



Social Safeguarding Process for Landscape and Jurisdictional Initiatives (LJIs)

May 2024

Acknowledgements

This Guidance has been developed by Proforest with key contributions from Landesa. Proforest would also like to acknowledge all stakeholders who contributed to the improvement of the Guidance through participation in a webinar and survey allowing a better understanding of the current knowledge and gaps regarding current implementation of social safeguards in their landscape initiatives. Particular thanks to Winrock, Earthworm Foundation, Cerrado Waters, WWF-UK and Conservation International which took their time via interviews or written feedback to further complement the document.

This Guidance will be shared with other companies and organisations to promote the wider uptake of these principles, such as through the Consumer Goods Forum's Forest Positive Coalition. There are further plans to pilot the Social Safeguarding Guidance in actual landscapes or jurisdictional initiatives. The findings and implications of the lessons learned through these pilots will be used to adapt and develop a Version 2 of this Guidance.

This Guidance, Version 1 has been funded by Nestlé. Nothing in this Guidance should be construed as implying new legal obligations for Nestlé. While the Guidance is supported by Nestlé, not every element of the Guidance may be endorsed by Nestlé.

Acknowledgments	2
Introduction	4
Understanding safeguarding	5
Importance of social safeguarding in Landscape and Jurisdictional Initiatives	6
Social safeguarding process	6
1. Commitment	6
1.1. Set out a commitment to safeguarding	6
2. Assess and plan	7
2.1. Identify risks of social harm occurring	8
2.2. Develop a safeguarding plan	10
3. Implement	11
3.1. Implement the safeguarding plan	11
4. Monitoring	11
4.1. Responding to negative impacts	11
4.2. Monitor and review	11
Appendix 1: Exercise for Distinguishing Social Safeguards from Human Rights Action in Landscapes	15
Appendix 2: Examples of social harms and associated safeguarding measures	17
Appendix 3: Glossary	16

Introduction

This guidance is for use by organisations implementing Landscape and Jurisdictional Initiatives (LJIs). The scope of this document covers LJIs only.

It describes a globally applicable minimum safeguarding process: laying out the key steps that all initiatives should follow.

The actual safeguards needed will vary considerably between projects, depending on the nature and country of the interventions.

Understanding safeguarding

What is social safeguarding and what are safeguards?

Social safeguarding is a process for protecting people from being harmed by interventions – such as those put in place by a Landscape Initiative - intended to do good. It includes understanding how people might be at risk, what could be done to mitigate that, and how to check that this is happening in practice.

Safeguards are protective measures put in place as part of this process by the organisation(s) that manage the intervention(s) as part of the LJI. All LJIs should have a minimum set of social safeguards in place to ensure negative impacts on human rights and on people involved directly or indirectly are avoided, or at least to minimise the risk.

What about environmental safeguards?

Some organisations include protecting the environment in their safeguarding, and develop guidelines for ‘social and environmental safeguards’. This guidance focuses only on social safeguarding: i.e. protecting people involved in or affected by an initiative – staff, implementing partners and people in target or at-risk communities. This prioritisation responds to a gap in knowledge identified, the desire to support the implementation of commitments made by global companies to respect human rights, and the reality that the majority of LJIs were established with a principle focus on environmental outcomes. A similar set of steps could be followed to reflect on the potential unintended environmental impacts of initiatives, which is beyond the scope of this document.

What is the difference between social safeguarding and taking action to address known human rights issues?

Figure 1. Social Safeguarding vs Taking action on Human Right



Social safeguarding is distinct from taking action to address existing human rights issues (Figure 1). Social safeguarding measures are the minimum steps taken to ensure intervention(s) have **no negative impacts on people**. This contrasts with action at scale to address existing human rights issues, looking at root causes and/or to promote improved livelihoods and wellbeing, within a landscape or jurisdictional initiative.

Even an initiative that is entirely focused on addressing exclusively environmental issues (e.g. halting water pollution or deforestation) should implement social safeguards, as its work could still be associated with unintended negative impacts on people.

However, some Landscape Initiatives are created with the explicit intention to take collective action at scale to address a widespread and/or complex human rights issues such as child labour, or workers' rights, or Indigenous Peoples' land rights, whose root causes considered to be suited to action via an LJI. These initiatives have action to address human rights issues as part of their scope (or main objective). These initiatives also need to implement social safeguards, to put in place measures to ensure there are no unintended consequences of their actions.

Some safeguarding activities may also go some way to supporting addressing existing human rights issues. E.g. An initiative supporting land regularisation of farmers in a landscape would be both a way to address existing land conflicts surrounding ownership and land uses but can also be a safeguard measure to secure long-term loss of access, resources and livelihoods for these same farmers¹.

Importance of social safeguarding in Landscape and Jurisdictional Initiatives

Landscape and jurisdictional initiatives are long-term, place-based, collaborative, multi-stakeholder approaches to realise common goals and positive outcomes for people, nature, and climate. Implementing minimum social safeguards helps an LJI to deliver their goals whilst avoiding harm to the people the initiative interacts with within the landscape. By building trust and avoiding conflict and grievances, an LJI can maintain good relations with the people and communities needed to help deliver the initiative. Adopting minimum social safeguards can also help deliver on requirements of regulation, given growing regulatory pressure to account for human rights in reporting and due diligence. Implementing human rights due diligence is also typically a requirement of international finance investors and donors, who are increasingly supporting LJIs.

Landscape and jurisdictional initiatives face unique challenges in designing and implementing a minimum social safeguarding process, given their numerous interventions and associated impact pathways. At the same time, LJIs offer a wealth of resources, governance structures, knowledge and partners that can be mobilised to develop a safeguarding system and reduce the risk of social harms occurring. The remainder of this Guidance sets out a recommended social safeguarding process which leverages these advantages to support landscape-level safeguarding. The word 'Safeguarding' and 'Social Safeguarding' will be used both interchangeably across this document to refer to the specific mitigation actions for people or safeguarding human rights in general.

¹For more detailed example of the differences, see exercise in Appendix 1.

Social safeguarding process

The recommended safeguarding process for LJI implementers covers four stages (Figure 2). It is important to approach safeguarding as an ongoing, iterative process occurring throughout the lifetime of an initiative rather than a tick-box exercise only conducted at the outset. This process is intended as a generic, globally applicable template, to be adapted to the specific circumstances of each landscape or jurisdictional initiative.

Figure 2. Stages of the recommended safeguarding process for LJIs

Safeguarding Process (Stages)	Sub-stage	Relevant Phase of a LJI ²
1. Commitment	1.1. Set out a commitment to safeguarding	Preparing and commitment
2. Assess and plan	2.1. Identify risks of social harms occurring 2.2. Develop a safeguarding plan to mitigate identified risks	Scoping issues, opportunities and interventions
3. Implement	3.1. Implement the safeguarding plan	Implementation
4. Monitor and report	4.1. Respond to negative impacts (grievance mechanism) 4.2. Report on progress and any grievances or negative impacts 4.3. Monitor and review standards and plan; adapt/adjust as appropriate	Monitoring and reporting

1. Commitment

1.1. Set out a commitment to safeguarding

Setting out a high-level commitment to safeguarding is an important first step. These should commit all implementing partners in the LJI to good practice in safeguarding human rights. Commitments to address specific categories of social risks or issues relevant to safeguarding can help define the scope of this commitment.

Establishing a high-level commitment to safeguarding early on can encourage alignment amongst different partners in the LJI, as well as helping communicate its intentions to stakeholders.

This step may be implemented via a bottom-up participatory process where communities and civil society with experience of different risks share their understanding and needs in safeguarding to be included in the project design. Targeted consultation could form part of this (see Step 2, Section 2.1). This might include hosting workshops, meetings, and other exercises with project partners & stakeholders. Such spaces could also be used to socialise key safeguarding concepts and gain input on the scope of commitments.

Table 1 below draws from international best practice to suggest specific high-level commitments that could be made.

² Nb. This assumes safeguards are being developed for a new or emerging LJI. If the LJI in question is already established and without adequate safeguards it is important to put these in place by moving through all stages as soon as possible.

Table 1. Suggested high-level safeguarding commitments

Critical safeguarding component	Suggested high-level safeguarding commitments
Gender Equality and Women’s Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not directly or indirectly reinforce gender-based discrimination and or contribute to adverse impacts on gender equality or women’s rights, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sexual harassment and/or violence against women, sexual exploitation, or human trafficking – Slavery, imprisonment, physical and mental drudgery, punishment, or coercion of women and girls – Increases to women’s work burden and time poverty – Restriction of women’s rights or access to resources (natural or economic) • Failure to recognise women’s ownership rights (such as due to marital status). • Build awareness about the need for gender equality in natural resources management and sourcing. • Promote balanced gender representation, including supporting women, sexual and gender minorities into decision-making roles. • Monitoring, recording and sharing of outcomes and impacts in relation to gender equality and women’s rights in initiatives.
Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No negative impact on health. • Follow strict Health & Safety procedures, including prevention of spread of communicable diseases (e.g., processes to safeguard communities in case of epidemics/pandemics). • No sexual exploitation, abuse, or sexual harassment associated with initiative activities. • No harassment or discrimination by project staff or subcontractors. • Protection of project staff and subcontractors from harm. • Prevention of child labour in initiative activities. • Ensure living wages for personnel working on projects. • Guarantee safe working conditions for those working in the initiative. • Respect labour rights as laid out in national law and international conventions.
Cultural Heritage, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, Displacement and Resettlement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The initiative shall not involve or be complicit in the alteration, damage, or removal of any sites, objects, or structures of significant cultural heritage without explicit Free, Informed and Prior consent (FPIC) of the relevant communities. • Respect for Indigenous Peoples’ rights to FPIC and to self-determination. • Respect for local communities’ rights to FPIC ; and substantive participation in consultative processes and decisions that may impact their lands, resources or livelihoods. • Respect of land rights, including formal and customary land rights. • No involuntary resettlement. • No economic displacement.
Corruption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No involvement in corruption. • Flagging or reporting corruption if it is identified or suspected.
Economic impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid any negative economic impacts, particularly in vulnerable communities and smallholders. • Ensure that benefit sharing arrangement results in equitable benefits for women, IPLCs, and other minority power groups.

A safeguarding document does not have to be a stand-alone document; a high-level safeguarding commitment may be included as part of other documents developed by the LJI that lay out commitments to good practice, expected impacts, or shared agreements on ways of working. Ultimately, the implementation of the commitments will require them to be embedded or integrated through organisations' policies (for example codes of conduct or process and procedures guidelines) – see in the implementation section below.

2. Assess and plan

2.1. Identify risks of social harm occurring

Risk is a central concept in safeguarding. As an LJI Implementer, it is important to assess the risk of social harms occurring as a result of the project interventions, then implement safeguarding measures to mitigate those risks. LJIs are often complex interventions with multiple objectives and activities and so the potential impact pathways can be numerous. Understanding these requires thorough assessment and planning before an LJI moves to implementation – or as soon as possible, if the LJI is underway and has not yet been subject to a safeguarding risk assessment.

In assessing safeguarding risks, it is important to distinguish between social and human rights assessments targeting different purposes (Box 1).

Box 1. Different purposes for information gathering on social issues and human rights

Social and human rights assessments can be used towards different purposes:

1. Identifying a social baseline against which to measure change as a result of the initiative (e.g. for tracking and reporting change)
2. Identifying human rights issues/risks occurring in the landscape, their root causes and how they might be addressed (e.g. via the LJI)
3. **Identifying social risks and issues where safeguarding actions should be put in place (e.g. risks stemming from a particular LJI activity)**

While this Guidance is focused on the final of these, some forms of data collection and analysis may inform all three purposes. For example, a Human Rights Risk Assessment (HRIA) can also be adapted to cover both human rights issues/risks preexisting in a landscape and those that could result from planned interventions, and so need to be safeguarded against.

The following three steps may be taken to identify the social risks and issues associated with a LJI.

Step 1. Desktop review of planned activities/interventions

To develop a comprehensive set of safeguards for a LJI it is important to identify the stakeholders involved, particularly under-represented groups, understand how the initiative will interact with and impact these groups, and to identify potential risks of negative social harm that may occur due to the LJI’s interventions. Table 2 below sets out some suggested steps that could form the basis of a desktop review.

Table 2. Suggested steps for reviewing safeguarding risks

Critical safeguarding component	Suggested steps for reviewing safeguarding risks
Stakeholder and Community Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify all communities and other relevant stakeholders in the project area or that could be affected by the LJI.
Gender Equality and Women’s Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate potential positive and negative impacts on men and women, paying attention to potential discrepancies based on gender.
Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify potential negative impacts to community health, safety, and working conditions.
Cultural Heritage, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, Displacement and Resettlement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess land and resource rights in the LJI area and identify rightsholders, including those with non-ownership rights such as access and use rights. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ensure identification of all Indigenous Peoples and local communities with collective rights (statutory or customary) to land or resources, either within the LJI area or that otherwise stand to be impacted by its activities. • Conduct due diligence to determine that participants in the LJI have a legitimate (statutory or customary) right to land according to the applicable tenure system of the project site, which enables them to manage and use the land as needed to carry out project activities and receive compensation for benefits from the initiative. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – This due diligence should include consideration of gender inequities that may be reinforced unless proactive measures are taken to ensure equitable outcomes. – This due diligence should also include consideration of historical context and screening for legacy issues related to how the land was acquired, such as improper acquisitions or coerced land takings, as well as assessing if there are conflicting or disputed rights between or within communities. • Determine in advance whether the LJI intends to utilise knowledge, innovations, or practices of Indigenous Peoples and/or local communities.
Economic impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify barriers for men and women smallholders to participate in and benefit from the LJI.
Corruption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand levels of corruption, e.g. by making use of country corruption risk indexes

When implementing partners have little to no understanding of safeguarding risks and measures, it may also be helpful to provide an overview of the types of generic impacts that could occur in such an initiative, to provide an entry point to the identification of safeguards that are relevant for the specific initiative in question. Some partners may already be undertaking safeguarding measures, without labelling these as such. Examples of such social harms that could be associated with LJIs can be found in Table 3, Appendix 2.

Step 2. Identifying risks: desk based review

To identify potential risk of harm to people coming from an LJI, a scoping or baseline risk assessment is necessary to understand the surrounding context, such as local norms and behaviours; the actors linked to the intervention, both directly and indirectly; and the potential negative impacts associated with the planned activities. This can be completed through a desk-based study initially, with on-the-ground baseline studies or assessments carried out to fill critical gaps in understanding. The assessment of risks should also consider the capacity of implementing partners to carry out and comply with safeguarding measures. This process can also help identify resources and capabilities that can be mobilised. Indeed, sometimes, we may find implementing partners who are not well versed in the safeguarding processes, hence, a training programme may be recommended to ensure they are able to support the assessment process.

Identifying risk: Targeted data collection via consultations, interviews and other on the ground data collection

- Building on the desk-based review, targeted consultation with representatives of potentially impacted groups can help to generate local information and insights, validate initial findings, fill knowledge gaps, and deepen understanding of risks, so supporting the development of appropriate safeguarding measures. This work can potentially be combined with other baseline studies and assessments, as noted above in Box 2.
- Data related to social and human rights issues is often limited, and data collection can be resource-intensive at the landscape level. Data collection may therefore need to be phased according to need. For example, an initial phase involving interviews of small sample sizes, and consultation with key informants (e.g. NGOs or researchers that work on these issues), could be used to initially identify risks of social harm, with in-depth risk assessments if initial scoping suggests a high risk of adverse impacts.

Step 3. Refine to final set of risks

Using the information from the desk-based review and targeted consultation with potentially impacted groups, it should now be possible to map out the interventions planned by the LJI and the potential adverse impacts of these. All risks highlighted should be taken forward for consideration in the safeguarding plan, regardless of their perceived level of severity.

2.2. Develop a safeguarding plan

The safeguarding plan should clearly assign roles and responsibilities and timelines to the parties involved in the LJI and set out how safeguarding measures will be implemented. Where many potential risks have been identified, it may be appropriate to assess the relative saliency of these risks – i.e. their potential severity and likelihood – to help prioritise the allocation of resources. Where saliency is low it may be appropriate to employ a ‘monitor and respond’ approach to safeguarding. Where saliency is high, comprehensive mandatory safeguarding measures may be required to address risks.

Designing and agreeing appropriate safeguarding measures should be carried out with the full and effective participation of interested stakeholders, including locally perceived vulnerable and minority ones such as IP&LCs and women’s representatives.

The safeguarding plan is a living document: as the measures are implemented and monitored and/or new risks identified the plan will need to be adjusted. There should be clarity on whose role it is (organisation and role) to own and manage the plan.

Organisations might find useful to develop a stand-alone document or to integrate it in the main management or implementation plan (depending in the project). This should be decided at the beginning of the process by funding and implementing partners but, ultimately, making sure that the key elements mentioned in this guidance are integrated and shared amongst relevant key stakeholders.

The plan may also take account of limited resources – both for identification of risks and for taking appropriate safeguarding measures – by laying out a stepwise approach to strengthening safeguarding i.e.. a type of continuous improvement approach. In such cases the work should always commence with taking action on the most likely and most severe risks identified.

3. Implement

3.1. Implement the safeguarding plan

To prevent adverse impacts from happening, the lead partner(s) in a LJl must identify and record how they will ensure that safeguarding actions are implemented, with a clear implementation plan and timeline for the agreed safeguarding measures. Whilst for the sake of clarity this is shown as a separate step, the implementation plan must speak directly to the safeguarding plan, and so may be combined with it.

The plan should consider the enabling environment in which measures will be implemented, to minimise risks. For example, the roll out of safeguarding measures to third party suppliers and contractors is frequently cited as a challenge by landscape implementers. To address this, targeted capacity-building and awareness-raising on the safeguarding risks (and corresponding measures) identified during Stage 2 may be conducted for the appropriate staff in those organisations. Targeted capacity building means giving appropriate training to specific groups in response to risks identified (*e.g. Trainings to staff contractors/ to prevent identified risks from inappropriate behaviours towards targeted communities during activities*). *Steps to monitor the implementation of the safeguarding (risk mitigation) plan should also be included in the implementation plan. Safeguarding targets or indicators should be incorporated into these monitoring efforts.*

4. Monitoring

4.1. Responding to negative impacts

Even with an effective safeguarding system, adverse impacts from an intervention may still occur. To address these, a landscape or jurisdictional initiative should have in place both effective reporting mechanisms and clear procedures for receiving and responding to complaints and grievances. The grievance mechanism does not necessarily need to be created as part of the safeguarding process. In many cases, this could be part of wider or existing grievance mechanisms of the project. In such cases, rather than developing a new, duplicative mechanism, the focus should be on reviewing the existing mechanism to ensure it adequately would cover grievances related to topics of concern for social safeguarding. As with all actions, it would be important to engage implementing partners in such review and revision.

Production landscape initiatives involve complex power relationships relating to access to markets and employment, which could pose an obstacle for creating an environment where participants and community members feel able to report issues. It is therefore important to identify barriers that stop people from reporting misconduct and make changes to complaint and feedback mechanisms to make them safer and more accessible. A well-designed grievance and redress system can support this by establishing clear reporting mechanisms and standard procedures for responding to complaints and grievances. Community-based monitoring can be explored as a potential tool for identifying negative social impacts, which can also help to ensure buy-in and involvement. Box 2 sets out principles that should be considered when establishing or adapting a grievance mechanism.

Box 2. Criteria for developing an effective grievance mechanism³

- **Legitimate:** Enable trust from the mechanism's users and ensure accountability for the fairness of the grievance resolution process.
- **Accessible:** Be known to all potential users, be clear on how this information is shared and provide assistance or alternative channels of communication for those who may face particular barriers to access, such as women, Indigenous Peoples, minority ethnic groups, and independent smallholders.
- **Predictable:** Be clear on the types of processes and outcomes available and means of monitoring implementation.
- **Equitable:** Provide users with reasonable access to the information, advice, and expertise necessary to engage on fair, informed and respectful terms.
- **Transparent:** Keep parties to a grievance informed about its progress and provide sufficient information about the mechanism's performance to build confidence in its effectiveness. Progress information includes clarity in roles and responsibilities, communication modes (email, written notice, meeting), phases of escalation, decisions gates and timeframes in which grievances will be addressed and sharing updates on grievance management externally.
- **Rights-compatible:** Ensure outcomes and remedies comply with internationally recognised human rights standards.
- **Source of continuous learning:** Identify lessons for improving the mechanism and preventing further grievances and harms.

Information about complaints and grievances and their handling should be disclosed publicly via means appropriate to stakeholders and on a regular time period to be agreed (e.g. updated monthly or quarterly). Best practice is to provide information about cases of negative impact such as: how many cases, issues raised, time taken to address the issues, how the issues were addressed, and what action is taken to mitigate this from happening again. This should be done in a way which ensures the anonymity of those reporting grievances. Transparency at an early stage can also help avoid larger safeguarding issues developing, reducing the potential for adverse impacts and associated media scandals.

4.2. Monitor and review

Safeguarding should be an ongoing process designed to actively protect and ensure no unintended consequences rather than a bureaucratic and linear exercise. Because risks can change over time, safeguards need to be regularly reviewed and, where needed, updated. Regular reviews and adaptive management are therefore a crucial part of an effective safeguarding system. This should include both operational monitoring, to determine whether the safeguarding plan is being implemented in full, and the monitoring of risks to identify whether safeguarding measures have been effective and whether any new risks have emerged. Based on the outcomes of this regular monitoring, the safeguarding plan should be adapted or updated to reflect changes in the initial baseline and risk conditions, including contextual factors and activities already undertaken by the landscape initiative.

During the ongoing implementation of the activities in the safeguarding plan, it is important to maintain and build trust between IPLCs, representatives of other stakeholder groups, NGOs and project partners. This will influence not only how freely people feel able to report misconduct, but also how easily project partners can gather information from stakeholders to help to conduct accurate risk assessments as the initiative unfolds.

³ Adapted from UNGP 31: Effectiveness criteria for non-judicial grievance mechanisms, available online [here](#).

Appendix 1: Exercise for Distinguishing Social Safeguards from Human Rights Action in Landscapes

Example 1: Social Safeguarding

Buyer companies identify a deforestation risk from smallholder expansion near a protected area.

They fund a multi-stakeholder landscape-level initiative to improve government monitoring, fund forest guards and improve smallholders livelihoods via improved yields and alternative incomes.



The project identifies risks of unintended consequences around: forest guard interactions with local people and socio-economic impacts of alternative income schemes. As a result, it implements a gender analysis, training of key staff, and monitoring systems to mitigate these risks.

Example 2: Action on Human Rights at Scale

Buyer and processor companies identify child labour and unacceptable migrant workers' employment conditions in a coffee production landscape, as a result of their HRDD.



The buyer and producer companies fund a landscape-level initiative with growers, local, national and regional government and NGOs to address the root causes of child labour and forced labour indicators, including remediation of affected people, and prevention & mitigation via provision of childcare, pricing that supports higher worker pay, and responsible recruitment programmes.

Example 3: Action on Human at Scale Rights & Social Safeguarding*

Downstream buying and processing companies identify child labour and unacceptable migrant workers' employment conditions as salient issues in a coffee production landscape, as a result of their Human Right Due Diligence (HRDD) & determine that mitigation would be well leveraged via action in a Landscape Initiative. Therefore, the buying and processing companies decide to fund a landscape-level initiative with growers, local, national and regional government and NGOs to address the root causes of child labour and forced labour indicators, including remediation of affected people, and prevention & mitigation via provision of childcare, pricing that supports higher worker pay, and responsible recruitment programmes.



While the landscape initiative is under development, the organisation in charge of implementing identifies women and children in producer villages, and male and female migrant workers as groups at risk from misconduct by project staff. As a result, the organisation decides to implement minimum standards for NGOs working with migrant workers about ethics and confidentiality of interview data. They also train extension workers on appropriate conduct in villages.

*In this last example the initiative while looking at addressing human rights issues in the landscape (example 2), will also ensure they identify and mitigate the potential risk to the people involved. They do this by implementing safeguards measures.

Appendix 2: Examples of social harms and associated safeguarding measures

Table 3. Some examples of social harms and associated safeguarding measures for reference

Category	Examples of social harm	Examples of safeguarding measures (other measures may be more appropriate: it will depend on the specific context)
Land tenure	Failure to respect land tenure of IPLCs resulting in loss of access, resources, livelihoods or cultural spaces.	Land registration systems that show who holds tenure rights within an area of interest.
Project execution	Harm from poorly executed projects on sensitive issues, such as child labour or gendered access to natural resources.	Ensure contracts awarded that may bring a contractor into contact with children or adults at risk includes provisions for the prevention, response and reporting of abuse and harm.
Gender	Activities that could increase women’s work burden, limit or restrict women’s access to resources, or result in women being excluded from decision-making platforms.	Hold consultations with only women (led by female consultation team members), establish mixed consultation teams and ensure meetings are held in easily accessible and safe spaces, at times of day compatible with the work and home schedules of men and women ⁴ .
Travel	Security risks for participants if travelling and gathering in insecure regions.	Establish travel procedures, checklists, and provide training on safety and security to those travelling to insecure areas. And/or request support from security authorities (e.g. military/police) in high risk areas.
Procurement	Risk of corruption and theft from procurement activities.	Due diligence tests of suppliers and competitive bidding rounds.
Community engagement	Risk of corruption, entrenching exclusion or power imbalances and elite capture when working with producer or community groups (e.g. community forest groups).	Ensure effective studies of community structures, and gender analysis have informed decisions on how to engage with communities, that proposals and decisions are discussed and agreed in meetings of members of communities, not just with leaders. Ensure the input of, and potential impacts on, more under-represented groups are taken in to account, e.g. women, youths, people outside of the formal community.
Livelihoods	Financial risks to people from livelihood diversification projects or alternative income generation projects that are poorly designed or executed, or have unintended consequences.	Develop cost-benefit analysis and livelihoods impact risks models before setting up or designing alternative livelihoods plans within the intervention context. Use gender analysis to understand the roles of men and women and how any interventions could impact them. Ensure wide consultation to understand possible impacts. Use periodic monitoring via key informant interviews and surveys to measure impacts (positive and negative) on a wide range of people (not just direct participants).

⁴ A few examples of best practices and tools or guidance to inform more inclusive consultations can be found here: Danish Institute for Human Rights: [Stakeholder Engagement Interview Guide](#), CIFOR-ICRAF: [Getting it right, a guide to improve inclusion in multi-stakeholder forums](#), Landesa: [Community consultation Checklist/ Designing a stakeholder engagement plan](#)

Monitoring	Safety risks for participants in community monitoring programmes.	<p>Ensure buy-in from companies and government to the concept and value of community monitoring and a commitment from them to support the process.</p> <p>Develop and publish zero tolerance policies and protocols for violence (including gender-based violence), intimidation, reprisals, criminalisation, and murder of land, environmental, and human rights defenders, as well as of individuals and groups engaging in community monitoring.</p> <p>Provide safe, confidential ways for community monitoring teams to flag concerns.</p>
Health and safety	Risk of unsafe working conditions, for example in agricultural or construction contexts.	<p>Carry out risk assessment of potential impacts, and act on these via an appropriate mix of awareness raising, operating procedures, capacity building on good practice, personal protective equipment (PPE), and safety equipment (e.g. seat belts, protective guards on equipment, adequate storage, application and disposal facilities for agrochemicals).</p> <p>Monitor and record incidents (including near-misses), share results and take action to address.</p>
Staff and contractors	Risk of harassment or discrimination by and towards project staff or contractors, e.g. agricultural extension officers.	<p>In response to risks identified, consider appropriate action that combines prevention with awareness raising and how to raise concerns or issues, e.g. explain zero tolerance for harassment / discrimination to project staff and others, e.g. community leaders/ members and companies.</p> <p>Provide clear rules and awareness raising on expected behaviour of project staff when visiting communities and expected treatment of project staff by hosts. No staff to visit alone (always in pairs), whenever feasible and/or practical. Provide training on how to respond to harassment and discrimination.</p> <p>Provide training on how to raise a grievance for people directly or indirectly impacted by the LJI interventions. Ensure anonymity can be guaranteed across the grievance process and initiate internal procedures to respond adequately to grievances before bringing up to a neutral and independent third party if the issue(s) is(are) still not addressed.</p>

Appendix 3: Glossary

Community-based monitoring (CBM) or community-based monitoring system (CBMS):

While there are many definitions and specific actions that could be counted as CBM, here, we understand a CBM as being a participatory tool used in a process to design, plan, collect and analyse information on natural resource use and community well-being for decision-making.

Corruption:

Corruption is a form of dishonesty or a criminal offense which is undertaken by a person or an organisation which is entrusted in a position of authority, in order to acquire illicit benefits or abuse power for one's personal gain.

While there are many forms of corruption, for the purpose of this guidance and linking with LJI activities, corruption is here understood as all form of practices or unfair ways of doing business or activities for example:

- Bribery and extortion (private-to-public and public-to-private)
- Informal payments
- Embezzlement and misappropriation of funds
- Nepotism and cronyism
- Cartelisation
- Not declaring conflicts of interest
- Fraudulent land transactions

Free Informed and Prior Consent (FPIC):

Free, Prior and Informed Consent is a principle protected by international human rights standards that state, 'all peoples have the right to self-determination' and 'the right to freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development'.

- Free: Consent given voluntarily and free of "coercion, intimidation or manipulation"; without undue influence; or manipulation through cash donations to influential community members.
- Prior: Consent is sought sufficiently in advance of any authorisation or commencement of activities.
- Informed: Refers mainly to the nature of the engagement. Information should be complete, and simplified in the language that is understood by the community.
- Consent: To the collective decision made by the rights-holders and reached through the customary decision making processes of the affected peoples. Consent must be sought and granted or withheld according to the unique political-administrative dynamic of each community.

Grievance:

A **Grievance** is a claim of social and environmental harm arising from the production or processing operations of a company. The company's relationship to the harm could be by:

- **Causing** the harm
- **Contributing** to the harm with or through a contractor, for example
- **Linked** to the harm of the affected person or party

We can categorise grievances into both **Human Rights grievances** (labour rights, land rights, other specific human rights issues) & **Environmental grievances** (deforestation, peat development and other environmental issues). In the context of this Guidance, grievances looked at are **grievances on Human Rights** specifically.

Grievance mechanism/management system:

Grievance mechanism are defined by the [UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights](#) (UNGPs) as “any routinised, State-based or non-State-based, judicial or non-judicial process through which grievances concerning business-related human rights abuse can be raised and remedy can be sought.

A “grievance mechanism or management system” relates to the process a business puts in place to receive, manage and remedy grievances (sometimes known as a grievance procedure, grievance mechanism or grievance remediation mechanism.)

Human Rights:

The [United Nations \(UN\) defines Human Rights](#) as **rights inherent to all human beings**, regardless of race, sex, nationality, ethnicity, language, religion, or any other status. Human rights include the **right to life and liberty, freedom from slavery and torture, freedom of opinion and expression, the right to work and education, and many more**. Everyone is entitled to these rights, **without discrimination**.

The [United Nations Guiding Principles \(UNGPs\) for Business and Human Rights](#) developed 3 principles grounded on:

- (a) States’ existing obligations to respect, protect and fulfil human rights and fundamental freedoms;
- (b) The role of business enterprises as specialised organs of society performing specialised functions, required to comply with all applicable laws and to respect human rights;
- (c) The need for rights and obligations to be matched to appropriate and effective remedies when breached. These Guiding Principles apply to all States and to all business enterprises, both transnational and others, regardless of their size, sector, location, ownership and structure.

Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD):

Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD) is a management process for a company to know and show that it respects human rights in its practices. The HRDD process offers companies a systematic approach to proactively identify, address, monitor and communicate actions taken to prevent, mitigate and remediate human rights abuses, such as child labour, forced labour, and excessive working hours, rather than having a reactive and less effective approach. This is beneficial for companies e.g. through staff retention, reduced risk of business failure, investment potential, etc. HRDD supports companies in delivering on the No Exploitation commitments of their NDPE policies⁵. HRDD is one component of the actions that companies should take as set out by the United Nations Guiding Principles (UNGPs) on Business and Human Rights. [The United Nations Guiding Principles \(UNGPs\)](#) on Business and Human Rights clarify the role of companies in respecting internationally recognised human rights. To date, the UNGPs represent the most authoritative guidance on Business and Human Rights (BHR). Human rights due diligence is not a single prescriptive formula. Enterprises of different sizes, in different industries, with different corporate structures and in different operating circumstances will need to tailor their processes to meet these different characteristics. However, the key elements of human rights due diligence—**assessing, integrating and acting, tracking, and communicating**—when taken together with remediation processes, provide the **management** of any enterprise with the framework it needs in order to know and show that it is respecting human rights in practice.

Indigenous Peoples and Local communities (IPLCs):

Acknowledging that there is no formal definition in international law of Indigenous Peoples, in part because of the variance across local contexts and because a critical right of Indigenous Peoples is to self-identification and determination. Shared common traits of Indigenous Peoples include self-identification as Indigenous Peoples; distinct social, economic or political systems; distinct language, culture and beliefs; strong link to territories and surrounding natural resources; forming non-dominant groups of society; historical continuity with pre-colonial or pre-settler societies; and resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities.

With the term ‘local communities,’ we are referring to communities – traditional or otherwise – living around, or potentially affected by, operations and business relationships. This includes a variety of distinct ethnic groups who may also hold land collectively but who are not considered Indigenous Peoples.

⁵ NDPE: No Deforestation, No Peat, No Exploitation. A common way to package sustainability commitments, especially in the palm sector.

Legacy issues (land):

An **enduring grievance with affected communities or historic land occupants or their descendants** related to the terms and processes by which land was previously acquired and subsequently used by a company or other entity and **which has been left unresolved, in part or in full, by the predecessor** or existing project developer⁶.

Landscape and jurisdictional initiatives:

Landscape and jurisdictional initiatives are long-term, place-based, collaborative, multi-stakeholder approaches to realise common goals and positive outcomes for people, nature, and climate in the context of agricultural production.

A variety of different landscape and jurisdictional initiatives are being developed. They generally combine most or all of the following elements⁷:

- Development and implementation at the scale of a jurisdiction (i.e. local or national government) with a focus on the performance of the whole landscape.
- Participation of government together with other stakeholders such as civil society groups, communities, private sector companies and farmers.
- One or more shared goals that support sustainable development (e.g. reducing deforestation, eliminating child labour or supporting smallholders).
- Alignment of the activities and inputs of different stakeholders (e.g. incentives, enforcement, and planning) to increase effectiveness.
- Accountability to provide credibility and assurance including long-term governance, monitoring, transparency, communication, and verification.

⁶ Taken from The Interlaken Group : [Land Legacy Issues Guidance on Corporate Responsibility](#)

⁷ See more details in this briefing : [Introduction to landscape or jurisdictional initiatives in commodity agriculture](#)

