

<b>Verification Checklist</b>				
<b>Ecosystem Restoration Standard V 2.0</b>				
<b>Standard section</b>	<b>Standard section</b>	<b>Standard subsection</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Stakeholder feedback</b>
<b>Planning</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.3</b>	1.3 Geographical location - Identification of the geographical location of the restoration effort, including jurisdiction (country, sub-national jurisdiction, local jurisdiction, legal address) and the specific restoration sites with specific boundaries clearly identified in both hard copy map form and digital shapefiles. (Digital shapefiles are Continuous Improvement for SH&C and medium projects)	Do digital shape files refer to geolocation points or polygons or both? The emphasis should be given to polygons. The continuous improvement should be more like: starting with geolocation points moving towards having full polygons of the restoration sites.

<p><b>Planning</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>1.4.1</b></p>	<p>1.4.1 Prior and current conditions and land use of the larger ecosystem of which the restoration area may be a part, including:</p> <p>a. Environmental conditions, for example relating to water and soil (properties and condition), diversity of natural ecosystems (for example grasslands or wetlands), species (presence of rare or threatened species or their habitats, and other important biological communities), remnants of native vegetation, prior impacts, etc.</p> <p>b. Social conditions, for example tenure characteristics (see Section 2: Tenure, Rights, and Security), community watershed areas, cultural heritage sites, policy and governance practices, engagement etc.</p> <p>c. Socio-economic conditions, for example prior land use, prior conservation or restoration efforts in the area,</p>	<p>‘En las condicione previas y actuales, siento que no queda claro la inclusión de los pueblos indígenas (solo menciona comunidades locales). Hay un indicador especifico para pueblos indígenas (1.4.4.) pero creo que se puede mencionar también en 1.4.1.</p> <p>In the preconditions and current conditions, I feel that the inclusion of indigenous peoples is not clear (it only mentions local communities). There is a specific indicator for indigenous peoples (1.4.4.) but I think it could also be mentioned in 1.4.1.</p>
------------------------	-----------------	---------------------	--	---

			<p>income level and other socio-economic parameters or needs.</p> <p>d. The relative state of the ecosystem and ecosystem recovery to be used to identify least cost, most effective restoration approach.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

<b>Planning</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.4.6</b>	1.4.6 Suitable native <b>reference sites</b> to provide target values for establishing recovery metrics in restoration sites (for example, successional forests of known age for gauging time required to reach particular levels of vegetation structure and diversity within the study area).	Seems repetitive if already asking to identify natural ecosystems using HCV and HCSA methodologies. Those approaches consider for instance Intact Forest Landscapes and Protected Area which by case are the "suitable native reference sites". Maybe this point could be better linked to 1.4.1.
<b>Planning</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	1.5 <b>Stakeholder engagement:</b>	We miss the gender balance aspect, gender balanced consultative process, youth inclusion. This must be an inclusive consultation process and this is not explicitly mentioned in the requirement

<p><b>Planning</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>1.6</b></p>	<p><b>1.6 Restoration Plan shall:</b></p>	<p>1. The Restoration Plan must be consulted with stakeholders and documented as stated in point 1.5. For this reason, it is proposed that a statement be made in point 1.6 (Restoration Plan shall)</p> <p>2. The Restoration Plan must also be adaptive to future changes in "threats and degradation drivers" as stated in point 1.4.2. It is proposed that in point 1.6 there are points to assess the existence of a planning improvement mechanism that is adaptive to the possibility of changes in "threats and degradation drivers" in the future. Revised Restoration Planning should involve relevant stakeholders.</p>
------------------------	-----------------	-------------------	---	--

<p>Planning</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>1.6.6</p>	<p>1.6.6 Demonstrate that the RM has the <b>financial resources</b> to ensure implementation of the Restoration Plan over a 5-year period and plan for a longer term (20 years).</p>	<p>‘El plan de restauración dice que debe demostrar recursos para 5 años, siento que es muy poco tiempo. Al menos debería ser 10 para garantizar que el proyecto al menos tenga ya un dosel generado con una altura que permita su desarrollo sin mayor intervención. Cinco años en algunos ecosistemas podría ser muy poco tiempo.</p> <p>The restoration plan says that it should demonstrate resources for 5 years, I feel this is too little time. It should at least be 10 years to guarantee that the project at least has a canopy already generated with a height that allows its development without further intervention. Five years in some ecosystems could be very little time.</p>
-----------------	----------	--------------	--	--

<b>Tenure, right and engagement.</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.2</b>	2.2 <b>Boundaries</b> are respected by adjacent landowners and other parties. Where necessary, due to encroachment or other risks, boundaries are marked in the field and resource protection interventions are in place and consistently implemented. Management rights are secured for 5 years and preferably 20-year restoration time horizons. <b>(Continuous Improvement for SH&amp;C projects)</b>	<p>‘Mismo comentario con el plazo de 5 años, debería ser al menos 10 para garantizar un proyecto exitoso.</p> <p>Same comment with the 5-year term, it should be at least 10 years to guarantee a successful project.</p>
<b>Field implementation</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.8</b>	3.8 <b>Chemical use</b> – Chemical use is to be avoided.	Should explicitly mention an Integrated Pest, Weed and Diseases management approach. Using cultural, mechanical, biological methods. Also clearly state that synthetic pesticides/ chemicals should be used as the last resort.
<b>Field implementation</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.8.4</b>	3.8.4 Chemical drift, run-off or spills shall be effectively avoided and controlled.	Chemical drift to natural ecosystems, particularly aquatic ecosystems. Measures to prevent drift should be added as examples (like in other sections of the standard): vegetative barriers, non-application zones next to aquatic ecosystems (at least 5-10mts--> this should depend on the type of application).

<b>Field implementation</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>3.11 Workers' rights</b> , as implemented, include:	<p>‘Debería estar alineado con los convenios fundamentales de la OIT ya que son parámetros internacionales. Al dejar trabajo infantil p.e. estos convenios ya tienen un parámetro.</p> <p>It should be aligned with the ILO fundamental conventions as they are international parameters. By leaving child labor e.g. these conventions already have a parameter.</p>
<b>Monitoring &amp; Reporting</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2 Monitoring of the outcomes</b> – Field monitoring occurs in line with Restoration Plan expectations (particularly targets, goals and objectives, including social and environmental). <b>(Continuous Improvement for SH&amp;C projects)</b>	It is proposed to have a new assessment point somewhere, perhaps in 4.2 to assess the existence of mechanisms and documentation of stakeholder involvement that can provide input or direction in achieving the targets, objectives and objectives of Restoration Activities that are adaptive, sustainable, responsible and open to the public (especially for large scale)



<b>Monitoring &amp; Reporting</b>	4	4.2.1	4.2.1 <b>Metrics for monitoring</b> are developed in relation to the Restoration Plan, including with regard to social (for example governance, income, equity, health and safety, rights, gender) or environmental aspects (for example soil, water, biodiversity and conservation). <b>(Continuous Improvement for SH&amp;C projects)</b>	It would be very useful to add examples, maybe as guidance material, on types of indicator related to "soil, water, biodiversity management and conservation". Should explicitly mention the relation between restoration and biodiversity conservations, or what do you expect from this. Even though the terms might be intertwined, restoration of a landscape is a different objective than conservation therefore biodiversity outcomes and impacts are different.
<b>Monitoring &amp; Reporting</b>	4	4.2.2	4.2.2 <b>Resources for monitoring</b> exist to ensure implementation of the Monitoring Plan over a 5-year period.	Ver comentarios anteriores con relación a los 5 años.  See previous comments regarding the 5 years.

<p><b>Adicional</b></p>	<p>The name of the standard has been changed from “Forest Ecosystem Restoration” to “Ecosystem Restoration”, in line with the stakeholder feedback received and help to elevate restoration to non-forest ecosystems (e.g. wetlands, grasslands, drylands) as equally important to forests: do you think the Standard can be maintained general or does it need to develop additionally specific indicators for each ecosystem?</p>	<p>If there is time and opportunity to elaborate more specific based on type of ecosystem, that would be wonderful. General indicator is good, but sometime it is so generous.</p>
-------------------------	---	--



		<p>You've done a great work putting together a more general "ecosystem restoration standard". It would be useful to have guidance material on how to implement the standard in diversity of biomes, ecosystems and contexts.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>In my opinion, it can be managed in general, but in order to provide clear direction to the assessor, it is necessary to provide specific examples for each type of ecosystem in the glossary in indicators that require sharpening for the type of ecosystem.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>‘Aunque considero que los forestales podrían englobar a el todo, si es verdad que los humedales, sabanas, manglares, pastizales naturales, estarían limitados, y por ende creo que si deberían tenerse indicadores, diferentes. Ecosistemas templados, áridos y tropicales, tienen características diferentes.</p> <p>Although I consider that forestry could encompass the whole, it is true that wetlands, savannas, mangroves, natural grasslands, would be limited, and therefore I believe that different indicators should be taken into account. Temperate, arid and tropical ecosystems have different characteristics.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>‘Al ser tan general, podriamos dejar afuera temas importantes, p.e. en humedales calidad del agua, especies.</p> <p>Being so general, we could leave out important issues, e.g. in wetlands, water quality, species.</p>
--	--	---



<b>Adicional</b>	While we see Ecosystem Restoration is being mainstreamed, we see it connected with other efforts (Sustainable Forestry, Climate Change mitigation and adaptation, Sustainable Agriculture, Sustainable/Resilient Landscapes, Sustainable Supply Chains, No Deforestation, etc.), and their related	Sustainable agriculture by involving private concession holders for the agricultural plantation is the most priority in my opinion.
------------------	--	---



	<p>certification/verification schemes (FSC, VERRA, Rainforest Alliance, Gold Standard, RSPO, HCVRN, HCSA, etc.). We aim to collaborate further with actors within these areas rather than trying to include more requirements to this standard. What are the priority areas and actors you think we should engage with to help deliver more comprehensive solutions? Please elaborate</p>	<p>This are indeed the key actors. We as Rainforest Allaince would like to engage with you to further collaborate on this regard. We see piloting possibilities in the context of sustainable forest management and also restoration in the context of agricultural productions.</p>
--	---	--





		<p>In my opinion, it is better to also involve field actors or ecosystem restoration initiators for various types of ecosystems that already exist in the field</p>
--	--	---

		<p>‘Deberíamos involucrar a las organizaciones como las juntas de regantes, el ANA; quienes controlan el uso del agua, en donde el productor participé mas activamente a la restauración y protección de los ecosistemas.</p> <p>We should involve organizations such as irrigation boards, ANA, who control the use of water, where the producer participates more actively in the restoration and protection of ecosystems.</p>
--	--	---

<p><b>Adicional</b></p>	<p>While the standard can be used to verify projects as often as necessary, we have established the minimum verification audit periodicity to: 1 year for large projects (over 10.000 ha) 3-5 years for the rest (Small &amp; Communities and medium-size projects). NB: Small equals under 100 ha Do you see this as appropriate?</p>	<p>We struggle with the size defintion. It really depend on the context and biome e.g. boreal forests compared to tropical forest in Central America. A possibility would be to assess size per type of ecosystem and the adjust the size classifications. O course we understand you need to start somewhere. The audit cycle is aligned with other certification schemes.</p>
-------------------------	--	---



		<p>Very dependent on the restoration plan made. The achievement of restoration takes a long time and cannot be done quickly. For some conditions ecosystem restoration may be seen within a year or two. But I think very few are like that.</p>
--	--	--



<b>Adicional</b>	Do you see other avenues to maximize the positive benefits of the standard?	We see other avenues to maximize the positive benefits of the standard. For instance an alliance and collaboration with exciting certification schemes such as RA.
------------------	---	--

		<p>‘Es sobre el manejo de los residuos, donde se busquen prácticas básicas de manejo de residuos.</p> <p>It is about waste management, where basic waste management practices are sought.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>‘Podría hacerse una evaluación de sobrevivencia, que no se si con el monitoreo normal, pueda aplicar con ello.</p> <p>A survival assessment could be done, which I don't know if with normal monitoring, I can apply with it.</p>
<p><b>Other comments</b></p>		<p>All is good.</p>

		<p>‘El uso del agua es una de las preocupaciones, el orden en que se deben programar los cultivos, por ejemplo la siembra de arroz en las zonas donde falta agua para el riego de cultivos que no demandan de uso de agua todo el año y no se usan métodos de riego por inundación como en el cultivo de arroz.</p> <p>Water use is one of the concerns, the order in which crops should be programmed, for example the planting of rice in areas where there is a lack of water for irrigation of crops that do not demand water use all year round and flood irrigation methods are not used as in rice cultivation.</p>
		<p>‘Se promueva igual la capacitación para hacer una reforestación adecuada.</p> <p>Training for proper reforestation should also be promoted.</p>

Note: This feedback was collected through an online survey. Several other comments were received by other canals and included in the standard version 3.