

# Jurisdictional and Nested REDD+ requirements for SOCIALCARBON projects.

## 1. Background and Introduction

SOCIALCARBON is working to ensure that REDD+ projects support the development and implementation of government-led REDD+ programs, are helping countries to meet commitments and are able to scale up their GHG mitigation ambitions. Many governments have now developed REDD+ reference levels that have been assessed by the UNFCCC Roster of Experts (in the case of a UNFCCC submission) or another independent body (e.g., related to a results-based payment scheme).

SOCIALCARBON recognizes the importance of facilitating the alignment of SOCIALCARBON project activities with a national (or in the interim, subnational) REDD+ program, in particular with the data, parameters and methods of such a program's reference level and monitoring system. Beyond reference level and monitoring alignment, wherever possible, REDD+ projects should also align with a number of other aspects related to nesting and seek any relevant government approvals if they are to be registered under the SOCIALCARBON Standard.

SOCIALCARBON's Jurisdictional and Nested REDD+ Requirements provides a framework for developing REDD+ programs that integrate (or "nest") projects within a workable, practical, flexible, and robust carbon accounting and crediting platform that represents current best practices. The Requirements are aligned, where relevant, with the UNFCCC decisions on REDD+ while supporting national REDD+ frameworks

## 2. Nesting Requirements

Where a project sits within an existing or emerging Jurisdictional REDD+ Program, project nesting is required, wherever possible, aligning its project baseline with the jurisdictional reference level (e.g., by adopting an allocation determined by the government, or otherwise agreeing on an adequately aligned project baseline) and

aligning with other aspects and requirements of the jurisdictional program (e.g., government approvals, monitoring, leakage, performance, safeguards and benefit sharing).

**2.1** Projects remain subject to any and all national or subnational laws, regulations, agreements or other official government rules, including those relevant to nesting.

**2.2** Projects registered (or emerging) under another JNR programs (e.g. Verra or ART TREES) or reference levels should:

- a) Identify whether a jurisdictional (national or subnational) reference level has been developed for the project area, relevant activities and carbon pools, and has been third party assessed (e.g., by FCPF TAP or UNFCCC Roster of Experts). Where this is the case, and where data at the jurisdictional scale is sufficiently robust for use by projects:
  - i) For deforestation and/or degradation activities, projects should identify whether an allocation of the jurisdictional reference level to projects has been undertaken and approved by an appropriate entity (e.g., national or subnational government agency). In such a case, projects should adopt the jurisdictional reference level allocation established by the government. Otherwise, projects (or project associations) are encouraged to work with the government to develop an allocation of the jurisdictional reference level (to the project area), and to apply such allocation once approved by an appropriate government entity.
  - ii) For reforestation/afforestation activities, and for deforestation and/or degradation activities where no allocation has been approved and is not under development, projects (or project associations) should negotiate a baseline with the government, or otherwise develop and justify a project-specific baseline aligned to the extent practicable with the data, parameters and methods of the jurisdictional reference level.
- b) Where there is no jurisdictional (national or subnational) reference level developed for the project area, relevant activities and carbon pools and assessed by a third-party (e.g., by FCPF TAP or UNFCCC Roster of Experts), or



where data at the jurisdictional scale is insufficiently robust for use at the project scale, projects should follow the applied methodology(ies) and all relevant SOCIALCARBON Standard rules.

**2.3** In all cases, projects should determine whether adequate uncertainty assessments have been undertaken at the jurisdictional level and project levels, as appropriate.

- a) Where a jurisdiction has established a cap on project emission reductions/removals that does not exceed the jurisdiction's overall performance, and:
  - i) Where an adequate uncertainty assessment has been undertaken at the jurisdictional level, projects do not need to undertake any further uncertainty estimation on jurisdictional data, parameters or methods applied by the project.
  - ii) Where an adequate uncertainty assessment has not been undertaken at the jurisdictional level, projects should undertake a full and transparent uncertainty estimation on the project baseline and overall emission reductions/removals including on all applied jurisdictional data, parameters and/or methods (and apply an appropriate deduction, where relevant), following the uncertainty rules in the VCS Standard.
- b) Where a jurisdiction has not established a cap on project emission reductions/removals (i.e., there is not assurance that credits are only issued within the jurisdiction's overall performance) projects should undertake a full and transparent uncertainty estimation on the established project baseline and overall emission reductions/removals including on all applied jurisdictional data, parameters and/or methods (and apply an appropriate deduction, where relevant) following the uncertainty rules in the VCS Standard.

**2.4** In all cases, projects should seek any relevant approval of the project baseline from an appropriate government agency.

**2.5** Projects should also align their monitoring data, parameters and methods to the extent possible with those of the National Forest Monitoring System. Projects may follow the monitoring frequency of the jurisdictional government, or may set their own monitoring frequency, but are encouraged to reconcile with government-level data at least every five years, or at the country's next Biennial Update Report to the UNFCCC. Note that incorporating project level monitoring results into higher-level monitoring is considered best practice.

**2.6** Where a project is undergoing validation or baseline reassessment, and where the government is likely to approve a relevant jurisdictional reference level within two years, SOCIALCARBON intends to work with project proponents on a case-by-case basis to permit extensions to the validation or project baseline reassessment deadlines, as appropriate. Any grandfathering period established for project baselines by the jurisdictional government must be adhered to, noting that SOCIALCARBON is unlikely to allow an extension to a project baseline reassessment deadline beyond two years.

**2.7** Beyond baselines and monitoring, there are a number of other aspects of nesting where projects should align wherever possible with the jurisdictional program and seek any relevant government approvals. Projects should always meet any requirements relevant to nesting set out by the jurisdictional government (e.g., with regard to leakage, safeguards or approvals).

### 3. Crediting of Nested Projects

The following requirements are for the crediting of projects that are nested within a jurisdictional program. These requirements have been designed to prevent double counting of credits between individual projects and jurisdictional programs.

**3.1** GHG emission reductions achieved by the Project within the geographic boundary of the jurisdictional program shall be deducted from the net GHG benefit of the

jurisdiction. This is to be agreed beforehand with the Jurisdictional Program Proponent(s) and documented with a signed legal agreement.

**3.2** The Project Proponent will have a signed legal agreement with the Jurisdictional Program Proponent(s) to document that the project area sits outside of the scope of the Jurisdictional Program.

**3.3** The Project will comply with the rules and requirements set out in the SOCIALCARBON Standard.



Version	Date	Comment
V1.0	03 Jan 2022	Initial version released under SOCIALCARBON Version 6.0.