2) disseminate information about environmental sustainability and social risks to men and women; and (3) increase female representation in the sector and in decision making positions. An important strategy for empowering women will be ensuring that each FMC entity has one woman elected from each village to serve on the management board and for women via the Vietnam Women's Union to also be represented on these management boards. These strategies seek to address limited availability of sustainable livelihoods and gender equality in livelihood opportunities. Furthermore EM minority women will be represented in the FMCs, and will play a key role in the identification and implementation of ER activities, especially livelihood activities that serve their interests and needs. They will also benefit from carbon and non carbon benefits derived for the ER-P. See ERPD section 15.

The Adaptive Collaborative Management Approach (ACMA), besides being an effective tool to improve forest management will ensure that activities are inclusive and pro-poor. ACMA is a collaborative and participatory approach where by existing forest management entities (PFMBs, SUFs, SFC) together with EM will establish Forest Management Councils that will be responsible for implementing Livelihood programs that would address poverty, and provide alternative sources of income to local households. Through a small grant's mechanism, the ER-P will provide key services to smallholders to improve their livelihoods through projects that are compatible with forest protection and biodiversity conservation. Through the ACMAs, the ER-P will support the allocation of Land Use Right Certificates (LURCs) to local households for smallholder plantation development. In addition, the Program will support village, as well as individual, forest protection contracts.

ACMA will contribute to the security of tenure for ethnic minorities because LURC(with men and women's names on it) will be issued where such land is available for production forestry activities. In addition, ethnic minority households will also benefit from their participation in developing and implementing livelihoods that are designed to improve the living standards of participants in the ACMA such as interventions associated with climate smart agriculture, agroforestry, value chains, NTFPs and non-land-based income generation activities. Of added value all of these interventions will ensure that problems currently associated with lack of food security for poorer and more vulnerable ethnic minority households will be reduced.

The Benefit Sharing Agreements

The Government of Vietnam aims to facilitate the empowerment of local communities in their relationships with managers of forests and biodiversity conservation through the greater

participation of ethnic minority women and poor and vulnerable villagers that to date have been largely excluded from meaningful forms of participation in benefit sharing. The ACMA entities will play a central role in benefit sharing. It is proposed that 90% of the funds available will be allocated by the provinces to each of the participating ACMA entity on the condition that it demonstrates a very clear commitment to include all forest users and contributes to sustainable forest management and reduce pressure on Special Use Forest protected areas.

The BSM designed for the ER-P is designed to ensure that 90% of carbon benefits will be paid to villages who will participate in the FMC for activities that are consistent with the ER-P. But to ensure all ethnic minority groups, not just the more numerous or better organized receive benefits, the FMC will be required to develop a transparent and equitable formula that reflects the contributions of all members of the FMCs.

The current laws of Vietnam define clearly the beneficiaries of forest resources, including forest owners as organizations, households, individuals, communities – those who sign contracts with the State or lease land and forest for long term utilization. The beneficiaries also include people who sign contracts on forest protection, regeneration zoning and afforestation in the state forestry entities (PFMBs, SFCs). Beneficiaries should also include communities living inside or near the forests, who rely on the forests, but they do not directly work in forest protection and development work (direct involvement in emission reduction/enhancing forest carbon stock, but their activities may indirectly affect emission reduction/enhancing forest carbon stock).

The following procedural steps will be followed by the management entities to link with other ACMA stakeholders and BSP beneficiaries and are partly based on procedural steps many SUFMBs are aware of based on how managers of the SUFs were linked with village users of the SUFs.

- DPCs agree to participate in the ACMA and identify the communes that are considered to be the hotspots for deforestation and forest degradation.
- CPCs to participate in the ACMA and identify the villages that are considered to be the hotspots for deforestation and forest degradation. CPCs agree to participate in the ACMA and identify the villages that are considered to be the hotspots for deforestation and forest degradation
- Local villages identified as hotspots for deforestation and forest degradation also need to buy into ACMA and because there are greater numbers of village level stakeholders involved (women and men, aged and young, poor and non-poor, and different ethnic minority groups but also some Kinh ethnic village communities) to secure free, prior and informed consultation (for environmental, displacement and ethnic minority development issues) the most participatory consultations (e.g. such as focus group discussions and village transects) at times convenient for all village people need to be facilitated.
- BSM Resource Survey and subsequent agreement on issues such as forest boundary demarcation, access to forests by users including whether quotas for collecting NTFPs are necessary and limited logging for housing structure purposes will need to be undertaken. The outcome should involve forest management entity staff in BSM preparation and principles of ACMA for natural resource use, BSM baseline survey on resource needs and existing resource availability that will serve as a forest resource inventory survey, documenting the status of the forest resources and results disseminated through a process of negotiation.

- BSM Social Screening undertaken to identify the poorest and most vulnerable households based on degree of forest dependency that identifies ethnicity, demographic features, health and education indicators, access to physical and social infrastructure, ownership of agricultural land and income and expenditure patterns.
- Elections in each village community to be facilitated to ensure the two most popularly elected village members (to ensure the participation of at least one-woman representative per village as well) represents the village at the monthly, bi-monthly or extraordinary meetings of the ACMA entity.
- Initial Benefit Sharing Plans drafted outlining how village households will be compensated for opportunity costs associated with the provision of forest environmental services or rights to collect unlimited quantities of NTFP are foregone, provision of both monetary and non-monetary incentives, how legitimacy and support for conservation will be achieved, reduction in the risk of non-delivery of agreed benefits, fulfilment of obligations and reducing elite capture of benefits.
- Any Benefit Sharing Agreement that identified monetary and non-monetary benefits should be prepared within 18 months of Entity Board establishment based on agreed interventions targeted at the poorest and most vulnerable households but in line with the flexible approach of ACMA this BSA can be amended where necessary on condition that it does not propose prescribed activities.

2.5 *Other Salient Issues*

In the ER-P area there are some of the ethnic minority groups that consider areas within the forests, including inside existing FMEs to be sacred or spiritual and which are considered areas that must not be tampered with. Generally, speaking most FMEs have been prepared to respect these sacred sites, especially where these sites are used primarily for burial grounds. It is anticipated that during the implementation of the ER-P that none of the activities planned by the FMCs would be permitted to impinge upon these sacred sites, which from a safeguard perspective trigger OP4.11 on Physical and Cultural Resources. During the SERNA such sites need to be physically identified and in the off-chance they belong to one or more ethnic minority groups who might not be participating in the FMC, not just on a voluntary basis but where perhaps a separate FMC is being established because a FME is situated in an area that encompasses more than one province (such as Vietnam-Lao PDR border FMEs between districts in Thua Thien Hue and Quang Tri). Based on the SESA there are few of these FMEs but nevertheless in this EMPF the fact that they exist needs to be flagged. In such instances a EMPD would need to be prepared to ensure such sites continue to be protected.

However, it should also be noted and as explained elsewhere, that they catalyst for positive impacts on ER-P impacted EMs will be the establishment of the ACMAs. Not only will the ACMA provide a vehicle for reducing conflicts between forest owners and managers and users but also empower ethnic minority groups hitherto excluded, especially ethnic minority women and other poor and vulnerable ethnic minority groups.

3.1 Consultation and Information Disclosure

The Government's program design was broadly consulted all six provinces (including targeted consultations with ethnic minority groups). Participation methods included village-level meetings with households, focus group discussions, workshops, participatory forest transects, natural resource assessments and interviews of key informants. Consultations have sought to identify local people's views regarding opportunities and constraints arising from forest and land resource access and use, including possible land use conflicts, and the security of their livelihoods. Qualitative data acquired through these processes has been used in the design of the overall program and the approach to Benefit Sharing. The implementation of the program is built around Adaptive Collaborative Management Approach. A consultation and participation plan have been developed and used during preparation to the ER-PD and is expected to be used during implementation. Also, a detailed stakeholder analysis was conducted as part of developing the consultation and participation plan to identify the relevant stakeholders that might gain or lose from the program.

Consultation with EM during program implementation

Consultation will be conducted with all ethnic minority people that are living in villages that will potentially be included in the FMC. Information on what the ER-P hopes to achieve and how these ethnic minority villagers will benefit but also the possible negative impacts will be included in the consultative processes. Furthermore, as part of the processes associated with the SERNA and ACMA it will be necessary to explain very carefully the objective of the ER-P and enable all participants to understand the specific nature of the ER-P. Most importantly it is necessary to explicitly state the expected results-based outcomes of the ER-P. The consultation will take into consideration that in most of the villages of the ER-P only a single ethnic minority group resides, but in villages contiguous with existing FMEs there are more than one ethnic minority groups such as Muang Lat District of Thanh Hoa Province where both ethnic Thai and Hmong are to be found, Quynh Luu District of Nghe An where Thai and Kho Mu are to be found, Huong Sen District of Ha Tinh where Lao and Kinh are to be found, and A Luoi District of Thua Thien Hue where the Ta Oi, Co Tu and Pa Co ethnic minority groups are to be found. The ER program will therefore ensure culturally appropriate consultations that are consistent with the culture of EM, including their language, customs and traditions.

The Provincial Project Management Unit (PPMU) will be responsible for ensuring the participation of the EM communities. The C+P plan will be used and the social scientist in the PPMU will support the PPMU in carrying out culturally appropriate consultations with the targeted beneficiaries. Effective communication strategy and documents were prepared during the readiness and ERPD design, these will be used to support the communication and outreach to ethnic minorities. community groups/associations, local leaders and EM leaders, women association and fatherland front, and local agencies will be targeted as well during consultations process. It is essential to invite local people to participate in meetings, including separate meetings with women, to know their views on ER program activities and identify the positive and negative impacts on their lives from the project.

PPMUs will hold regular meetings with the People's Committee of communes, women's associations, village headman and local communities to ensure that all involved persons are fully aware of and understand the contents of the ACMA and ER program. The purpose of the consultations is for all EM expected to be affected by the program to gain sufficient information about the component, activities, the mitigation and compensation measures, and mechanisms established for redress of grievances.

Through the consultation process, PPMUs will notify the EM people of their rights, the project's scale, and the potential impacts on the livelihoods, environment and natural resources. When there a difference or conflict between EMs and the project implementing agencies emerge, PPMUs will need to put in place a mediation and negotiation approach resolve those differences (please see grievance section below). Negotiation includes mutual respect for cultural differences, discussion of the issue with the legitimate representatives of the EMs, allowing sufficient time to make decisions, and willingness to compromise and record results.

4.2 Ensuring Broad Community Support

Ensuring broad community support will be made possible through using the culturally appropriate medium of communication and consultations. There are quite definitive language barriers in many of the ethnic minority groups, especially for older women and to a lesser extent older man and for some ethnic groups such as the Hmong compared to the Thai. However, during all consultations for the SESA and in the preparation of this EMPF all participants strongly preferred to be consulted in their own language. Thus, the EMPF clearly stipulates that unless this is demonstrated there would be no basis for broad community support. Furthermore, the participatory and collaborative nature of the ACMA, to include the establishment of the FMC would foster using appropriate language for consultations and outreach. The new Draft Forestry Law is mandating managers of FMEs to collaborate that clearly implies broad community support is necessary.

4.3 Identifying and Preparing an EMDP

An EMDP will be prepared to ensure that ER program implementation will follow OP4.10 by fully respecting the dignity, rights, cultural and economy of ethnic minorities. EMDP will be prepared irrespective of whether there are one or more than one ethnic minority group involved. This will become clear during the SERNA Because neither the existing FME or the local communes and villages or the mass organizations are most unlikely to know how to prepare an EMDP that would comply with OP4.10. The Safeguards specialists within the PPMU would assist the embryonic FMC to prepare an EMDP. It would be responsible for ensuring that an EMDP was prepared consistent with OP4.10 with evidence of broad community support from all ethnic minority groups impacted by the ER-P.

Where there is not this broad community support the FMC will be required to develop additional measures to ensure there is broad community support. For instance, it will be required to demonstrate that if one of the different ethnic minority villages or even households within the same villages do not support the ER-P for whatever reason (e.g. perhaps under previous or current Government programs targeted at ethnic minority villages or households they received no benefits or were treated unfairly by such a program) confidence-building measures via the EMDP will have to be explicitly stated. If this is not possible than the FMC would not proceed with measures, such as restricting access to the forests for the harvesting of NTFPs or increasing the production cycle for production forest land that is owned by the different ethnic minority group. However, as is being argued in this EMPF a sensible and well-designed ER-P that leads to the formation of the FMC will always leave the door open for those villages or households

that do not initially agree to be part of the FMC: the condition being that agreement to join and participate requires the preparation of an EMPD. The EMPD will ensure that EM will be represented both men and women as part of the FMC responsible for designing and implementing ER program activities, any negative impacts will be addressed through the consideration of alternative options as per the outcomes of consultations done.

3.2 Information disclosure

As per Bank's requirement, this EMPF will be disclosed prior to Program appraisal. Its Vietnamese version will be disclosed on the website of Central PMU, and locally at provincial, district, and commune level on subsequent dates. The English version of this EMPF will be disclosed on Bank's InfoShop.

Site specific EMDP will be prepared during Program implementation by the ACMA, once accepted by the WB, such EMDPs must be disclosed locally prior to appraisal of respective activities. The EMDPs need to be disclosed in an accessible place and in a form and language understandable to the EM peoples as well as other Program stakeholders. If any activities proposed require Categorization A for either OP4.01 and OP4.12 the WB will inform the ER-P that such activities should not be supported.

4 Grievance mechanisms

A comprehensive feedback grievance and redress mechanism is outlined in ERPD. For the purpose of the EMDP, ethnic minorities and local communities would be facilitated to raise their grievance through the preparation and implementation stages of the ER program.

The grievance redress mechanism for the EMPF and EMDP will use the existing grievance systems set up at the commune, district, provincial and national levels. The following process will be undertaken when grievance should arise:

- First step is to report grievance to the FMC level (local level) because there is likely to be more than one commune involved as members of the FMC, and in many instances more than one districts. FMC through the village leader will meet with the affected households raising the grievance and would document the grievance and the FMC should aimed to resolve within the timeframe outlined below as per the Vietnam's complaint Law, if not resolved
- Step two is to seek redress with the PPMUs, It is expected for the PPMUs to resolve the situation PPMU will be responsible for documenting and archiving records of complaints and resolutions made

In each of these steps' complainers will be provided with the opportunity to appeal any decision made on resolving conflicts. All grievances will be documented and kept at the PPMU. Records and reports of complaints may be publicly accessible by uploading to government portal.

Capacity building will be provided by strengthen the GRM based on traditional cultural practices at the local level so that step one above would use these grievance systems for addressing and resolving grievances. The written Registry of Grievances (to be referred to as the Mediation Monitoring Registry) at the village/commune level which is used for resolutions and disclosure on a village-wide basis will be strengthened. The EMDP will contribute to an improvement in transparency by preparing a written Registry of Grievances (which includes the names of villagers lodging the grievance, the date the grievance was lodged, a summary of the grievance, feedback from the GRM entity, description of actions undertaken to resolve the grievance, the date an agreement was reached, and if not, what was the next course of action, and the signature or thumbprint of all parties

Time frame for resolving grievances

The following timeline although it is specific to resettlement, would be considered for redress. The information in the paragraphs is from the Vietnam Complaint Law.

The complaint resolution timing: pls see article 27, 28 for the first time resolution and article 36, 37 for the second time (Article 27. Acceptance of complaints for settlement: Within 10 days after receiving a complaint under his/her competence but not falling into any of the cases specified in Article 11 of this Law, a person competent to settle first-time complaints must accept such complaint for settlement; notify such in writing to the complainant, competent agency, organization or person that has forwarded such complaint, and the state inspectorate of the same level. In case of refusal to accept the complaint, he/she must clearly state the reason thereof. Article 28. Time limit for settling first-time complaints: The time limit for settling a first-time complaint does not exceed 30 days after the complaint is accepted. For a complicated case, this time limit may be prolonged but must not exceed 45 days after the complaint is accepted.

In deep-lying or remote areas with difficult travel conditions, the time limit for settling a complaint is 45 days after the complaint is accepted. For a complicated case, this time limit may be prolonged but must not exceed 60 days after the complaint is accepted. Article 36. Acceptance of second-time complaints for settlement: Within 10 days after receiving a complaint under his/her competence but not falling into any of the cases specified in Article 11 of this Law, a person competent to settle second-time complaints must accept such complaint for settlement; and notify such in writing to the competent complainant, agency, organization or person that has forwarded such complaint, and the state inspectorate of the same level. In case of refusal to accept the complaint, he/she must clearly state the reason thereof. For a complicated case, when finding it is necessary, a second-time complaint settler may set up an advisory council to give advice on the complaint settlement. Article 37. Time limit for settling second-time complaints: The time limit for settling a second-time complaint does not exceed 45 days after the complaint is accepted. For a complicated case, this time limit may be prolonged but must not exceed 60 days after the complaint is accepted. In deep-lying or remote areas with difficult travel conditions, the time limit for settling a complaint is 60 days after the complaint is accepted. For a complicated case, this time limit may be prolonged but must not exceed 70 days after the complaint is accepted

5 Monitoring and Evaluation

5.1 Overview

Responsibility of overall monitoring and implementing the EMPF and EMDPs rests with the PPMU with oversight by the CPPU through progress reports and internal monitoring. The implementation and results of the EMDP and integrated activities on minority will be monitored regularly, and internally by PPMU and provincial Committee for Ethnic Minorities Affairs. These statements and recommendations relating to EMs will be included in the periodic reports of PPMU that must be sent to CPMU.

PPMU will set and submit monitoring reports to CPMU on a quarterly basis

Implementing the EMPF and EMDP will also be subjected to external independent monitoring by a qualified consultant, which could also be an NGO or CSO. The external independent monitoring consultant will be hired by CPO. This service could be integrated into the contract for independent monitoring of the implementation of RPF and RAPs.

5.2 *Internal monitoring*

Responsible agencies. The CPMU will be responsible for the overall implementation of the EMPF and EMDPs. CPMU is responsible for overall guidance to the PPMU and implementation of subprojects' EMDPs on the part of the PPMU.

5.3 *External monitoring*

Responsible agencies. An independent monitoring consultant (IMC) will be contracted to monitor the implementation of social safeguards of project, including the EMDPs. The monitoring report will be submitted to the World Bank for review and comments. External monitoring should be conducted twice a year during the implementation of the Program to timely identify issues that might need immediate action from CPMU and PPMU.

6 Guidelines for the EMDP

6.1 *EM screening*

The triggering of the policy OP4.10 is the presence of ethnic minorities in the ACMA's area of influence, not whether they are adversely affected or "not able to benefit from interventions proposed by ACMA," if ethnic minorities are beneficiaries of a Program – without direct adverse social impacts – an EMDP will be prepared based on free, prior and informed consultation and social assessment to ensure that the interventions proposed by ACMA will provide culturally appropriate benefits to EM people.

- First, screening for EM peoples should be done within the sub-project area, and/or area of influence as determined by the SERNA prepared for the FMC. As has already been mentioned the ER-P based on the SERNA can already identify where this is likely to be an issue.
- Second, if screening of EM peoples confirms that there are more than one ethnic minority group within the proposed ER-P area where an FMC will be based, an EMDP will be prepared – on the basis of the SERNA. As every FMC in the upland areas will involve ethnic minority groups it will only be those potential FMCs where more than one ethnic minority group is a potential member of the FMC will an EMDP be prepared. The basis for development of the EMDP will be based on the following criteria:
 - Commune with ethnic minority living is under extremely difficult situation;
 - There is acquisition of production and/or residential land of ethnic minority groups;
 - There are negative impacts on ethnic minority communities living in the area;
 - The need to assist the development of ethnic minority groups in the region through consultation.

Also, if the minority communities in the Program area are affected to the cultural identity or facing difficulties that obstacle to their participation, benefit from the project, there should be appropriate measures to recover and mitigate this problem.

The EMDP should be developed on the basis of social assessment and consultation with ethnic minorities in the Program area.

6.2 *Social assessment*

Purpose: The Social Assessment (SA) required by the WB as an essential component of the EMDP preparation will be incorporated into the SERNA (Socio-Economic and REDD+ Needs Assessment). This will be facilitated by a social development specialist with expertise in natural resource management issues in upland forest-dependent areas of the ER-P Accounting Area who will work in conjunction with ethnic minority households to identify key socio-economic issues and past and existing D&D activities that have led to the creation of hot-spots exacerbating D&D. In the context of Bank's OP 4.10, this is a study that aims to explore how planned Program activities under a Bank supported sub-project that might affect the livelihoods of ethnic minority households present in the proposed area of influence for the establishment of the FMC. The purpose of the SA is to ensure if there is any potential adverse impacts as a result of the subproject, appropriate measures are in place (in advance of the establishment of the FMC or to retrofit should an ethnic minority group, either on a village-wide or household basis not initially decide to participate in the FMC) to avoid, mitigate, minimize such potential adverse impact, or to compensate for affected population, if unavoidable. For this Program a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) was also prepared.

The overall objective of the SESA is to better understand the impacted communities in order to improve community engagement in long-term delta investment planning processes to ensure long-term sustainability and client ownership of the proposed investments.

Methods: A social assessment, in a nutshell, is a series of activities that are carefully planned and implemented to generate an outcome as outlined in the Purpose section above. Most important with the SA exercise is the consultation process to be conducted with EM people in the sub-project area. Consultation should be undertaken as a series of meetings with EM done at different times during the sub-project cycle to ensure potential impact is projected as accurate as possible. As a good practice, EMDP will be prepared based on free, prior and informed consultation and social assessment to ensure that the sub-project will provide culturally appropriate benefits to EM people.

The EM consulted needs to be provided with accurate and sufficient information about the proposed interventions before specific consultations take place. However, for the ER-P this should not be a major issue because of the approach of the ACMA will mean all affected members of the ACMA – and this includes villagers who decide to participate in the ACMA – will have available the type of information necessary to make their own decisions. The problem will arise for those households or villages who decide for whatever reason not to join the ACMA.

Hence, for this category of EM person, appropriate consultation methods, specific to each ethnic minority groups, need to be adopted to obtain valid and reliable feedback from the EM being consulted. When consulting EM, particular attention need to be given to vulnerable groups, particularly those below the poverty line, the landless, the elderly, women and children. It is important that broad community support for the ACMA intervention be obtained before such an intervention is appraised for implementation.

Data collection: There are two types of data that need to be collected for a social assessment undertaken for the proposed ACMA interventions. Data that are already available to the affected/target EM population is secondary data. However, apart from the SESA and some statistical data (much of which is over 10 years old) there is not much secondary data available. However, the point has already been made that the ER-P can readily identify those ER-P areas where FMCs will involve more than one ethnic minority group. This was quite easily undertaken during the SESA when ethnic minority villages in different communes and districts of the ER-P provinces were undertaken and reflected in Appendix 1 of this EMPF. The social assessment component also known as the social screening component in the SERNA process will need to rely on external experts because such capacity is not readily available at the local level. Experience shows that data specific to household level are typically not readily available. Primary data, therefore, should be obtained from affected population through household surveys/visits, through focus groups discussion using appropriate participatory consultation processes and natural resource transects.

Type of data: When conducting a social assessment to develop an EMDP, the following information should be collected from both secondary and primary sources:

- General socio-economic data of the potentially affected EM population specify key demographic data on household composition, gender-differentiated data on income streams and occupations, education, health status, etc.
- Key cultural traits of EM groups;
- Types of income generation activities, including income sources, disaggregated by their household member, work season, include land and productive assets;
- Annual natural hazards, such as storms, floods and drought that may affect their livelihood and income earning capacity, including a focus on more recent climate change induced natural hazards;

- Common pool resources, production and livelihood systems, and whether such groups have access to production forest land and agricultural land;
- Potential (positive and adverse) impacts of subprojects on their livelihoods; and
- Preferences of EM for support in development activities that are related to the ER-P and it is proposed they be funded under both Components 2 and 3 of the ER-P

Data Analysis: This exercise is challenging, ranging from simple to complicated, depending on the type of data collected and the complexity of data, as well as data analysis skills available from the social assessment team. As a suggestion, qualitative data analysis should be obtained and analysis to support the findings of the social assessment. Quantitative analysis should be considered well before hand, and should only be adopted with the support from trained staff and support from an external consultant. The ACMAs are unlikely to have this capacity although the ER-P as part of capacity building could support the strengthening of capacity in such forms of analysis. It also needs to be noted as part of the social learning processes embedded in the ACMA that local communities could play some role, albeit at a somewhat basic data analytical stage. However, this EMPF is premised on the notion that EM persons should be assisted to develop a range of competencies and data analysis is one of them. It is very important not to overstate the putative competency or the lack of competency by local communities. The extant point is that the EMPF should not promote exercises in data analysis that are abstract and esoteric as this is not an academic exercise and has been forgotten in the past when some EMPFs for projects and programs have been prepared in Vietnam.

6.3 *The requirement for the preparation of an EMDP*

The following steps should be followed by CPMU, PPMU and their safeguards Specialists in order to prepare an EMDP for a subproject.

6.3.1 *Screening of EM peoples*

According to the principles stated above (item 7.1).

6.3.2 *Preparation of an EMDP report*

An EMDP should contain elements and aspects as suggested from Bank's OP 4.10. The depth and breadth of the EMDP may vary depending on the nature of Program impacts, and the proposed development activities – as agreed upon with the consulted EM peoples that are consistent with the ER-P. The final version of the EMDP, incorporating final feedback from consulted EM peoples has to be disclosed – as per OP 4.10 requirements. Annex 2 of this EMPF proposes an outline for the preparation of an EMDP.

6.4 *Procedure for review and approval of an EMDP*

Once preparation of an EMDP is completed for a subproject, Provincial PMU needs to submit the EMDP to the Central PMU for their review and comments before it is submitted for the WB review and approval. The Bank may request revision and update of the EMDP. When there is doubt, or need for technical support in preparing the EMDP, the WB's task team should be contacted for timely support. EMDP, once accepted by Bank, needs to be disclosed prior to sub-project appraisal/approval.

6.5 *Implementation of an EMDP*

The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), on behalf of the Government, is the Program owner. MARD assumes an overall responsibility for the entire project. The FMC directly implements all ER-P activities in the field with technical support from PPMU and DPC.

At the Central level: a Central PMU is established to coordinate the Program implementation. CPMU will be responsible for the overall implementation of EMDPs prepared under the Program and ensuring that all PPMUs understand the purpose of EMPF, and how EMDPs for each sub-project are prepared and approved prior to implementation. CPMU is also responsible for ensuring effective implementation of the EMDP, including monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the EMDP.

At the outset of the Program implementation, safeguards specialists in CPMU will provide training to PPMUs specialists and staff to enable them to be able to undertake screening of ethnic minority peoples in the sub-project area. Where local capacity is insufficient to prepare an EMDP, qualified consultants may be mobilized to assist PPMU in development of EMDP for the subprojects. EMDP should be prepared in accordance with the EMPF.

At provincial level: The PPMUs are responsible for preparing and implementing the EMDPs. Appropriate staff and budget – sufficient to implement an EMDP, should be assured. In case where EM peoples are affected as a result of land acquisition, to allow construction of subprojects, compensation, assistance to EM affected will be addressed through relevant RAP which is prepared for the establishment of the FMC in accordance with the project's RPF.

Responsibility for preparation and implementation of EMDP are as follows:

- a) The general responsibility of the elaboration and implementation of the EM policy framework belongs to the Central Program Management Unit Office (CPMU). The CPMU shall employ safeguards consultants (placed in all PPMU 6 ER provinces) in close coordination with such relevant agencies as Ministries/ Departments at Central level, People's Committees at the Provincial, District and Commune level involved in the ER-P and affected communities to prepare the EMPF. This EMPF will be approved by the MARD and cleared by the WB prior to the time of Agreement Negotiation.
- b) The EMDP of each FMC will be prepared with the assistance of an external expert based on the principles of the EMPF and the ER-P will cover the costs of this assistance. It is unreasonable for a specific SERNA leading to the establishment of the FMC to cover such costs. This is different with the compensation that would be paid as a result of involuntary resettlement under the RPF because it is the FMCs agreed upon measures that would trigger possible involuntary resettlement impacts. The ER-P PPCs will be responsible for approving and ensuring that the EMPDs are implemented.
- c) The Management Board for Forest Projects under MARD, shall be responsible for ensuring effective implementation of the EMPF and the EMDPs in close consultation to the same level departments and Program provinces.

7 Costs and budget

The budget for the EMDP implementation will be estimated during the EMDP preparation based on specific activities proposed for each EMDP. The EMDP will define and provide budgets for the implementation. Based on the existing proposed designed of the ER-P the SERNA, which will be undertaken in ethnic minority villages in and around the FMEs will be funded by the proposed advance the GoV will seek from the Carbon Fund.

The cost estimates for each of these 60 SERNA (based on the number of FMEs in the ER-P area) are currently being prepared. It is likely that costs for the SERNA will be approximately US\$15,000 or US\$900,000. For the participation of ethnic minority villages in FMC activities participation in regular meetings of elected village level representatives are included in the annual FMC budget, which is estimated at US\$10,000 per annum per FMC or US\$3,600,000 during the implementation period of the ER-P.

An additional US\$100,000 per FMC for the promotion of climate smart agriculture and sustainable livelihoods to be made available on a revolving grant basis will incur expenditure during the implementation period of the ER-P of US\$6,000,000. Thus, the estimated total for all implementation activities will be US\$10,500,000. The Financing Plan, which is yet to be fully agreed upon and is based on an advance from the Carbon Fund will identify the agreed costs and budget. However, it needs to be noted that not only forest-dependent ethnic minority households will benefit from the activities the ER-P.

However, the budget identified above is for the implementation of the FMC and there will be a yet to be quantifiable number of FMCs. For FMCs that will involve more than one ethnic minority group it is very difficult at this stage to determine what costs would be involved. As a guide the FCPF through an international indigenous people's organization is funding the preparation of an SERNA leading to the establishment of an FMC involving Thai and Hmong ethnic minority groups living in the buffer zone of the Pu Hu Nature Reserve in Muang Lat District and this has cost in excess of US\$50,000 but the objective here has to been to demonstrate international good practice. It is likely that other iterations of EMDP preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation are likely to be less in the vicinity of US\$5,000 to US\$7,500 depending on the size and complexity.

Funding source

The costs of EMDP implementation will be allocated from the budget of the FMC based on payments received from the Carbon Fund although if an EMDP is required in the first two years of the FMC establishment then the PPC will need to provide advance funding. For this reason, FMCs will be requested to consider how they will fund any necessary EMDP implementation prior to it being funded.

8 Annexes

8.1 *Annex 1- Summary of Main Issues Related to ER-P and Ethnic Minorities*

8.1.1 *Details of Consultations with Ethnic Minority Groups in the ER-P Provinces*

Consultation Purposes

1. Please note that details of the consultations in each locality have been included in each of the issues but where some issues are not relevant (e.g., Hmong perceptions of the forests that are quite different to those of other upland ethnic minority groups: all of whom with the exception of a small group of Lao are indigenous to Vietnam OR infrastructure development associated with hydropower development has not impacted upon specific localities – in Quang Tri and Quang Binh – the extant issue was not considered important by ethnic minority groups who were consulted).

2. Consultations undertaken in March and April 2017 in Trung Dung District in Nghe An Province and Muang Lat District in Thanh Hoa Province were undertaken at the request of the World Bank to ensure issues germane to the ACMA and BSM were understood by the least marginalized (the Thai) and the most marginalized (the Hmong). However, all three socio-linguistic groups were included by virtue of the fact that the Kho Mu (belongs to the Mon-Khmer socio-linguistic group) were consulted.

3. Facilitators were as follows: (i) Mr Nga Ha Huu, Social Anthropologist, FCPF; (ii) Mr Phoung Phamxuan, Legal Specialist (ACMA/BSM), FCPF; (iii) Ms Ha Nguyen, GAD Specialist, Winrock, VFD Program; (iv) Ms Hai Ly Thi Minh, Livelihood Specialist, SNV, VFD Program; (v) Mr Le Trung Thong, Social Safeguard Specialist, FCPF; Mr Christopher Turtle, CTA, FCPF and STC, World Bank; and Mr Shane Tarr, BSM/Social Participation Specialist, VFD, Winrock and STC, World Bank.

Group discussions aim at: i) Providing information on the ER-P (Emissions Reduction-Program) ii) Learning about the EMs' advantages and disadvantages in participation in the ER-P; iii) Learning about the roles of the EMs' traditional and present institutions in participation in the ER-P.

Consultation Contents

- Socio-Cultural characteristics of different forest-dependent ethnic minority groups;
- The social and economic importance of forests and other natural resources in the livelihood systems of these ethnic minority groups;
- Structural and cultural constraints to be able to participate in the ER-P and how these can be overcome;
- How different ethnic minority groups would participate in benefit-sharing arrangements proposed by the ER-P; and
- The role of women in the ER-P and whether different ethnic minority groups approach gender participation in such processes differently.

Consultation Methods

- Consultations with the key Program stakeholders, including Provincial Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, Protection Forest Management Boards, District Forest Protection Department, the Provincial and District Department for Ethnic Minority Affairs. District/Commune Women Unions.
- For group discussions at, affected and unaffected EM people were chosen from various household groups, by living standards, genders, and ages. Each group included 15 – 20 participants. A social specialist guided them during the discussions and documented discussed information. People discussed freely under the specialist’s guidance, without any external intervention or constraint.

| |
|---|
| <p>ISSUE 1: There is generally a good deal of dissatisfaction expressed by all ethnic minority groups in relation to access to the forests for the following reasons: (i) restrictions now in place to prevent extracting logs for housebuilding; (ii) boundary disputes; (iii) conflicts in relation to the over-exploitation of NTFPs; (iii) arbitrary imposition of penalties for breach of existing forest protection laws; and, (iv) very low contract fees for forest protection services.</p> |
| <p>ISSUE 2: We love the forests because of their spiritual value, indicator of our cultural identity, very important source of livelihood and environmental reasons (protection against drought and soil erosion) but our traditional knowledge is not valued by many managers of the forests who claim scientific and technical knowledge is more important than traditional knowledge accumulated and transmitted from one generation to the next. The forests no longer belong to us even though we and our ancestors have been living in and off the forests for such a long time.</p> |
| <p>ISSUE 3: LURCs for natural forest land are of no use to us because we cannot use them as collateral to finance investments in other income-generation activities or provide for other important cultural investments such as marriage and funerals. However, LURCs for land classified as production forest land are important and for this land we would like to be issued with LURCs.</p> |
| <p>ISSUE 4: We are being sacrificed in the name of national development because the hydropower companies through the flooding of both agricultural and forestry land that we on for our livelihoods cannot really compensate us for our losses but we are always told we will be better off economically and socially. This is simply not true.</p> |
| <p>ISSUE 5: It is increasingly difficult to sustain our traditional livelihoods based on being just dependent on the forests and our younger men and now even younger women are leaving the village in search of waged employment in the cities and more developed lowland areas of even the same province.</p> |
| <p>ISSUE 6: We know little or nothing about REDD+ and do not understand what is meant by reducing carbon emissions but if the GoV wants us to participate in this Program it needs to explain more carefully what it entails and how we will benefit. However, from what we have been told we will only get benefits based on results and we cannot afford to provide emission reduction activities and wait for 2,3,4 or more years to be paid how much. This is very unclear. At least under other GoV programs we have some idea as to what the monetary benefits are.</p> |
| <p>ISSUE 8: We would be very happy to work with existing forest management enterprises if they also showed us respect as people who depend on the forests and were genuinely interested in better management practices that we could also benefit from but we also have to be convinced that the FMEs really want to work with us.</p> |
| <p>ISSUE 9: If the Program is going to provide monetary benefits on an individual basis and only to those that provide services, such as forest protection services, we are not very interested because how will older people, physically handicapped people or women with young children benefit? Rather unless there were very significant payments per annum (>VND5,000,000) the preference is for the benefits to be shared on a community basis.</p> |
| <p>ISSUE 10: There is the need to use available land to grow crops for which there is a market, especially cassava and maize, but yields are still very low compared to those that the Kinh can achieve because they have a better knowledge of how to grow such crops using high-yielding crop varieties and are more skilled in dealing with trading intermediaries who are mostly Kinh. If this Program could assist us to increase yields by whatever means possible we will ensure that we are not responsible for clearing natural forest land.</p> |
| <p>ISSUE 11: Livestock raising is still very important for both economic and cultural reasons. Economically because it is like having money in the bank and can be converted to cash if there is a major crisis in the household and culturally because during community-based ceremonies the sharing of livestock products is very important to maintain good</p> |

relations with each other. We will not enthusiastically support any Program that tries to discourage us from raising livestock.

| Location | Date | Ethnic Group/s | No of Participants | Gender |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| Hong Trung A Luoi Thua Thien Hue | 04/11/2015 | Ta Oi | 23 | M:10; F:13 |
| Hong Tra A Luoi Thua Thien Hue | 05/11/2015 | Ta Oi | 18 | M:07; F:11 |
| A Roang A Luoi Thua Thien Hue | 06/11/2015 | Co Tu | 25 | M:14; F:11 |
| Hong Ha Nam Dong Thua Thien Hue | 08/11/2015 | Pa Hi | 20 | M:8; F:12 |
| | | Bru Van Kieu | 07 | M:5; F:02 |
| A Vao Da Krong Quang Tri | 10/11/2015 And 11/11/2015 | Co Tu | 29 | M:13; F:16 |
| Ta Rut Da Krong Quang Tri | 12/11/2015 And 13/11/2015 | Bru Van Kieu | 25 | M;09; F:16 |
| Vinh Ha Vinh Linh Quang Tri | 15/11/2015 | Bru Van Kieu | 21 | M:12; F:09 |

| | | | | |
|---|------------|--------------|----|------------|
| Vinh Khen | 16/11/2015 | Bru Van Kieu | 23 | M:11; F:12 |
| Vinh Linh | | | | |
| Quang Tri | | | | |
| Truong Son | 18/11/2015 | Bru Van Kieu | 26 | M:13; F:13 |
| Quang Ninh | And | | | |
| Quang Binh | 19/11/2015 | | | |
| Trong Hoa | 21/11/2015 | Chut | 30 | M:14; F:16 |
| Minh Hoa | And | | | |
| Quang Binh | 22/11/2015 | | | |
| Son Tay | 25/11/2015 | Lao | 25 | M:12; F:13 |
| Huong Son | And | | | |
| Ha Tinh | 26/11/2015 | | | |
| Huu Kiem | 01/03/2016 | Kho Mu | 21 | M:10; F:11 |
| Ky Son | And | | | |
| Nghe An | 02/03/2016 | | | |
| Tam Quang | 03/03/2016 | Hmong | 25 | M:23; F:02 |
| Tuong Duong | And | | | |
| Nghe An | 04/03/2016 | | | |
| <i>(Additional Consultations Facilitated to Ensure Hmong Women Could Participate)</i> | 05/03/2016 | Hmong | 18 | Women Only |
| | and | | | |
| | 06/03/2016 | | | |
| Chau Hoi | 07/03/2016 | Tho | 25 | M:11; F:14 |
| Quy Chau | And | | | |
| Nghe An | 08/03/2016 | | | |
| Mon Son | 10/03/2016 | O'Du | 20 | M:09; F:11 |

| | | | | |
|-------------|------------|--------|----|------------|
| Con Cuong | And | | | |
| Nghe An | 11/03/2016 | | | |
| Quynh Chau | 12/03/2016 | Thai | 32 | M:12; F:20 |
| Quynh Luu | And | | | |
| Nghe An | 13/03/2016 | | | |
| Pha Dan | 15/03/2016 | Thai | 25 | M:10; F:15 |
| Ky Son | And | | | |
| Nghe An | 16/03/2016 | | | |
| Luong Minh | 08/03/2017 | Thai | 23 | M:05; F:18 |
| Trung Dung | | Kho Mu | 10 | M:02; F:08 |
| Nghe An | | | | |
| Xien My | 09/03/2017 | Thai | 27 | M:09; F:18 |
| Trung Dung | | | | |
| Nghe An | | | | |
| Yen Na | 10/03/2017 | Kho Mu | 18 | M:06; F:12 |
| Trung Dung | | | | |
| Nghe An | | | | |
| Hien Kiet | 05/05/2016 | Muong | 31 | M:14; F:17 |
| Quan Hoa | And | | | |
| Thanh Hoa | 06/05/2016 | | | |
| Binh Luong | 08/05/2016 | Muong | 25 | M:11; F:14 |
| Nhu Xuan | And | | | |
| Thanh Hoa | 09/05/2016 | | | |
| Van Xuan | 12/05/2016 | Muong | 28 | M:16; F:12 |
| Thoung Xuan | And | | | |
| Thanh Hoa | 13/05/2016 | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------|------------|-------|----|---------------|
| Xuan Phu | 15/03/2016 | Thai | 23 | M:10; F:13 |
| Quan Hoa | And | | | |
| Thanh Hoa | 16/03/2016 | | | |
| Trung Thuong | 18/03/2016 | Thai | 25 | M:13; F:14 |
| Quan Son | And | | | |
| Thanh Hoa | 19/03/2016 | | | |
| Trung Ly | 02/04/2017 | Thai | 21 | M:10; F:11 |
| Muang Lat | And | | | |
| Thanh Hoa | 03/04/2017 | | | |
| Trung Ly | 04/04/2017 | Hmong | 20 | Male Only 20 |
| Muang Lat | And | | | |
| Thanh Hoa | 05/04/2017 | | | |
| Trung Ly | 06/04/2017 | Hmong | 25 | Women Only 25 |
| Muang Lat | And | | | |
| Thanh Hoa | 07/04/2017 | | | |

8.2

Summary of Consultations with PPCs, DPCs, and CPCs

Thua Thien Hue (03/11/2015). Participants included DPC Secretary, Provincial REDD+ Coordinator, CEMA, DARD, DONRE, Farmer's Union and Vietnam Women's Union (M:10; F:03; EMG: 1). Issues that were discussed include the following:

1. EMGs who have always relied on the forests for their livelihoods should be permitted to continue doing so but they must understand that the forests do not belong just to them but all the people in Vietnam. They have to understand their traditional ways of living in and depending on the forests cannot be wholly replicated today.
2. Consensus is that EMGs want to continue doing some logging, but not just for household purposes but as a source of income, and the harvesting of NTFPs is still very important for many EMG households but they need to recognize there needs to be quotas and seasonal restrictions otherwise there will be fewer NTFPs to harvest.
3. EMGs do not want to be issued with LURCs for protection forest because they know they cannot use such LURCs as collateral to borrow money from Vietnam's two main banks that lend money to rural households for both productive and non-productive purposes. What EMGs want – as indeed do the Kinh – are LURCs for production forestry land. They think degraded forest land that can be used for production forestry should never be reforested.
4. Not too many EMG households are really interested in Forest Protection Contracts because VND200,000 per hectare makes it hardly worthwhile to spend the time necessary to protect the forests. It is better to provide a lump sum to specific villages or groups within these villages. Although the problem often is that women do all the work and only adds to their existing workload.
5. EMGs in A Luoi and Nam Dong do not know much about REDD+ although in Nam Dong they are a little bit more aware because JICA has a program that supports technical issues associated with REDD+. But is most unlikely that ethnic minority women, except those directly associated with VWU know anything at all about REDD+.
6. There is some limited awareness of shared management approaches among some EMGs because of the Bach Ma Project that was first implemented in 2010. However, we are not sure what a collaborative approach to forest management would involve.
7. It is extremely unlikely that any EMG would agree to provide services in the proposed Program and then to be paid based on results. Not only would they find this difficult to believe but very few of these households could afford to provide services without some form of advance payment.
8. EMG people have quite a different concept of benefit sharing than the Kinh. Most EMG believe that everyone must share in any benefits, whether monetary or non-monetary, because this is part of their traditional culture.

Quang Tri (09/11/2015). Participants included Deputy Chairperson, Provincial REDD+ Coordinator, DARD, DONRE, CEMA and Vietnam Women's Union (M:08; F:02). Issues that were discussed include the following:

1. The two EMGs in the province – Bru-Van Kieu and Ta Oi – have similar traditions relating to the use of forests but the Ta Oi are more outwardly orientated and it is easier to discuss sustainable forest management issues with them. However, both EMGs place great emphasis on the sacred nature of forests.
2. Bru-Van Kieu living in or near the Dak Rong Nature Reserve often have conflicts with the SUF management and the Trieu Hai SFC over access to the forest for harvesting NTFPs because both the SUF and SFC claim many Bru-Van Kieu are simply interested in logging and try and hide this from both managements. But the situation is a little better with the Ben Hai SFC although if EM HH's are consulted they initially say everything is okay and then later complain quite a lot.
3. EMGs don't want LURCs for Protection Forest Land. They only want access to and use of the forests without being punished by the FMEs. In the past the problem only involved HHs in close proximity to the FMEs but now with motorcycles no distance is too great.
4. There is some knowledge of REDD+ in Dak Rong because REDD+ has been quite active in this district but there is a significant difference between what EMG men understand and what EMG women misunderstand. Indeed, by-and-large the EMGs do not understand the objectives of REDD+. Emissions reduction is an abstract and esoteric concept to them.

5. Benefit sharing arrangements for the EMGs are quite different than they are for the Kinh. The latter believe that if you do actively share in forest protection activities you should receive no benefits unless of age and physical capacity whereas the EMGs believe everyone irrespective of their inputs is entitled to share in any benefits that accrue.

Quang Binh (19/11/2015). Participants included Chairperson, Provincial REDD+ Coordinator, DARD, DONRE, CEMA, Vietnam Women's Union and Fatherland Front (M:11; F:4). Issues that were discussed include the following:

1. Like Quang Tri the Bru-Van Kieu is the major EMG in the province and the other EMG is the Chut, which originally migrated to the province during the American War. The major difference between the two EMGs is that the Chut are less sedentary than the Bru-Van Kieu and claim less stewardship over the forests.
2. Allocating natural forest land is one thing but owning it is another thing. Neither EMG want to be issued with an LURC for forest land they cannot exploit. However, they do seek to have LURC issued for production forestry land because they look upon it as a fungible asset.
3. The world-famous UNESCO Phong Nha-ke Bang National Park is located in the province and both Chut and Bru-Van Kieu live in the buffer zone. Whether they constitute a threat to the NP is open to question. But we have introduced a benefit sharing arrangement whereby these villagers receive monetary benefits. It is unknown how much per hectare the ER-P will provide but clearly nowhere near as much in per capita terms as what we have now. There is a mixture of monetary payments on an individual household basis and village basis.
4. In relation to co-management or collaborative management – and we have a good idea as to the difference between the two – we are not sure we would agree with the approach being suggested unless it can be demonstrated it would result in a “win-win” for all stakeholders.

Ha Tinh (24/11/2015). Participants included Vice-Chairperson, REDD+ Coordinator, DARD, DONRE, Ethnic Minority Affairs Officer (non-CEMA), DPI and VWU M:14; F:05. Issues that were discussed include:

1. The province has the least number of ethnic minority people of all six provinces but the three groups – Thai, Muong and Lao – are not so different to one another. They all know what the forest landscape once was but recognize that times change and with degraded forest land it is better to derive some form of livelihood from. So, neither the PPC or we think local EMG would support a program that required the reforestation of such land. Reference should be made to our PRAP.
2. EMGs do not want LURCs for forest land they cannot effectively utilize and by this they mean being able to log the forest, harvest NTFPs in the absence of a quota and graze livestock. This is not a criticism of EMGs but rather a statement of their cultural and economic practices. Such practices are grounded in traditions that date back to a period long before the Kinh moved to upland areas.
3. EMGs are looking for ways to enhance their upland cropping productivity and are open to any demonstrations that can be upscaled and replicated. However, they appear a little unwilling to embrace what has worked in the lowlands – different agro-ecological context is recognized – although if they see Kinh in the upland areas increasing their cropping productivity they are interested in following suit. The good thing about the three EMGs in Ha Tinh is that they do not feel patronized by the Kinh.
4. In relation to co-management we are not sure how this would work according to the design of the ER-P. To us the design is still a little unclear but in this province, we do have some experience with co-management and it has worked reasonably well.
5. For benefit sharing arrangements the three EMGs are likely to prefer a situation where the village or groups within the village receive monetary benefits that could provide something useful (e.g. improved social or physical infrastructure) for the group rather than individuals. However, it is not possible to be sure until there have been focused consultations with EMGs.

Nghe An (29/02/2016). Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Provincial REDD+ Coordinator, DARD, DONRE, CEMA, DOF, DPI, Farmer's Organization and Vietnam Women's Union (M:15; F:5). Issues included:

1. We have a variety of EMGs in the Province. The most problematic because of their approach to sustainable forest management are the Hmong but the most conservative are the very small O'Du and the larger Kho Mu and Tho EMG. The Thai by way of contrast, are relatively well-integrated into mainstream Vietnamese society.
2. The forest is important to all five EMGs but with recent developments in the province, including the one of the world's largest dairy farms, these forest-dependent households now have more income-generation opportunities than in the past. There has also been the conversion of degraded forest land into rubber even though some of this land was occupied by EMGs they have for the most part not invested in rubber tree cultivation. Part of the reason is that they are also risk-adverse.
3. Like elsewhere the EMGs do not want LURCs for forest land they cannot exploit. Rather they want to ensure they have LURCs for production forestry land. But few are interested in extending the production cycle from 5 to 10 years even though they understand the economic benefits.
4. There is very little knowledge of REDD+ at the district or commune level let alone the village level, except where the VFD program has been active. In Thai villages the women have participated in REDD+ information sessions but not in other EMG villages for the most part. The most problematic EMG in this respect are the Hmong because their women are largely excluded from participation in activities in the public domain.
5. In this province we do not have much experience with initiatives whereby FMEs work with local village communities so this is uncharted territory for us. It would be interesting to see what EMGs have to say about this because to the best of our knowledge we have never raised this issue.
6. Any benefit sharing arrangement needs to differentiate between monetary and non-monetary benefits and between whether benefits are distributed on an individual household basis or collective basis but we think for the EMGs the collective is likely to be more important than the individual basis.
7. It is highly unlikely that any EMG will involve themselves in activities proposed by this Program if they are required to provide these services upfront and be paid on performance over which they have very little control. This is not the same as growing an annual or semi-annual agricultural or longer-term industrial crop or engaging in agro-forestry, where of course there are risks but are generally more manageable on an individual household basis.

Thanh Hoa (05/05/2016). Participants included Vice-Chairperson, REDD+ Coordinator, DARD, DONRE, DPI, DOF, SBV, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization and VWU (M:13; W:7). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. There are seven EMGs in the Province and they constitute nearly 18% of the total population. Four of these EMGs – Muong, Thai, Dao and Tay – while culturally different to one another are more integrated into mainstream Vietnamese society than the other three – Hmong, Tho and Kho Mu – with the Hmong being the least well integrated and more likely to cause problems in forested areas of the province than other EMGs.
2. All EMGs access the forests where they can, including the SUFs, to harvest NTFPs and also in some instances to engage in “illegal” or “consensual” logging. Because there has not always been clear boundary differentiation there are also some households living within the boundaries of the FMEs and the latter, especially the SUFs are reluctant to forcibly move such households. They recognize that with a shortage of arable agricultural land such households have to eke out a living somehow. If the Program could address such issues it would be very good.
3. EMGs are reluctant to spend much time ensuring that forest protection contracts actually result in actions to protect the forest. It is not because the EMGs do not love the forests but rather the payments are too low and there are other income-generation activities where in 2016 agricultural workers can earn up to VND 200,000 per day for up to four to six months of the year.
4. EMGs do not want LURCs for protection forest land for the same reason they do not want them anywhere else in Vietnam. What they want is LURCs for Production Forestry Land but even here there can be some problems. For instance, in Muang Lat one of the poorest districts in the province, the VFD Program undertook a detailed cadastral survey and LURCs were issued to beneficiaries. However, the Hmong did not want the LURCs for production forestry as they argued they could not afford to wait five years let alone ten years and sought to use the allocated land for agricultural cropping purposes (maize and cassava).
5. The province has some experience with forms of co-management and benefit sharing and is interested in seeing how this Program will work. It thinks a pilot program to cover PFMBs, SUFs and SFCs should be implemented and see how they perform. However, they do not think the Program should seek to introduce new structures.

6. They do not accept that any EMG is prepared to provide services to reduce carbon emissions and wait 2,3, 4 or more years to be paid based on results. Their concern is who measures, reports and verifies the performance of FMEs and villagers. They argue that while villagers are not experts they do know the forests and it would be less than satisfactory if local villagers were not involved in MRV activities.

A Luoi DPC (03/11/2015), Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, A Luoi PFMB, Tien Phong SFC, Head Forest Ranger, DARD, DONRE, Ethnic Affairs Officer, VWU, Fatherland Front and Commander Border Security Force (M:10; F:03). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. During the American War this district was ravaged because of fighting being as it was strategically located with the Ho Chi Minh Trail passing through the district. It was bombed but more importantly Agent Orange was used and there are many areas of the district that were once arable that are no longer arable.
2. The Ta Oi and Co Tu are still heavily dependent on the forests for their livelihoods, although it is more difficult to harvest NTFPs than in the past and now many households have at least 1 or more members employed as waged workers or in some other non-land based income generation activities.
3. Forest Protection Contracts are provided to groups rather than individuals and the PFMB does try and ensure payments for these contracts are made promptly. However, it is still necessary to check that these groups do actually work according to the terms of the FPC.
4. There is no demand for forest land to be allocated on an individual household basis because everyone knows this is impossible according to the Land Law but there is the demand for land used for production forestry to be legally allocated and an LURC issued. The issue is whether these LURCs can be issued to a group or only on an individual household basis.
5. The EMGs are well versed in traditional forest management practices but not so much in modern forest management practices and we hope that the link can be made between traditional and modern forest management practices.
6. At the commune level no-one knows much about REDD+ - they know a bit more in Nam Dong where JICA has been active but communes affected by HPP are aware of PFES and while they appreciate that payments are better than nothing they still don't think the loss of natural or production forest land is compensated for by PFES.
7. Benefit sharing is agreed with in principle but how is it going to be implemented. We are not really aware as to how the proposed ACMA approach would work and need sensible explanations that can be understood in the context of A Luoi.

Hong Trung and A Roang CPCs (05/11/2015). Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer (M:10; F:03). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. Co Tu and Ta Oi forest-dependent households while living in different villages from each other have a similar understanding of the forests but the degree of dependency depends on where the village is located. There are some hotspot areas where deforestation has occurred although on a much lesser scale than during the American War.
2. LURCs for forest land that is protected are of very limited use but very useful for land that is being used for production forestry. However, one of the problems in both communes is that existing LURCs often do not have the name of husband and wife. This is both illegal and renders wives more vulnerable than they should be.
3. Forest protection contracts are good in principle but the payment of VND200,000 per hectare is too low and there need to be greater monetary incentives than offered at present.
4. There is no knowledge of REDD+. The district has not communicated with us and we have seen no mention on TV or the print media: so, what is REDD+?
5. There is no way any villager will engage in activities described under REDD+ without an advance payment. Being promised payments in the future but with no clear indication of amount per tonne or when payment will be made is unsatisfactory. It is necessary to understand the nature of risk-adverse behaviour.
6. If the Program could bring together the people living in the villages of the commune with the FME to resolve outstanding issues and enter into a long-term partnership that would be very positive.

Hong Ha CPC (08/11/2015), Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Office. (M:06; F:02) Issues discussed were as follows:

1. The two EMGs living in the commune are the Pa Hi and Bru Van Kieu. Both traditionally could be described as forest dwellers but now even though they still depend on the forests to some extent for land-based livelihood activities they are more dependent on agricultural cropping and some production forestry than the forests.
2. There is some information about REDD+ but we do not fully understand what is to be achieved except we know that where possible the Program will assist localities to better manage existing forests.
3. LURCs for forest land are of no use and households would be opposed to LURCs being issued to entities to exploit the forests. However, households involved in production forestry do value LURCs especially if higher value production forestry can be achieved with longer rotations. Without the LURCs such households cannot seek finance to tide them over for the additional years to lengthen rotation.
4. Everyone is now talking about climate smart agriculture but so far, no practical information has been disseminated by DARD in the commune but if the Program could truly support such an initiative it would be welcome.
5. Closer cooperation between the FME and our commune is a very good idea. Actually, the FME is not antagonistic to us or negative but lacks the resources to enable real cooperation to take place.
6. Benefit sharing arrangements should be on a collective rather than an individual basis because we have been told on an individual basis they will be quite small but on a collective basis they could be worthwhile.

Da Krong DPC (10/11/2015), Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Dak Rong-Huong Hoa PFMB, Trieu Hai SFC SFC, Head Forest Ranger, DARD, DONRE, Ethnic Affairs Officer, VWU, Fatherland Front and Commander Border Security Force (M:10; F:03). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. Consultations have been undertaken concerning REDD+ with both EMGs and Kinh who are dependent on the forests, although the Kinh dependency is on production forestry rather than subsistence-based dependency on the natural forests.
2. Some of the EM villages have not responded positively because they have a litany of complaints against the Tien Phong SFC but the latter disputes this because it has FSC Certification and would not have it if it behaved the way such villagers have stated.
3. Villagers who are harvesting NTFPs are not chased out of the PMEs so long as they are not grossly exploiting NTFPs but they are arrested if they are caught being involved in illegal logging but some villagers are very clever and extract a tree here-and-there and it is hard to pinpoint which individual or group was involved.
4. Many of the households are not interested in cooperating, especially with the SFC because they claim they are never listened to but the FMEs do try and reach out to villagers so this is unfair allegation.
5. Villagers want land allocated for agricultural cropping purposes and complain that trees are more important than people but of course it is people that destroy the forests.
6. LURCs for protection forest land are not sought after but villagers would like Forest Protection Contracts that enable them to gain exclusive right to harvest NTFPs from this allocated forest land and engage in logging for domestic construction purposes.
7. EMG women are far less active in relation to the VWU than Kinh and when the VWU tries to mobilize EMG women to discuss issues associated with sustainable forest management few of these women are interested in participating.
8. A priority in this district is to reduce the conflict between the FMEs and local forest-dependent villages, especially those in and around the actual FMEs.

A Vao CPC (11/11/2015) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer. (M:06; F:02) Issues discussed were as follows:

1. Relations between the SFC and local communities is very poor. The SFC does not trust local people and local people think the SFC is arbitrary and capricious and refuses to understand the extent of real poverty among most of our village households.

2. Have been told that REDD+ is going to improve the situation but just how will REDD+ do this. It cannot even tell us how much we will be paid per tonne to mitigate carbon emissions or when would we get paid. It is necessary to understand the socio-economic situation of our villages.
3. Allocating LURCs for production forest land only really benefits the Kinh because EM households in our villages have neither production forestry land or the investment finance (for the most part) to ensure that production forestry yields a good return.
4. Important to understand that women are the primary harvesters of NTFPs and actually know more about the forests than most men. So, if there is to be a reliance on also utilizing traditional knowledge and actually targeting the major users the focus has to be on women although not to the exclusion of men.
5. Benefits need to be shared on a community basis and not an individual household basis. It is important to understand that the collective organizations of EM villages and strong notions of egalitarianism set these villages off against the Kinh villages.

Ta Rut CPC (13/11/2015) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer. (M:08; F:02) Issues discussed were very similar to those discussed by the A Vao CPC:

1. Relations between the PFMB and local communities is very poor. The PFMB does not really trust local people and local people think the PFMB is more concerned with what happens at the provincial and national level.
2. Have been told that REDD+ is going to improve the situation but just how will REDD+ do this. It cannot even tell us how much we will be paid per tonne to mitigate carbon emissions or when would we get paid. It is necessary to understand the socio-economic situation of our villages.
3. Allocating LURCs for production forest land only really benefits the Kinh because EM households in our villages have neither production forestry land or the investment finance (for the most part) to ensure that production forestry yields a good return.
4. Important to understand that women are the primary harvesters of NTFPs and actually know more about the forests than most men. So, if there is to be a reliance on also utilizing traditional knowledge and actually targeting the major users the focus has to be on women although not to the exclusion of men.
5. Benefits need to be shared on a community basis and not an individual household basis. It is important to understand that the collective organizations of EM villages and strong notions of egalitarianism set these villages off against the Kinh villages.

Vin Linh DPC (15/11/2015) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Thach Han PFMB, Ben Hai SFC, Head Forest Ranger, DARD, DONRE, Ethnic Affairs Officer, VWU, and Fatherland Front (M:10; F:04). Issues discussed are as follows:

1. Bru Van Kieu are sometimes very difficult to work with in relation to forest management issues. They have a very narrow understanding of who the forests belong to and think because they have lived in or near the forests for such a long-time they have rights to the forests that other people do not have.
2. Forest protection contracts are provided to EM households on an individual, group and community basis but generally these households do not want to actively protect the forests because the work is very difficult and the payment per hectare is very low.
3. Ben Hai SFC goes out of its way to treat forest-dependent households both equitably and transparently but too many households do not appreciate the efforts of this SFC.
4. Conflicts over a range of issues – boundary demarcation, access to forests for limited logging for household purposes and harvesting of NTFPs, punitive measures to keep local villagers out of the village, and lack of communication – are not easily resolved but if the Program could contribute to a reduction in conflict that would be a very positive outcome.
5. It cannot be expected that households will participate in the Program and support activities that lead to a reduction in carbon emissions without some upfront advance payment.

Vin Ha and Vinh Khen CPCs (17/11/2015) Participants included Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer. (M:15; F:6) Issues discussed at this combined consultation were as follows:

1. Bru Van Kieu not necessarily that difficult to work with. Of course, they think differently to the Kinh or an EMG like the Thai but difficulties arise when they find they have been locked out of accessing resources they have used for a very long time.
2. SFC has a very good policy on paper to engage communities living in forested areas that it manages but in practice it actively tries to stop individual villages from anything but the restricted harvesting of NTFPs. If they hear of or see villagers felling trees for whatever purpose they are very quick to respond.
3. Communes should work with the FMEs, whether PFMBs and SFCs, to derive more benefits for village households but the latter also have to desist from engaging in activities, such as forest land conversion for agricultural cropping or other purposes. EMGs are not always innocent and FMEs are not always guilty.
4. There is the need to have in place a formal mechanism that enables benefit sharing arrangements but so far, we have not been told what may be permitted although traditionally the Bru Van Kieu like to share any benefits on an equitable and transparent basis with every household.
5. Serious attempts should be made to understand the perspectives of the Bru Van Kieu but also expose them to modern technical and scientific knowledge on how best to manage the forests and also how to engage in income-generation activities that do not destroy the forests.

Quang Ninh DPC (18/11/2015) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Quang Ninh PFMB, Head Forest Ranger, DARD, DONRE, Ethnic Affairs Officer, VWU, Fatherland Front and Commander Border Security Force (M:10: F:03). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. Bru Van Kieu are the only EMG in the district. However, they constitute nearly 30% of the rural population, are more likely to be dependent on the forests than the Kinh and the poverty rate is a staggering 86.3%, which is amongst the highest poverty rates in Vietnam. This EMG is even poorer because there are diminished forest resources, there is little or no suitable agricultural cropping land and little non-land based income generation activities.
2. The PFMB is aware that something has to be done with this EMG but is not sure how to ensure it can assist in reducing the poverty rate. 30a is supposed to have been off assistance and it is in terms of infrastructure development but this has yet to move people out of poverty. Is it possible for REDD+ to be off assistance?
3. Reaching out to this EMG is not easy because it has a very different conceptualization of how to use natural resources than the Kinh and even the DPC. The EMG representatives on the DPC concur on this matter.
4. There are limited opportunities to provide Forest Protection Contracts and even when they are offered the communities often agree but then do not actively ensure that activities identified in the FPCs are actually undertaken.
5. EMG women know more about the forests than EMG men because they spend more time harvesting NTFPs but also because they understand very clearly that logging is not beneficial for most households. Thus, it is hoped that the Program will devise a strategy to ensure women are active participants.
6. As with elsewhere this EMG wants to share benefits on a collective rather than individual basis but it is unlikely to support the Program if it is wholly results based and they have to wait to be compensated for their contribution.

Trung Son CPC (18/11/2015) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer. (M: Issues discussed were as follows:

1. Over 78% of the commune population are designated as living in poverty but in reality, all households in the rural villages are living in poverty. Thus, effectively we are talking about a situation where any project or program has to target all households if it claims to be reducing poverty.
2. Unsure as to how the Program is going to reduce poverty but as a start it should focus on hotspots in or near the PFMB. Very poor households need to engage in whatever activities, including illegal logging to meet both daily needs and longer-term expenditure needs including for culturally specific rituals.
3. The PFMB is actually looking at ways to reach out to the commune and if this Program can be off assistance that would be very good. Whether the PFMB will agree to local communities being on the management board remains to be seen. We understand very well that the PFMB also has limited resources.
4. Issuance of LURCs is not the real issue for the very poorest households. Rather they either want to be allocated land they can undertake agricultural activities on or supported for production forestry. Of the

two agriculture is more important because it can contribute far more quickly to household food security.

5. This EMG does not culturally support benefit sharing agreements that are targeted at individual households but rather benefit all households, even if some households are unable to provide any services that will trigger the BSA.

Minh Hoa DPC (21/11/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Truong Son PFMB, Head Forest Ranger, DARD, DONRE, Ethnic Affairs Officer, VWU, Fatherland Front and Commander Border Security Force (M:15: F:04). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. Chut are the only EMG in the district. However, they constitute nearly 20% of the rural population, are more likely to be dependent on the forests than the Kinh and the poverty rate is over 80% but in reality, we think all Chut households are living in poverty.
2. 30a is assisting with attempts to move these EMG out of poverty but because it focuses on infrastructure development to a greater extent it does not address the poverty of real forest-dependent households.
3. There has to be an approach that addresses the over-exploitation of NTFPs. The Chut state they do not harvest more NTFPs in the past but the real point is that there are fewer NTFPs remaining because of past practices.
4. Some Chut men are logging on behalf of outside buyers who have provided them with chainsaws and this practice needs to be halted but when these men and their families see money in the household coffers they are not going to willingly stop being involved in this practice.
5. Within the boundaries of the PFMB some land has been cleared for agricultural cropping and while it would be good if it were to be reforested we need to worry about how those involved will be able to protect their livelihoods.
6. Chut women are rendered almost invisible and it has been observed that if they can be involved in any program this will generate benefits for the household as they understand the forests much better than men.
7. EMG women know more about the forests than EMG men because they spend more time harvesting NTFPs but also because they understand very clearly that logging is not beneficial for most households. Thus, it is hoped that the Program will devise a strategy to ensure women are active participants.

Huong Son DPC (25/11/2015) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Huong Son PFMB, Tien Phong SFC, Head Forest Ranger, DARD, DONRE, VWU, Fatherland Front and Commander Border Security Force (M:10: F:03). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. The only EMG in the district is the Lao. Ha Tinh is the least ethnically diverse of any of the programs involved in the program. Many people think the Lao are quite similar to the Thai so what applies to the Thai also applies to the Lao. We do not think this generalization is accurate and such assumptions should not be made.
2. The Lao are the most forest-dependent households in the District but poverty levels among the Lao are similar to poor Kinh households. This is in marked contrast to the situation that prevails in other upland areas of other provinces in the program.
3. It should be understood that the Kinh and the Lao have a similar understanding of and experience in the forests because both depend on it to the same extent, especially if poor. So, the emphasis in our opinion should be on trying to understand forest-dependent households based on poverty rather than ethnicity in our district.
4. Households know that to escape poverty it is necessary to be less dependent on the natural forests and more dependent on sources of income derived from production forestry, upland agricultural cropping and non-land based income generation activities.
5. At the district level we know little about REDD+ but at the commune and village level even less is known about REDD+. However, there is no way any household will agree to provide support to this program unless they are compensated and right now there is not much information.
6. Relations between the PFMB and local communities are reasonable although there is some misunderstanding as to the entitlement of households to gain physical access to the forests and harvest NTFPs. If the program could improve upon the existing situation it would be welcomed by the District.
7. Benefit sharing is quite complex. With the Lao they are likely to want to share with all households irrespective of individual contributions to activities designed to support emissions reductions but the Kinh are more likely to argue contributions equal benefits: non-contributions equal no benefits. However, the situation has to be understood after real investigations.

Son Tay CPC (25/11/2015) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Forest Ranger. Issues discussed were as follows:

1. The poorest households are typically the most forest-dependent households but there are not many examples of these households breaching conditions relating to access to and use of the protection forest. However, in the past a significant amount of original forest land was lost due to logging and conversion of this land into agricultural land.
2. Households would be happy to be involved in the program if it can be demonstrated that there will be real benefits but they will not provide services for which payment terms are not clear nor can they afford to provide such services without at least some upfront payment.
3. LURCs for production forest land are welcomed but any proposal to promote longer rotations must be agreed upon and it is necessary to understand the economic circumstances of each individual household.
4. Climate-smart agricultural activities are also welcomed but there is lack of clarity as to what exactly is climate-smart agriculture. People look upon agricultural activities as the most important land-based activity to support their livelihoods.
5. In relation to benefit-sharing the Lao are more interested in benefits being shared collectively than on an individual basis although the Kinh, especially poorer Kinh households, are not much different.

Huu Klem CPC (01/03/2016 and 02/03/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer (M:7; F:4). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. We agree with the Ky Son DPC on what interests the Kho Mu the most but we don't blame the Kho Mu because in the past this livelihood system worked quite well for them. Of course, the Kho Mu are economically better off than in the past even if they are poorer than the Kinh but socially they are not as well off.
2. Changing the way, the Kho Mu graze cattle is not that easy. Even if we can demonstrate that their animal health improves as a result they point out that it is cattle from the lowland that have diseases such as foot-and-mouth disease.
3. It is important to reach out to the Kho Mu and the FMEs can better manage the forests if they can co-opt forest-dependent Kho Mu households.
4. The program would be very good if it could encourage Kho Mu women to speak up because we know they have a very good understanding of the forests.
5. For the Kho Mu benefit sharing is on a collective rather than individual basis and this would need to be how benefits would be shared as part of this program.

Tuong Duong DPC (03/03/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Tuong Duong PFMB, Head Forest Ranger, DARD, DONRE, Ethnic Affairs Officer, VWU, Fatherland Front and Commander Border Security Force (M:12; F:05). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. The Hmong are quite difficult to work with, at least in relation to the forests because they are not grounded in the forests the way other EMs are. This does not mean we are critical of the Hmong but have to recognize their different ideas than those of other EMs.
2. The question is can Hmong be mobilized to manage the forests the way other EMs can? The answer to this question is not straight-forward because Hmong women, who harvest most of the NTFPs have a better knowledge of the forests than Hmong men. But Hmong women are not encouraged to participate in public meetings.
3. The Hmong are more interested in upland agricultural cropping than other EMGs and over time have become very competent upland agriculturalists. However, can REDD+ assist these households increase their yields while at the same time not destroying remaining forest cover.
4. It is very hard to convince the Hmong to sign forest protection contracts because they are unimpressed with the existing payment rates per hectare.
5. It is unclear as to whether the Hmong would agree to participate in activities associated with the proposed program unless they were to receive upfront payments but actually they are not different in this respect to any other EMG or even the Kinh.
6. Benefit sharing arrangements among the Hmong are clan-based and would be collective in nature rather than on an individual household basis.

Quy Chau DPC (07/03/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Quy Chau PFMB, Head Forest Ranger, DARD, DONRE, Ethnic Affairs Officer, VWU, Fatherland Front and Commander Border Security Force and Chau Hoi CPC (M:18 F:05). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. The Tho are a significant EM in the district. They rely on the forests for their livelihoods but not to the exclusion of other land-based livelihood activities associated with agricultural cropping and livestock rearing. Very few Tho households are involved in production forestry activities.
2. Occasionally, the FME complains about encroachment by the Tho but the latter point out this is only because they cannot meet household subsistence needs by simply relying on agricultural land outside areas managed by the FME.
3. If the program can bring the FME and the Tho households together and resolve issues relating to access to and use of the forest resources it will be very positive.
4. The Tho are interested in benefit sharing agreements that could possibly lead to an improvement in their livelihoods but on a collective rather than individual basis.
5. If it is possible to enhance the participation of Tho women this will be good for everyone including Tho men as Tho women are very knowledgeable about the forests.

Mon Son CPC (10/03/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer (M:08; F:03). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. The O'Du are more interested in raising cattle and letting them free graze in the forest than spending too much time protecting the forest. They see cattle as like having money in the bank and it is difficult to explain that while this practice in the past might have been alright it is no longer alright.
2. PFMB complains that time-and-time again they have to remind offenders that their cattle should be corralled and not permitted to roam freely. Every attempt is made to demonstrate that the Kinh have healthier cattle than the O'Du but the latter reject this and argue their cattle live longer than those of the Kinh and taste better when slaughtered.
3. However, it is very important that the O'Du can be co-opted to better manage the forests because without their cooperation the forests will not be effectively managed. It is not appropriate to conserve the forests by preventing the O'Du from entering the forests and using some of their resources, especially the NTFPs but they also be permitted to extract up to 10m² of forest trees for domestic purposes but only for house building.
4. For the O'Du benefit sharing is on a collective rather than individual basis and this would need to be how benefits would be shared as part of this program.
5. It would be good if women were provided with a voice because the women know more about the forests than the men and their knowledge should be appreciated by the program.

Ky Son DPC (10/03/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer (M:08; F:03). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. The Kho Mu are more interested in raising cattle and letting them free graze in the forest than spending too much time protecting the forest. They see cattle as like having money in the bank and it is difficult to explain that while this practice in the past might have been alright it is no longer alright.
2. PFMB complains that time-and-time again they have to remind offenders that their cattle should be corralled and not permitted to roam freely. Every attempt is made to demonstrate that the Kinh have healthier cattle than the Kho Mu but the latter reject this and argue their cattle live longer than those of the Kinh and taste better when slaughtered.
3. However, it is very important that the Kho Mu can be co-opted to better manage the forests because without their cooperation the forests will not be effectively managed. It is not appropriate to conserve the forests by preventing the Kho Mu from entering the forests and using some of their resources, especially the NTFPs but they also be permitted to extract up to 10m² of forest trees for domestic purposes but only for house building.
4. For the Kho Mu benefit sharing is on a collective rather than individual basis and this would need to be how benefits would be shared as part of this program.
5. It would be good if women were provided with a voice because the women know more about the forests than the men and their knowledge should be appreciated by the program.

Yen Na CPC (10/03/2017) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer and Heads of Villages in the Commune (M:15; F:4). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. The Kho Mu are more interested in raising cattle and letting them free graze in the forest than spending too much time protecting the forest. They see cattle as like having money in the bank and it is difficult to explain that while this practice in the past might have been alright it is no longer alright.
2. PFMB complains that time-and-time again they have to remind offenders that their cattle should be corralled and not permitted to roam freely. Every attempt is made to demonstrate that the Kinh have healthier cattle than the Kho Mu but the latter reject this and argue their cattle live longer than those of the Kinh and taste better when slaughtered.
3. However, it is very important that the Kho Mu can be co-opted to better manage the forests because without their cooperation the forests will not be effectively managed. It is not appropriate to conserve the forests by preventing the Kho Mu from entering the forests and using some of their resources, especially the NTFPs but they also be permitted to extract up to 10m² of forest trees for domestic purposes but only for house building.
4. For the Kho Mu benefit sharing is on a collective rather than individual basis and this would need to be how benefits would be shared as part of this program.
5. It would be good if women were provided with a voice because the women know more about the forests than the men and their knowledge should be appreciated by the program.

Quan Hoa DPC (05/05/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Quan Hoa PFMB, Head Forest Ranger, DARD, DONRE, Ethnic Affairs Officer, VWU, Fatherland Front and Commander Border Security Force (M:10: F:03). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. Any program that contributes to better forest management practices while simultaneously ensuring that forest-dependent households improve their livelihoods we support. For instance, the CLIP activities supported by TSHPP are working quite well in villages affected by that project although there is not much emphasis on enhancing production forestry.
2. REDD+ needs to enhance the participation of forest-dependent households with an emphasis on the participation of women as they really do know more about the forests than men and this fact is not denied by most men although it is not evident in practice.
3. Allocating natural forest land for forest protection services is fine but at present the payment rate per hectare is so small there is a marked reluctance by most households to sign such contracts or if they do they do not spend much time honouring their contract.
4. Benefit sharing arrangements need to be on a collective basis because this is how the Muong maintain effective social relations with other Muong. In this respect they are somewhat different to the Kinh because the latter believe that those who do not provide any contribution – unless aged, physically handicapped or simply too young – should not receive any benefits.
5. The program needs to assess what the current status quo is in relation to access to and use of existing forest resources. The district lacks the resources to do so as does the FME.
6. Activities that are to be supported need to be demand driven. The program simply cannot require whatever activities it deems suitable to be supported although it is recognized that a menu of options is very helpful.
7. The program needs to be more effectively publicized so that everyone is aware as to what it entails. At present only, a few of the DPC members and a few CPC members have any knowledge of REDD+.

Hien Kiet CPC (05/05/2016) Planned consultations involving the CPC were not possible due to administrative misunderstanding but FCPF-REDD+ discussed the Program with the Vice-Chairperson, Assistant Party Secretary and VUW. (M:2; F:1) Issues discussed as follows:

1. All households irrespective of their ethnicity are facing hardship in this commune. It is no accident we are included in the 30a Program and while this is better than nothing it has had a limited impact on moving households out of poverty.
2. Can REDD+ assist in moving people out of poverty? We actually think land-based livelihood activities are less effective for reducing poverty than waged employment in a place like Thanh Hoa City or Haiphong or even the industrial estates in Southern Vietnam.
3. Program should encourage FMEs and local communities to work together and for too long there has been too much emphasis on technical aspects of forest management than social aspects of forest management. The trees need protecting but only people can protect them.
4. A good benefit sharing mechanism needs to be put in place so benefit sharing arrangements involving community groups to protect the forests will work. At present forest protection contracts are near worthless because villagers do not like them.

Nhu Xuan DPC (12/05/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, A Luoi PFMB, Tien Phong SFC, Head Forest Ranger, DARD, DONRE, Ethnic Affairs Officer, VWU, Fatherland Front and Commander Border Security Force (M:09: F:03). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. In the past when the forests belonged to the Muong they were sustainably managed by the Muong but this was in the days when there were no roads and limited external demand for natural forest. This is not the situation today and it is incorrect to argue that by handing back the forests to their original inhabitants would be a positive step forward. We simply disagree with such an approach but we do agree that it is necessary for the FME and local communities to work together to better manage the forests.
2. The REDD+ Program is not very well known or understood by any of us at the district level. We have been to one seminar in Thanh Hoa, which was quite good but we need ongoing exposure to knowledge about this program. Perhaps the media should be encouraged to publicize the program.
3. Good ideas we have for this program include resolving conflicts between FMEs and the villagers, worthwhile forest protection contracts, equitable and transparent benefit sharing arrangements and clarification of user rights.
4. The program could support what we have come to learn is climate-smart agriculture, which is a great idea if it can increase yields while at the same time be associated with deforestation free production models although it must be remembered that the two best performing upland crops are maize and cassava.
5. We would like to know when this program will be implemented, how long will it run for, what activities it will support, and what monetary and non-monetary benefits will flow to the commune and its villages.

Binh Luong CPC (09/05/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer and Heads of Villages in the Commune (M:10: F:2) Issues discussed were as follows:

1. The Muong in the commune generally comply with the law in relation to a prohibition on logging in the protected forest unless there are areas that are degraded through deforestation and then they will seek on an informal basis to engage in agricultural cropping. We are worried that if the program chooses to support reforestation activities – and for the sustainable management of forests this is necessary – what will happen to such households. The commune has a small buffer but it is insufficient to meet the requirements of all these households.
2. If the program can bring together the owners and managers of the forest with the users this is a very positive outcome. Owners and managers need to listen to and understand the perceptions of the Muong and the latter have to reciprocate. One positive outcome could be if Muong women were to be represented. They know more about the forests than men although the latter probably have a somewhat better grasp of non-traditional knowledge.
3. Benefit sharing arrangements are very important. Right now, there is over-exploitation of NTFPs, not because people are deliberately over-exploiting this resource but through increased population pressure over the past five decades. It is a very good idea to undertake a natural resource assessment and look closely at all practices. If the program can support this it would be very good.
4. Payments for services, such as forest protection activities, can be negotiated on an individual household basis but are more effective if negotiated on a group or community basis and this is what the Muong normally prefer.
5. The program needs to understand that results-based payments without some form of advance payment will be resisted by all villagers and as a commune we will not lend our support to a program that refuses to make some upfront payments.

Thuong Xuan DPC (11/05/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, DARD, DONRE, Thuong Xuan PFMB, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Border Security Officer (M:12; F:3). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. There are some instances where EMG households have resorted to agricultural cropping in areas managed by the FME. These EMG households claim the land is degraded and the FME has done nothing to reforest it but has also turned a blind eye to their actions. The FME response is that it understands these households are poor and have no other choices but asks the question what can the program do to remedy this situation.

2. Issue here is not allocating protected forest land to EMG households but whether or not they can be allocated more land for production forestry or agricultural cropping. If households are given the choice they will opt for the latter because food security is important. Support for longer production forest rotations will work for non-poor Muong but not for poor Muong. What will work for the poor Muong are sensible interventions to improve the productivity of agricultural cropping.
3. It is important to develop some mechanism to effectively link communities with the FME and if the program could support this we think it would be very useful. It does not matter whether the monetary benefits from reducing carbon emissions are great but more importantly what are the non-monetary benefits.
4. It is anticipated based on existing cultural practices that benefit sharing arrangements should be targeted at groups within communities or the whole village community but for activities associated with forest protection contracts arrangements on an individual household basis could work although it can be observed then that all the work with the exception of forest patrolling is left up to women.

Van Xuan CPC (12/05/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer and Heads of Villages in the Commune (M:15; F:4). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. Forest-dependent households are very interested in engaging with the FME to improve relations between themselves and the FME. The biggest issue is related to boundary demarcation disputes and access to the forests to harvest NTFPs and log up to 10m² for household and community construction purposes.
2. Those households engaged in production forestry would like to extend the rotation period but at present cannot because they lack access to affordable finance and the VBSP is reluctant to consider whether such households could service their loans, even very low interest loans. The VBSP prefers to lend for livestock raising because it can see that the income stream is quantifiable on a periodic basis.
3. If the proposed program could support land-based income generation activities, especially increase in yields for maize and to some extent cassava there would be very strong support from most households.
4. Benefit sharing needs to be on a community-wide basis not on an individual household basis although some households are able and willing to enter into household-based forest protection contracts.

Quan Hoa DPC (14/03/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, DARD, MONRE, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU, District Security Officer, Head Forest Ranger and Some Commune Heads (M:20; F:6). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. The Thai is the major EMG and largely have good relations with the Kinh and indeed there is quite a bit of inter-marriage so the EMGs and the Kinh will have no problem cooperating with the FME if a new organization is established.
2. The district has worked very hard to ensure all households have LURCs that conform to the Land Law and you will find that every LURC issued includes the name of husband and wife. No-one wants an LURC for good forest land because they value the forests but they would like for badly degraded forest land. We do not think reforestation of such land will be viable.
3. It is important to reduce carbon emissions although in Vietnam this would be surely more effective if they focused on the big cities such as Hanoi, Haiphong, and Ho Chi Minh. But we commit ourselves to supporting the program although commitment also has to be matched by a clear statement as to what benefits will we derive from the program.
4. Benefit sharing arrangements should be directed towards the community rather than on an individual household basis because as we understand the monetary benefit per tonne will not be very great. However, good benefit sharing practices with the harvesting of NTFPs would be very useful. We are getting to the stage now where NTFPs are being over-exploited.
5. The program should attempt to value the traditional knowledge of the Thai because they, especially the women have a very deep knowledge of the forests but this does not mean modern scientific and technical knowledge related to forest management should be ignored.

Xuan Phu CPC (15/03/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer and Heads of Villages in the Commune (M:18; F:6). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. Poorer Thai rely on the forests to a greater extent than less poor Thais. If there is any encroachment it is generally by poorer households because they lack irrigated rice land in the river valleys. So, the hotspots are in villages in the buffer zones of the FME. It is a very good idea to target these villages to

provide them with activities so they can reduce the need to engage in livelihood activities that impact upon the forests.

2. People in the commune love the forests. They love the physical landscape and recognize that the good protection of the forests saves them during times of drought or heavy rain and also prevents landslides. But the forest also conveys a sense of spirituality that only the Thai can understand.
3. It is a very good idea if the program can foster a greater degree of cooperation between the FME and local communities and everyone in the commune, including women would be more than happy to participate.
4. Benefits should be shared on a collective and equitable basis and the people in the commune villages value transparency.
5. People will not participate in program activities, such as providing effective forest protection services, without a clear indication of how much they will be paid and some form of advance payment. This is not a specific cultural characteristic but reflects the risk-adverse strategy that is necessary for survival.

Trung Thuong CPC (18/03/2016) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer and Heads of Villages in the Commune (M:20; F:7). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. The major EMG in this commune is the ethnic Thai. They rely to varying degrees on the forests with the 50% who are living in poverty more likely to be forest-dependent than the non-poor who are largely non-poor because they have river valley rice fields, some have plantation forestry and most of the non-poor households now have at least one household member working in one of the industrial estates in Vietnam.
2. PFMB complaints about households are not very great although there is some encroachment and from the past there have been some instances where natural forest has been logged by some Thai households and converted to agricultural cropping land.
3. There is a good system of LURCs in this commune and all households have an LURC with the name of husband and wife included for at least the house and garden land and those with river valley rice land or upland production forest land also have LURCs. No-one wants an LURC for natural forest land because it is not a fungible asset.
4. There is a good sense of cooperation among the ethnic Thai and they coexist very well with the Kinh. Thus, form some form of co-management whereby the FMB and local communities join together is quite realistic. This would be likely to reduce what few conflicts there are, notably boundary demarcation disputes and the over-exploitation of NTFPs.
5. Benefit sharing arrangements should be on a collective basis because the Thai prefer to share benefits among all community members but any attempt to encourage households to render services for the program without some form of advance payment will be resisted.
6. Extending production forestry through longer rotations has a lot of value but households involved have to assess whether they can forego income resultant from such an extension. If financial support available from VBSP and VBARD this would work.

Muang Lat DPC (02/04/2017) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer and Heads of Communes (M:25; F:06). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. Limited information on REDD+ but because of the VFD Program there is some information available. DPC supports the objectives of REDD+ and hope that program not only contributes to the sustainable management of existing forests but also assists in moving people out of poverty.
2. LURCs are only for production forestry land but as can be observed some households are not interested in production forestry and simply want LURCs to be issued for agricultural cropping purposes. It is understood that food security is important but it is also important for future generations that climate change issues are addressed.
3. It is hoped that the Trung Son HPP via its CLIP activities can enable communes and villages to benefit from climate-smart agriculture, access VBSP and ABARD for financial support, and improve the value of maize and cassava (two crops that are very important in Muang Lat)
4. Ethnic differences are not a barrier to cooperation and we are very confident that the two major ethnic groups – Thai and Hmong – can work together with the commune and district management entities.

5. Benefit sharing arrangements are very good. This is what is required to ensure the sustainability of our forests but we will have to work hard to identify sensible options although it is likely that benefit sharing on a collective basis is going to be more effective.
6. Overall looking at REDD+ we think there are a range of monetary and non-monetary benefits that will improve the lives of forest-dependent communities and look forward to be part of the program.

Trung Ly CPC (03/04/2017) Participants included Chairperson, Party Secretary, Fatherland Front, Farmer's Organization, VWU and Commune Security Officer and Heads of Villages in the Commune (M:12; F:2). Issues discussed were as follows:

1. The Hmong are generally living at higher elevations than the Thai and spend less time in the forests than the Thai although in reality both EMGs rely to varying degrees on the forest.
2. VFD assisted the CPC undertake cadastral surveys of degraded forest land and issued LURCs to both Hmong and Thai. The Hmong do not want restrictive LURCs – were told they could only engage in production forestry – while the Thai said they would agree to such restrictions because they had other land for agricultural cropping.
3. A considerable number of both EMGs were affected by the Trung Son HPP and CLIP interventions are underway but so far, no linkage with REDD+ although there is real interest in climate smart agricultural interventions.
4. It is possible for Thai and Hmong despite their socio-cultural differences in this commune to work together but the real problem is how to involve Hmong women because they face cultural constraints on participation that Thai women do not.
5. For benefit sharing arrangements it is easy for the Thai. They are only interested in collective forms of benefit sharing but for the Hmong it is quite unclear as some favor collective sharing while others favor an individual approach.
6. Forest protection contracts would be welcome if the program could arrange for a higher fee per hectare to be paid.

NOTE

Where a district or commune is not listed above this is because consultations were not able to be held with either the district or commune because of non-availability of staff for whatever reason. However, in the details of consultations on a village-by-village basis in the previous list the actual commune where consultations were facilitated is identified.

8.3 Annex 2 - Outline and Elements of an EMDP

Executive Summary

This section describes briefly the critical facts, significant findings from the social assessment, and recommended actions to manage adverse impact (if any) and proposed development intervention activities on the basis on the social assessment results.

I. Description of the Proposed ACMA Intervention/s

This section provides a general description of the goals, components, potential adverse impact (if any) at the commune and village level levels. Make clear the identified adverse impact at two levels – project and sub-project.

II. Legal and institutional framework applicable to EM peoples

III. Description of the sub-project population

1. Baseline information on the demographic, social, cultural, and political characteristics of the potentially affected EM population, or EM's communities.
2. Production, livelihood systems, tenure systems that EM may rely on, including natural resources on which they depend (including common property resources, if any).
3. Types of income generation activities, including income sources, disaggregated by their household member, work season;
4. Annual natural hazards that may affect their livelihood and income earning capacity;
5. Community relationship (social capital, kinship, social networks)

IV. Social Impact Assessment

This section describes:

1. Methods of consultation already used to ensure free, prior and informed consultation with affected EM population in the sub-project area.
2. Summary of results of free, prior and informed consultation with affected EM population. Results includes two areas:
 - 2.2. Potential impacts of the proposed interventions (positive and adverse) on their livelihoods of EM in the sub-project area (both directly and indirectly);
 - 2.2. Action plan of measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for these adverse effects.
- 2.3. Preferences of EM for support (from the project) in development activities intended for them (explored through needs assessment exercise conducted during the social assessment)
- 2.4. An action plan of measures to ensure EM in the ACMA area receive social and economic benefits culturally appropriate to them, including, where necessary, measures to enhance the capacity of the local project implementing agencies.

V. Information Disclosure, Consultation and Participation:

This section will:

1. Describe information disclosure, consultation and participation process with the affected EM peoples that was carried out during sub-project preparation in free, prior, and informed consultation with them;
2. Summarizes their comments on the results of the social impact assessment and identifies concerns raised during consultation and how these have been addressed in sub-project design;
3. In the case of ACMA activities requiring broad-based community access and support, document the process and outcome of consultations with affected EM communities and any agreement resulting from such consultations for the sub-project activities and safeguard measures addressing the impacts of such activities;
4. Describe consultation and participation mechanisms to be used during implementation to ensure Ethnic minority peoples participation during implementation; and
5. Confirm disclosure of the draft and final EMDP to the affected EM communities.

VI. Capacity Building:

This section provides measures to strengthen the social, legal, and technical capabilities of (a) local government in addressing EM peoples issues in the sub-project area; and (b) ethnic minority

organizations in the ACMA area to enable them to represent affected Ethnic minority peoples more effectively.

VII. Grievance Redress Mechanism:

This section describes the procedures to redress grievances by affected Ethnic minority peoples. It also explains how the procedures are accessible on a participatory manner to Ethnic minority peoples and culturally appropriate and gender sensitive.

VIII. Institutional Arrangement:

This section describes institutional arrangement responsibilities and mechanisms for carrying out the various measures of the EMDP. It also describes the process of including relevant local organizations and NGOs in carrying out the measures of the EMDP.

IX. Monitoring & Evaluation:

This section describes the mechanisms and benchmarks appropriate to the sub-project for monitoring, and evaluating the implementation of the EMDP. It also specifies arrangements for free, prior and informed consultation and participation of affected Ethnic minority peoples in the preparation and validation of monitoring, and evaluation reports.

X. Budget and Financing:

This section provides an itemized budget for all activities described in the EMDP.

(ANNEXES including maps of the locations of EM communities; EM poverty maps and the others)

8.4 *Annex 3 The Adaptive Collaborative Management Approaches (ACMA) and social inclusion of ethnic minority groups*

8.4.1 *ACMA structure and processes*

The ACMA structure is not designed to replace the existing management structures of the forest management entities but rather to complement them by facilitating far greater levels of collaboration between managers and users that generally exists at present. The six provincial REDD+ coordinators in the ER-P will over the next six months explain to forest management entities how they can benefit from ACMA and what processes they need to follow to ensure that the principles of ACMA will be deeply embedded in the BSMs and BSPs. Eligible and prescribed activities need to be discussed with these forest management entities. For instance, most activities already budgeted for in ODA projects and programs, significant infrastructure development, procurement of major expense items, basic staff salaries and office-running expenses, poverty reduction programs, physical displacement and resettlement of households, academic studies or activities that involve modification to the natural habitat are to be prescribed. Permitted activities would include BSM resource surveys and agreements, participatory boundary demarcation, community communication activities, awareness-raising activities, village-based forest protection teams and small-scale, demand driven livelihood improvement activities that address the major drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.

Each of the forest management entities buying into ACMA will work with the Provincial REDD+ PPMUs (the PPMU would be expected to appoint a REDD+ coordinator) and the local DPCs and CPCs to ensure that the processes described in the next section from the initial land use resource survey to the actual sharing of benefits can be implemented. The Provincial REDD+ Coordinators will be the link between ER-P at the ACMA level and both the provincial and national level. This Coordinator will also be represented on the ACMA and would have the power of veto over ACMA decisions if they were contrary to the objectives of the ER-P agreed upon by each ACMA.

As a first step the ACMA will include two to three representatives of the forest management entity including the person responsible for outreach to the villages identified by the CPCs as being most responsible for deforestation and forest degradation, Secondly the ACMA will include three representatives of the DPC – the chairperson or his or her nominee, the officer tasked with agricultural and forestry issues, and the cadastral officer – and at least one CPC official (preferably the member with the best “hands-on” experience of deforestation and forest degradation. Working on the assumption based on the average of 10 villages in each of the buffer zones, a woman and man from each of these villages will be elected by other adult villagers. It is also likely that mass organizations, especially the Vietnam Women’s Union and Fatherland Front together with an Ethnic Affairs Officer (if one exists), will be represented. This means that each ACMA could have up to 31 members who will meet at least quarterly and monthly to begin with (or more often if required) to discuss and approve ER-P related activities. While a female quota is disavowed given that there will be 10 women representatives from the villages and at least one VWU women will be much better represented than they are at present.

The chairperson of the ACMA will be the DPC chairperson or his or her nominee. This person will not be responsible for the day-to-day activities of the ACMA but as the designation implies to chair meetings. The reason for this is that the existing forest management entities have no legal jurisdiction over agricultural land unless it has been “legally” or otherwise forest land that was converted into agricultural land since at least when the first Land Law was passed in 2001. Because ER-P activities involve both forestry and agricultural land the DPC has to be involved. Of equal importance if existing forest land is to be allocated to individuals and households at the village level only the DPC, which acts on behalf of MONRE, is legally empowered to issue LURCs. Therefore, the linkage between the ACMA and DPC is very important. In relation to the CPC it is also very important because it will identify villages that are most responsible for deforestation and forest degradation and also in terms of payments for forest environmental services it is the lowest administrative entity (unless villages establish legally incorporated cooperatives) that payments from national or provincial government can be made.

At the village level, as explained above a woman and man representative will be elected by other villagers to serve on the ACMA. These two representatives will be the link between the ACMA and the village and will be mandated to bring to the attention of the ACMA the concerns of their constituents in the village and discuss with their constituents, decisions that were made or will be made by the ACMA. The ACMA will also have at its disposal one participation expert who will spend most of her or his time in each of the 10 villages providing outreach services on matters relevant to ER-P concerns. Villagers will also be able to hold formal or informal meetings with this participation expert to also raise any concerns they have and to consider any feedback this expert might provide. This is actually a very innovative approach that ACMA is offering because on an iterative basis it means each of these villages will be visited at least once every 6 to 8 weeks as part of the ER-P, which is something that has not occurred in the past with traditional rural development projects and programs. Moreover, it requires that villagers who were less likely to be consulted in the past including most women and other vulnerable persons must be consulted.

The day-to-day activities of the ACMA will be managed by the existing forest management entities but they will be bound by the decisions reached at ACMA meetings in relation to activities that have been agreed upon. For instance, the forest management entity cannot fund activities targeted at the non-poor households in a specific village where pre-existing criteria exists, as it will be, to target the poorest 25 households, nor can it fund activities that have not been approved by the ACMA. It can also not make a unilateral decision not to fund a specific village because it has received reports that activities meant to be regulated such as the over exploiting NTFPs or poaching wildlife or engaging in illegal logging. At present the PFMBs and SUFMBs can take unilateral action against both individual households within such villages or the whole village. With ACMA it is necessary to raise such issues at both the village and ACMA meeting level because based on the individual village BSA it is likely that an agreement had been reached in relation to quotas on NTFP harvesting, a moratorium on wildlife poaching, and under what circumstances is logging permitted.

The ACMA will be required to make financial decisions consistent with activities permitted within the scope of the BSM. For instance, the ACMA cannot make significant public infrastructure investments

such as investments in energy generation projects, procure major expense items such as vehicles, generators or air conditioners or pay for basic staff salaries and office running expenses (with the exception of the salary of the participation specialist and expenses directly related to ACMA and BSM). The estimated budget for each ACMA on an annual basis would be up to US\$3,000- 5,000 which includes the salary, travel expenses and board and lodging for the participation specialist and costs associated with the monthly ACMA meetings that includes participation fees for elected village members and DPC, CPC and mass organization's representative's participation fees. These are to be paid in accordance with cost norms that prevail in each ER-P and are also designed to ensure that opportunity costs for village members are included. The last provision is important because otherwise it would be very difficult for poor villagers to present themselves at the village level for election to the ACMA.

8.4.2 *Interventions to address drivers*

The major drivers of deforestation and forest degradation that will be addressed by ACMA and will be reflected in the BSPs that will be signed between each of buffer zone villages identified as hotspots by the CPCs. As indicated elsewhere payments for forest environmental services (not to be confused with PFES) will be made based on agreements reached between the ACMA and individuals, households, groups or even villages. The exact modalities will depend on the ACMA and the approach agreed upon by the members of the ACMA who will be bound by the stated preferences of villagers based on a combination of inputs and performance based outputs. The BSM does not require a design that is super-imposed upon all ACMA but rather the design reflects local conditions based on the premise that not "one shoe will not fit all feet": this is where the BSM differs from PFES. A template is being offered but what is included in the template is reflected by ACMA-based decisions.

However, to ensure that the BSM does address drivers and also targeted at the poorer and more vulnerable groups that are more likely to be forest-dependent than non-poor and less vulnerable groups the BSM will include a grant mechanism of US\$15,000 per management entity per annum or US\$1.36 million per annum for the 69 management entities or US\$13.36 million over the ER-P implementation period. These grants will be for livelihood improvement activities either inside or outside the forest. The grants can take the form of a one-off investment or they can be rolled over thereby increasing the value and utility of the initial grant. They are also designed to bring about a modest reduction in poverty and thus the grants will ensure poorer households do not become poorer as a result of ER-P and will also where necessary serve to restore incomes of these poor households that might be affected by the ACMA decision to reconvert agricultural land into forest land.

Inside the forests interventions may include, depending on the locality linking local communities collecting rattan, bamboo shoots, wild yam, forest mushrooms, cardamom, cinnamon, anise, honey, aromatic and medicinal herbs such as ginseng and stephania, and plants producing natural vegetable oils more effectively to local markets. At present supply chains are dominated by trading intermediaries who rely on NTFP harvesters knowing little or nothing about actual demand for such products, especially for environmentally and health conscious local and international consumers. It is difficult to quantify the financial benefits from adding greater value while also simultaneously adopting a more sustainable approach to the harvesting of NTFPs but in some instances, such as for forest mushroom or a medicinal herb such as stephania if households can move beyond the forest-edge in the sale of their NTFPs prices paid should at least rise by 50% or more. No support will be provided too individual, households or groups that collect either endangered fauna or flora as defined by Vietnam's own environmental laws or its accession to international environmental conventions.

Outside the forests there are a range of interventions that are likely to work based on work undertaken by IFAD among upland ethnic minority groups in the Northern Mountainous Region of Vietnam. Interventions that are considered most suitable for poor households include eel-raising, artichoke tea, local pigs, black bone chickens, goat-raising and ginger. These activities carry a low risk of failure and are relatively inexpensive to finance. Activities not considered suitable for poor households include hybrid pig breeding, which is a perennial favourite of projects attempting to restore incomes lost by households affected by infrastructure projects in upland areas. The proposed interventions, even though

they also need to be demand driven and based on specific conditions that prevail in each of the impacted villages, are designed to be pro-poor in delivery and it will be the poorer and more vulnerable households that buy into the interventions. Quantifying these benefits, it is assumed that an average of 24 households per village with average agricultural land-holdings of 0.5 hectares or 12 hectares per village or 120 hectares per ACMA or in the ER-P area 8,400 poor and vulnerable households with a total of 64,320 beneficiaries with access to 8,400 hectares will benefit. Additionally, it has been estimated incremental benefits via improved non-forest based productivity increases will be in the order of 30%.

8.4.3 *Linking ACMA stakeholders*

The following procedural steps will be followed by the management entities to link with other ACMA stakeholders and BSP beneficiaries and are partly based on procedural steps many SUFMBs are aware of based on how managers of the SUFs were linked with village users of the SUFs. The essential difference being is that the emphasis is on collaborative management not co-opted management:

- DPCs agree to participate in the ACMA and identify the communes that are considered to be the hotspots for deforestation and forest degradation. It is unlikely that DPCs will know which villages in the buffer zone are actual hotspots but they will certainly know which communes can be considered hotspots.
- It is assumed that CPCs will agree to participate in the ACMA and identify the villages that are considered to be the hotspots for deforestation and forest degradation. CPCs agree to participate in the ACMA and identify the villages that are considered to be the hotspots for deforestation and forest degradation.
- Local villages identified as hotspots for deforestation and forest degradation also need to buy into ACMA and because there are greater numbers of village level stakeholders involved (women and men, aged and young, poor and non-poor, and different ethnic minority groups but also some Kinh ethnic village communities) to secure free, prior and informed consent (for environmental, displacement and ethnic minority development issues) the most participatory consultations (e.g. such as focus group discussions and village transects) at times convenient for all village people need to be facilitated.
- BSM Resource Survey and subsequent agreement on issues such as forest boundary demarcation, access to forests by users including whether quotas for collecting NTFPs are necessary and limited logging for housing structure purposes will need to be undertaken. The outcome should involve forest management entity staff in BSM preparation and principles of ACMA for natural resource use, BSM baseline survey on resource needs and existing resource availability that will serve as a forest resource inventory survey, documenting the status of the forest resources and results disseminated through a process of negotiation.
- BSM Social Screening undertaken to identify the poorest and most vulnerable households based on degree of forest dependency that identifies ethnicity, demographic features, health and education indicators, access to physical and social infrastructure, ownership of agricultural land and income and expenditure patterns.
- Elections in each village community to be facilitated to ensure the two most popularly elected village members (to ensure the participation of at least one-woman representative per village as well) represents the village at the monthly, bi-monthly or extraordinary meetings of the ACMA entity.
- Initial Benefit Sharing Plans drafted outlining how village households will be compensated for opportunity costs associated with the provision of forest environmental services or rights to collect unlimited quantities of NTFP are foregone, provision of both monetary and non-monetary incentives, how legitimacy and support for conservation will be achieved, reduction in the risk of non-delivery of agreed benefits, fulfilment of obligations and reducing elite capture of benefits.

- Any Benefit Sharing Agreement that identified monetary and non-monetary benefits should be prepared within 18 months of Entity Board establishment based on agreed interventions targeted at the poorest and most vulnerable households but in line with the flexible approach of ACMA this BSA can be amended where necessary on condition that it does not propose prescribed activities.
- In line with the ACMA activities to do with reflection on interventions, the actions themselves and what subsequent actions are necessary is not time-bound, with the exception of the interventions targeted at poor and vulnerable households and will depend on negotiated agreements with all ACMA stakeholders.

It is important to stress that the linkages will be maintained on an iterative basis because of the regular meetings of the ACMA and the activities of the ER-P financed Participation Specialist in each of the 10 villages.

8.4.4 *The negotiated Benefit Sharing Plans*

Vietnam already has templates for BSPs such as the BSP that was prepared by the Bach Ma National Park (SUFMB) seven buffer zone villages in Thuong Nhat Commune, Nam Dong District, Thua Thien Hue, which is one of the six ER-P provinces. To develop the BSPs over a period of three months the SUFMB and the seven villages undertook joint investigations into the status of forest land (rich, medium and poor forest, rehabilitated and regenerated forest, and forest land that was now effectively grass-land) and decided what areas should be included in the BSP taking into account the flora and fauna of the forested areas. It was decided by both the SUFMB and the villagers that different types of forests required on different types of use, ranging from rich forest (47.3% of forest land) where only forest protection activities should be undertaken and the hunting of wildlife prohibited to rehabilitated and regenerated forest (constituting 30.4% of forest land): grassland in the SUF was infinitesimal at only 0.2% of forest land.

The household demand for NTFPs and estimated quantities and at what time of the year were discussed and agreed upon between the SUFMB and households (not simply the village head) on an individual basis. Because women based on the joint survey were the main collectors of NTFPs on an almost daily basis they were encouraged to actively participate in all process driven activities leading to the formulation of the BSPs although they were identified as Benefit Sharing Arrangements but the terminology *per se* is not an important issue. The end result was a BSP that defined agreed upon quotas for the collection of NTFPs, the name of each individual or household that signed up to the agreement (unfortunately the name of the female spousal partner was not included but would be included in the BSPs prepared for the ER-P. These BSPs included what months of the year would beneficiaries be involved in the collection of NTFPs (e.g., rattan months 3-9 and 11-12 or honey months 3-7) in relation to flora NTFPs and for fauna NTFPs (e.g., wild pig months 11-12 or forest snail months 1-9) but there were also variations from one village to the next (rattan in another village it was agreed would be collected from months 1-9 and honey months 6-7) or in some instances between different beneficiaries of the same BSP.

To ensure that there would be sustained buy-in from all beneficiaries a series of meetings were convened to discuss such issues as to how the BSP could be supervised and monitored and what level of reporting would be deemed necessary. During these meetings it was recognized that conflicts might arise during the implementation of the BSP and it was considered necessary to discuss the negative impacts (identified during the preparation of the BSPs as the over-exploitation of NTFPs despite the agreed upon quota, local people or illegal loggers taking advantage of the more “open” policy to undertake logging without permission and the hunting of other species not agreed by the BSP participants to be hunted). Such issues would also be raised and discussed with BSPs prepared for the ER-P because ACMA is based on the principles of free, prior and informed consent. Beneficiary agreement also required a shared responsibility for avoiding or mitigating negative activities.

One of the essential differences between the BSMs that were prepared as part of the pilot BSMs targeted at the SUFMBs and buffer zone villages is that the ER-P involves not only these SUFMBs but also the PFMBs and SFCs. This of course is a far more complex undertaking. Additionally, the BSPs that will be designed as part of the ER-P will also be required to identify the poorer and more vulnerable households that will benefit from the commune-managed livelihood interventions that are also non-forest based. However, the most substantive difference is that the BSM of the ER-P, as pointed out above when discussing carbon monetary and non-monetary benefits provide challenges but also opportunities that were not possible with the earlier BSMs. There is a more holistic approach to sustainable forest management based on explicitly recognizing the linkages between agriculture and forestry and why sustainable agricultural activities are also very important to ensure sustainable livelihood developments of forest-dependent households.

Thus while the BSPs will be in part based on the templates prepared for the earlier BSMs because they have proved to be very good at quantifying at least in the context of preventing the over-exploitation of NTFPs, the templates will require more detail. This will need to include the names of all individuals and households (and that includes gender, age and ethnicity), what agricultural and forest land they own (defined by the issuance of a LURC) or utilize legally or “illegally”, whether they have utilized, exceeded or need to utilize the 10m² forest timber ethnic minority groups are permitted for household construction purposes. The BSPs will also need to include what forest environmental services beneficiaries are provided, how much they will be paid and when they will get paid. The BSPs also need to clearly specify how benefits intra-household will be shared not just on a household-by-household basis. Elite capture at the village level is one important social exclusion issue but gender-capture benefits at the household level is a gendered issue within the context of the BSP that should and can be avoided.