



REDD+ after Cancun: Moving from negotiation to implementation

**Douala, Cameroon, May 10–12, 2011
Workshop Report and Main Messages**

Florence Bernard
Deborah Murphy
Jessica Boyle

REDD+ after Cancun: Moving from negotiation to implementation

Douala, Cameroon, May 10–12, 2011 Workshop Report and Main Messages

Florence Bernard
Deborah Murphy
Jessica Boyle

© 2011 International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development

The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) contributes to sustainable development by advancing policy recommendations on international trade and investment, economic policy, climate change and energy, and management of natural and social capital, as well as the enabling role of communication technologies in these areas. We report on international negotiations and disseminate knowledge gained through collaborative projects, resulting in more rigorous research, capacity building in developing countries, better networks spanning the North and the South, and better global connections among researchers, practitioners, citizens and policy-makers.

IISD's vision is better living for all—sustainably; its mission is to champion innovation, enabling societies to live sustainably. IISD is registered as a charitable organization in Canada and has 501(c)(3) status in the United States. IISD receives core operating support from the Government of Canada, provided through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and Environment Canada, and from the Province of Manitoba. The Institute receives project funding from numerous governments inside and outside Canada, United Nations agencies, foundations and the private sector.

International Institute for Sustainable Development
161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R3B 0Y4
Tel: +1 (204) 958–7700
Fax: +1 (204) 958–7710
Email: info@iisd.ca
Website: www.iisd.org

Table of Contents

1.0	Main Messages from the Workshop.....	1
2.0	Workshop Report.....	4
2.1	Introduction	4
2.2	Opening of the Workshop.....	5
2.3	Update on the Negotiations	5
2.4	Regional Perspectives	7
2.5	Addressing Safeguards and Encouraging Multiple Benefits	9
2.6	Breakout Groups: Safeguards and Multiple Benefits	11
2.7	Plenary Discussion: Key Issues for the Way Forward.....	12
2.8	Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	13
2.9	Drivers of Deforestation: Agriculture	15
2.10	Breakout Discussions on MRV and Agriculture.....	17
2.11	Plenary Discussion: Key Issues for the Way Forward.....	18
2.12	Closing Remarks	19
3.0	Key Messages	20

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ASB-ICRAF	ASB Partnership for the Tropical Forest Margins at the World Agroforestry Centre
AWG-LCA	Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action under the Convention
CCBA	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
COP	Conference of the Parties
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FPIC	Free, prior and informed consent
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
IISD	International Institute for Sustainable Development
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
MRV	Measurement, reporting and verification
NAMA	Nationally appropriate mitigation actions
PES	Payment for Ecosystem Services
RECOFTC	The Center for People and Forests
REL	Reference Emission Level
RL	Reference Level
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, plus conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of carbon stocks in developing countries
REDD+ SES	REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards
UN	United Nations
UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

1.0 Main Messages from the Workshop

The third capacity-building workshop for negotiators and stakeholders on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, plus conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of carbon stocks in developing countries (REDD+), held in Douala, Cameroon, May 10–12, 2011, aimed to:

- Explore the way forward in the international REDD+ negotiations, building on the outcomes of Cancun;
- Examine options for measurement, reporting and verification (MRV), addressing and respecting safeguards, and encouraging co-benefits;
- Explore coordination across issue areas;
- Identify priorities, strategies and opportunities for collaboration for REDD+ readiness and implementation;
- Develop key messages for the June 2011 meetings of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The workshop was delivered by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) and the ASB Partnership for the Tropical Forest Margins at the World Agroforestry Centre (ASB-ICRAF), with the generous support of the Government of Norway.

The main messages of the third workshop for the African region were:

Safeguards

- Work is needed to identify the details and components of safeguard information systems. This could include arrangements for benefits sharing, mechanisms for dispute resolution and land tenure arrangements.
- Country experiences can provide lessons for measuring and reporting on safeguards, such as REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards; Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT); and forest certification. These experiences need to inform the negotiations.
- Broad participation of stakeholders is needed to identify and measure impacts of safeguards.
- Any agreed safeguards system must be cost-effective.
- Equitable benefits sharing is an essential element of going beyond “do no harm” to create multiple benefits.

MRV (Measuring, Reporting, Verification)

- Countries need to establish what skills, capacities and information are available domestically (for example, by developing an inventory), and build on this national expertise in developing MRV systems.
- African countries should consider appointing MRV experts to UNFCCC technical and expert groups.
- The promotion of regional MRV strategies could help African nations share experiences and learn from one another.
- Local community and indigenous peoples involvement, including traditional knowledge and participatory processes, must be an important element of MRV programs.
- Further exploration is needed on the issue of linking of MRV and safeguards information systems.

Agriculture

- The linkages between agriculture, food security and climate change must be recognized.
- Agriculture should not be part of REDD+ at present, but addressed as a driver of deforestation.
- A programme of work on agriculture should be taken up under the UNFCCC. Further exploration is needed to determine the best way to do this. Options include exploration under the subsidiary bodies for scientific and technological advice (SBSTA) and implementation (SBI), sectoral approaches, or a separate agenda item under the Ad Hoc Workshop Group on Long-term Cooperation Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA).
- Options include under the SBSTA/SBI, sectoral approaches or as an additional issue under the AWG-LCA.
- Any agriculture actions need to recognize the importance of this sector for mitigation and adaptation in developing countries, and account for national sovereignty issues.

Financing

- Funding for REDD+ (from multilateral and bilateral institutions) needs to be transparent, equitable and accessible to all countries.
- The REDD+ Partnership should feed into, and be closely linked to, the UNFCCC.
- Financing must facilitate the engagement of national experts, allowing countries to contract local domestic consultants over external consultants.

Other Issues

- A step-wise approach, and learning-by-doing, is important.
- Gender issues must be taken into consideration in all REDD+ activities.
- Communication among negotiators, forest departments, civil society and the private sector is important for effective REDD+ programs.
- Capacity building (such as forest assessments, monitoring forest cover change and measuring safeguards) and technology transfer (such as geographic information systems and remote sensing) are critical and needed.

Priorities for Follow-Up

- Continued information exchange across countries, with an emphasis on deepening the involvement of technical experts (foresters and land managers), civil society and the private sector.
- Information exchange and capacity building focused on:
 - Accessing funding for REDD+ projects, and fund structures within countries;
 - MRV: balancing scientific and local knowledge, and undertaking participatory assessments with communities;
 - Linking subnational and national approaches in forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels in monitoring and reporting systems;
 - Verification, including identifying cost-effective developing country processes for verification (such as using regional bodies);
 - The “how” of REDD+ implementation at the country level, including case studies;
 - Processes and examples for developing an inventory of a developing country’s capacities and technologies for REDD+;
 - An innovative and interactive platform for countries to share information and experiences.

2.0 Workshop Report

2.1 Introduction

The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) has partnered with the ASB Partnership for the Tropical Forest Margins at the World Agroforestry Centre (ASB-ICRAF) to deliver a project that builds policy capacity in developing countries engaged in United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) negotiations related to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (REDD+). The project is funded by NORAD under its Climate and Forest Initiative 2010 civil society support program.

Building on a series of workshops held in Asia and Africa in 2009–10, regional workshops were held in Douala, Cameroon (May 10–12, 2011) and Hanoi, Vietnam (May 18–20, 2011). The workshops, *REDD+ after Cancun: Moving from negotiation to implementation*, focused on building policy capacity for negotiators and stakeholders (including foresters, land managers and civil society) to develop processes and modalities for REDD+ at the national, regional and international levels that encourage robust REDD+ investments while respecting safeguards and encouraging multiple benefits. Further information on all project activities, including key messages from the regional workshops, reports, presentations and background documents can be accessed at: http://www.iisd.org/climate/land_use/redd/.

The May 2011 African workshop in Douala, Cameroon was attended by over 55 participants and expert presenters. Participants were from African countries that receive support through the UN-REDD program and/or the World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF).¹ The workshop program included updates on the outcomes of COP 16 related to REDD+ and agriculture; regional perspectives and country experiences on REDD+ progress and actions; expert presentations and discussions on addressing safeguards and encouraging multiple benefits; measuring, reporting and verification (MRV); as well as agriculture as a driver of deforestation.

The workshop was conducted using the *Chatham House Rule*, whereby participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed. With the exception of expert speaker presentations, comments during discussion and breakout group sessions are not attributed in this report.

¹ Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Nigeria, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia – a total of 17 countries.

2.2 Opening of the Workshop

ASB-ICRAF Global Coordinator Peter A. Minang welcomed workshop participants and gave an overview of the workshop objectives. He acknowledged the presence of the special guests present, Raymond Mbitikon, Executive Secretary of the Central African Forests Commission (COMIFAC) and Cleto Ndikumagenge, Facilitator Delegate of the Congo Basin Forest Partnership, and thanked the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) for their continued support of the project. He registered apologies from the Norwegian Ambassador in Cameroon who could not attend the workshop due to other engagements.

Raymond Mbitikon, Executive Secretary of COMIFAC, opened the workshop, emphasizing the importance of capacity building for REDD+ negotiators and land managers. He stressed that Congo Basin forest cover is about 200 million hectares (approximately one fifth of world forest reserves) and shelters a population of more than 50 million, but experiences an alarmingly high rate of forest degradation. From 1995 to 2005, Cameroon lost more than 13 per cent of its forests; the annual rate of deforestation of the Congo Basin is 0.42 percent. He also highlighted that one fifth of global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions come from deforestation in the Congo Basin. Mbitikon encouraged participants to share concrete experiences from their countries and develop a strategy to assist African negotiators to better position themselves to negotiate the modalities of the REDD mechanism that promotes the well-being of rural populations in Africa who largely depend on forests.

The co-facilitators of the workshop, Peter Minang, ASB-ICRAF, and Deborah Murphy, IISD, thanked the guests and welcomed participants. Jessica Boyle, IISD provided an overview of the project and the aims of the workshop: i) to explore the way forward in the international REDD+ negotiations, building on the outcomes of Cancun; ii) to examine options for MRV, addressing and respecting safeguards, and encouraging co-benefits; iii) to explore coordination across issue areas; iv) to identify priorities, strategies and opportunities for collaboration for REDD+ readiness and implementation; and v) to develop key messages for the June 2011 UNFCCC meetings. Further detail is available in a project background document, provided to workshop participants and available here.

2.3 Update on the Negotiations

During the first technical session, a panel of negotiators provided an overview of COP 16 and Bangkok outcomes on REDD+ and agriculture and what these mean for negotiations in 2011. The experts noted that while agriculture is not part of the Cancun Agreements, countries are encouraged

to include actions to address drivers of deforestation, and specific attention should be paid to agriculture as the main driver of deforestation.

Cancun resulted in a series of decisions and set of principles that form a solid foundation for REDD, but there was no commitment to fixed targets, a fixed financial mechanism, or a legally binding agreement. The Cancun Agreements include REDD+ safeguards and general principles that can act as pillars to further develop the mechanism. The decision supports a three-phase step-wise approach: 1) develop a strategy and build capacity support; 2) implement the strategy; and 3) promote a result-based phase associated with broader financing options. Potential elements of the SBSTA work program could include: i) establishing which elements of land use act as agents/drivers of deforestation; ii) establishing modalities for reference emissions level (REL) and reference level (RL) scenarios; iii) supporting development of MRV modalities and reporting on safeguards; and iv) exploring the linking of REDD+ and NAMAs.

The REDD+ process moved at a very fast pace, which had positive spinoffs in other areas such as MRV. All African countries need to participate in and benefit from REDD+; and in Cancun, the African Group called for the inclusion of agriculture in REDD. This led to a compromise, where agriculture was removed from REDD+ and put in a work program under the SBSTA. SBSTA discussions will determine to what extent developing countries benefit from REDD+. Countries need to consider that implementation of safeguards could become a conditionality for funding. Critical issues to be discussed in the negotiations include: clarity on financing; establishment of REL and monitoring systems; identification of drivers of land-use change; the extent of the role of safeguards in REDD implementation; and clarification on definitions of forest, forest degradation and forest conservation. There is a disconnect in the discussions on implementation (under the AWG-LCA) and technical issues (under SBSTA). The REDD+ Partnership provides a venue to somewhat combine the two, but there are gaps between all of these venues and what is happening at the national levels.

REDD+ is an opportunity for livelihood improvements, as a huge amount of money could potentially flow to developing countries. REDD+ could have various co-benefits, such as reducing conflict over resources and delivering benefits directly to the poor. The key points and main issues in REDD+ discussions include: scope and objectives of REDD+; safeguards; protection of natural forest and restoring degraded natural forest; ensuring rights of indigenous peoples; gender considerations; global emissions reduction goal for deforestation; retaining forest carbon; accountability mechanisms (MRV systems) and institutional arrangements (financial mechanisms). Many developing countries prefer fund-based, as opposed to market-based, mechanisms; while most developed and some developing countries prefer market-based or a combination of the two.

Discussion

Participants shared concerns about how to move from negotiation to implementation. One main concern shared was the lack of clarity about nested systems; or how the international framework will accommodate the many on-the-ground pilot projects and how subnational activities will fit in the national system. A second main concern was the lack of promised financing and the readiness needed before countries can benefit from the carbon market. REDD should be an economic development tool for African countries and agriculture should be considered as part of the problem as well as the solution. Increased involvement is needed from indigenous African NGOs, civil society and women's groups. Another issue is benefits sharing, and how to ensure that carbon benefits reach indigenous and local communities directly, without need of intermediaries. Private sector involvement should be part of the agenda of future negotiations and discussions. African countries should emphasize innovative safeguard experiences and case studies to demonstrate what is happening on the ground and build trust with developed countries on their capabilities to deliver. Participants were informed that there will be opportunities in Durban to exhibit best practices in the African pavilion. There was discussion about the way forward for African countries to prepare for the international negotiations: participate in the Coalition for Rainforest Nations and other organized groups to build capacity building and strategize on REDD; and develop a common African position on MRV and safeguards.

2.4 Regional Perspectives

The presentations in this session focused on regional perspectives and country experiences on REDD+ progress and actions. The goal of this session was to help identify key challenges for REDD+ moving forward, gaps between the negotiations and action on the ground, and lessons learned from early implementation.

Jean Ilunga Muneng, Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation and Tourism in Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) shared information about regional cooperation under COMIFAC and domestic REDD process in DRC. DRC formed a REDD national committee that involves all stakeholders, including members of Parliament, civil society, indigenous and local communities. An inter-ministerial REDD committee includes the departments of Agriculture, Rural Development, Environment, Mines, Land Planning, Town Planning and Habitat. DRC wants to create a register of REDD+ activities and is developing a first inventory of REDD+ projects and initiatives, and a process of accreditation. Muneng stressed lessons learned from the REDD+ national process, which included the: need for institutional strengthening of the national REDD+ leadership; coordination between multilateral institutions and bilateral donors; and participatory processes.

Joel Scriven, UN-REDD Programme, Food and Agricultural Organization presented the UN-REDD approach on information, monitoring and MRV for REDD+ in Indonesia. He highlighted the importance of the three phases, from readiness to results-based demonstration activities and payments for verified performance. The approach to implementation in Indonesia includes three phases. Phase 1 consists of the development of partnerships, extensive technical consultations, action plan and institutional arrangements; building on existing capacities and expertise; and hiring and training technical staff. Phase 2 will focus on implementation of national policies and measures, demonstration activities, a monitoring system for subnational pilot activities, a REDD+ safeguards information system, capacity building of sectoral land management systems, national forest inventory and a REDD+ GHG inventory. Phase 3 is important for the integration of REDD+ with other mitigation actions. At this stage, the MRV system to report on REDD+ mitigation performance should be fully operational and should enable payment linked to performance. REDD+ reporting requirements should be consistent with NAMAs, the REDD+ safeguards information system should be ongoing and the demonstration monitoring system should be scaled up to a national performance monitoring system. Scriven highlighted the current challenges for MRV, which include: i) limited knowledge of negotiation outcomes at the national and regional levels, and a need to increase coordination and communication at all levels; ii) a need for institutional strengthening at the national level; iii) coordination of international support, delegation of responsibilities, jurisdictions, capacity building; iv) communicating and building lasting technical knowledge; and v) extending training to the subnational level.

Discussion

Many countries were concerned about how various domestic projects will fit into the international REDD agreement. Another concern was equity in financing. For example, DRC receives more financial support than other countries in the Congo Basin region, a situation that might lead to some countries progressing faster than others. The 10 COMIFAC countries are working to improve coordination, further a regional vision and improve negotiating power by speaking as a consolidated voice.

Participants also discussed the scalability of MRV—that is, scaling up from the project or subnational level to the national level. Project-based MRV will create a bureaucratic backlog (similar to the Clean Development Mechanism [CDM] certification process) and create variance in reference levels and methods. To date, demonstration activities have been at the project level, but in the long run, a national approach should be encouraged.

Responsibility for MRV lies with different institutions at various levels. Indonesia is in the process of creating an MRV agency that will coordinate all institutions and deal with REDD and NAMAs.

Many countries are still at the institutional mapping stage, determining where capacity lies, where it must be strengthened, and where it is missing altogether. Pending issues are to assess existing capacities, the need for new institutions, how to finance them, and how to effectively engage indigenous groups and account for traditional forms of governance. In DRC, for example, each thematic coordination groups has at least one civil society/indigenous representative.

2.5 Addressing Safeguards and Encouraging Multiple Benefits

The Cancun Agreements include a number of safeguard provisions that are to be addressed and respected throughout the implementation of REDD+ activities in developing countries. Discussions in this session explored some of the key issues related to addressing safeguards and encouraging multiple benefits in the REDD negotiations.

Deborah Murphy, IISD, provided an overview of safeguard issues and options that were laid out in the draft policy paper entitled *Safeguards and Co-Benefits in a REDD+ Mechanism*. She noted the inclusion of safeguard measures in the Cancun Agreements, and differentiated between safeguards as the “do no harm” principle, and multiple benefits that extend beyond the status quo. A number of existing initiatives, governance frameworks and standards can help inform the further development of safeguard modalities under REDD+. She also outlined the key outstanding issues for negotiation in the lead-up to COP 17, including the design of a system for providing information on how safeguards are being addressed and respected; determining how this system will link to the MRV of carbon stocks; and how to encourage REDD+ activities to go beyond “do no harm” to encourage multiple benefits.

Rahima Njaidi, Community Forest Conservation Network (MJUMITA), Tanzania, presented on the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+ SES). These consist of principles, criteria and indicators that define the necessary conditions to achieve high social and environmental performance. They provide a framework for assessment of social and environmental performance using a multistakeholder assessment process. The standards support the design, implementation and evaluation of government-led REDD+ programs, enabling consistent assessment irrespective of funding source. A number of countries, such as Ecuador, State of Acre (Brazil), Province of Central Kalimantan (Indonesia), Nepal, and Tanzania, are participating in the initiative. An international standards committee oversees the initiative and a broad membership ensures stakeholder balance. Njaidi highlighted the challenges and lessons learned: given the multiple levels (national, international, etc.) of safeguards, there is need for coordination and consistency; implementing and assessing free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) is critical but challenging; and managing multistakeholder processes highlights capacity needs. REDD+ SES promote social and environmental performance that goes beyond “no harm.”

Priscilla M. Achakpa, Women Environmental Programme, Nigeria, shared perspectives on gender. She explained that men are more likely to be involved in timber and logging, but women are involved in deforestation at the livelihood and agricultural levels. The integration of gender considerations into REDD+ frameworks brings about improved efficiency and sustainability, as it contributes to women's involvement and commitment as critical players of local forest management. The design of social and environmental safeguards must include gender perspectives. Gender issues in Nigeria are captured in the National Forest Policy, which aims to actively involve women in forest policy development, implementation and sustainable management of forest resources. To improve gender considerations in REDD activities, awareness raising is needed for government officials and forest communities. The concept of gender in FPIC should be mainstreamed for REDD+.

Deuteronomy Kasaro, National REDD+ Coordinator, Zambia, discussed the co-benefits initiative in Zambia. To generate benefits, there is a need to identify drivers of deforestation. Kasaro stressed that a distinction should be made between benefits from natural resources, such as biodiversity, and co-benefits that accrue to communities. For co-benefits to be promoted, there is a need to address the needs of local communities, which should be able to make and influence decisions in forest resource management. REDD revenue should contribute to local-level development, such as support for rural health centers, schools and feeder roads, as well as value-added investments, such as small-scale forest enterprise development. Kasaro highlighted that REDD+ activities bear the risk of causing social and environmental harm if the REDD+ programs are designed with a focus on emission reduction objectives only.

Discussion

Anything the REDD+ mechanism does in addition to reducing emissions can be considered a co-benefit. Participants shared concerns about the multiplicity and coordination of various existing standards, the number of criteria and how they could determine effective national REDD safeguard standards that do not duplicate the administration and cost burden of the CDM. Countries need to determine minimum realistic and practical conditions that will allow REDD to be effective and doable. The cost of a safeguard system, the need for monitoring and evaluation frameworks, and ensuring broad participation of stakeholders are concerns for countries. Countries also need to consider how to best reach the poor, and integrate women's groups, which play a key role in forest management. Countries also need to tackle the issue of outside timber dealers, who are responsible for deforestation and degradation. Another issue is how to differentiate between uncontrolled fires and using fires (slash and burn) as a management tool.

2.6 Breakout Groups: Safeguards and Multiple Benefits

Three breakout groups were formed to discuss key questions:

1. What lessons can be learned from activities in your country that can inform the negotiations?
2. How can we encourage REDD+ activities that go beyond “do no harm” and encourage multiple benefits?
3. What systems are needed for providing information on how safeguards are being addressed and respected while respecting national sovereignty?

Group 1 noted that lessons can be learned from the ongoing implementation of some forest-based activities, including FLEGT, Forest Resource Assessments, Environmental Impact Assessments and the African land policy framework adopted in Libya in 2009. Negotiators should invite researchers to accompany them during UNFCCC negotiations to apprise them of developments in REDD+ processes. Safeguards should be extended to the informal sector, especially the small landowners who play the biggest role in deforestation in Africa. In order to go beyond “no harm” and promote multiple benefits, the group called for an effective participation of stakeholders, rewarding self-organized community structures instead of direct payments to communities, cross-border collaboration to reduce leakage, clarity on land regulations and quantitative carbon valuation of national forests for appropriate compensation. Effective REDD+ safeguard information systems require a clear benefits sharing mechanism, dispute resolution mechanism, clear land tenure arrangements (including addressing the issue of “who owns the carbon?”) and continuous assessment of the carbon value of the forest that is conserved under REDD+.

Group 2 stressed that many countries are at different stages in REDD+ development, with DRC and Sudan being more advanced. Country experiences include use of World Bank social and environmental safeguards, forest certification, payment for ecosystem services and protection of rights of minorities. Some stakeholders lack capacity to manage and use REDD funds, and need capacity building. Cross-learning at the national and regional levels is important to share best practices and experiences; and pilot projects are needed with private companies. Some noted the need for an international framework for safeguards, while others highlighted the need to respect national sovereignty with criteria developed by national governments. A safeguards information system could include a chain of custody to track the national process, as well as beyond borders. Communication tools are needed to raise awareness in local communities. Radio is a good communication tool in Africa because computer use and Internet access is not widespread.

Group 3 discussed the important role played by communities in developing and implementing safeguards. REDD will work where participatory forest management is strong, as it empowers local

communities, including indigenous communities. The devolution of power to local/regional level in terms of forest management can be difficult and attempts point to lessons: i) communities need the capacity to deal with funds, otherwise they can become overwhelmed; ii) the carbon market is not a silver bullet and should be considered carefully; iii) a bottom-up approach and transparent partnerships between the various stakeholders are key factors of success. Various options have been used for benefits distribution. Community forest management can involve monetary gains going into a trust fund to pay for projects in the community. Or governments can collect funds and redistribute. Land ownership is also an issue: if all protected lands are owned by the government, how will communities access benefits?

2.7 Plenary Discussion: Key Issues for the Way Forward

In the plenary, participants discussed safeguard information systems, addressing some key questions: Who is the information for? How frequently should it be reported? What type of data is required? What platform is required? How are measurements going to be done? Who is going to pay? Who is responsible? What governance structures need to be developed? Are countries reporting to the UNFCCC or to international donors? Participants advised on the need to learn from existing institutions and frameworks such as Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT), REDD+ SES and forest certification processes to build safeguards on REDD+. The experiences of community-based forestry and participatory processes can inform safeguards. “Sharing” information is not as simple as putting everything on the Internet, because connectivity remains a big issue in Africa.

The equity and accessibility of international financing was discussed, with participants noting that some countries do not seem to be attractive for donors. Large emitters, such as Indonesia or Brazil, are able to get international funding, but this is not the case for many African countries. Funders favour mitigation actions over adaptation and/or capacity building, and the current financing distribution could cause balkanization of states. The financing issue is still under negotiation, and African countries need to think about how to contribute to the discussions on financing institutions and governance. African countries should also be more proactive in developing their own policies and strategies related to climate change and REDD, and develop clear key messages to deliver in the REDD+ partnership. African countries also have to think about how to tie mitigation and adaptation together in strategies so that the REDD activities are attractive to donors (more oriented toward mitigation), but help African countries meet their needs as well (adaptation). There is no agreement on definitions, MRV and scope; but financing is being provided for REDD+ activities without clear vision of where this will lead. The Africa group should develop a clear vision to ensure negotiating clout.

Participants discussed if markers are required to indicate the transition between the three REDD phases.

2.8 Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)

Discussions in this session explored some of the key issues related to the development of an MRV framework for REDD+. Discussions during this session focused on lessons learned from early action and various information gaps.

Florence Bernard, ASB Programme Associate at ICRAF, gave an overview of MRV issues and options. She first provided a comprehensive definition of MRV based on the UN-REDD definition. She stressed that MRV was included in the Cancun Agreements as one of the most critical elements necessary for the successful implementation of any REDD+ mechanism. The Cancun Agreement calls for: a national forest reference emission level (REL) and/or forest reference level (RL); a robust and transparent national system for forest monitoring; and that alternatively, such reference levels and monitoring system can be developed at the subnational level as an interim measure. Annex II requires SBSTA to provide guidance on methodologies for developing national forest RELs and/or RLs. Practical questions were raised in regard to implementation: lack of common and clear understanding of what constitutes a “forest” and its boundaries in the REDD+ framework; MRV institutional framework; and transition criteria for graduating from one readiness phase to another with regard to the step-wise MRV approach. Outstanding issues in the lead-up to COP 17 include RLs, nested approaches for baseline deforestation rates, what to include or leave out in terms of carbon pools and how it affects the accuracy and acceptability of MRV results, costs and financing of MRV, and the scope and characteristic of a REDD MRV system going beyond carbon.

Denis Sonwa, Scientist of the Environmental Services and Sustainable Use of Forests group in the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), gave a presentation on taking stock of MRV in Central Africa. He explained the main land uses in Congo Basin, and noted that the main land-use changes are due to deforestation (i.e., conversion of forest land to agricultural land, meadows and villages) and degradation (i.e., selective logging). Some efforts are made toward sustainable management, including Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) practices (e.g., International Tropical Timber Organization guidelines), certification processes, FLEGT processes and harmonization of efforts at the regional level. Regarding MRV in REDD, he stressed that more information was needed on carbon pools, land cover and related carbon stocks, land-use changes and related carbon losses. Improved MRV in Central Africa requires capacity building, concerted and coherent efforts at the national and regional levels, and establishment and updating of databases of basic information need for REDD.

Brian Mantlana, Climate Change & Bio-Adaptation Division, South African National Biodiversity Office, presented on REDD+ capacity building, using the example of the Germany-South Africa Mitigation and MRV Partnership, which started in May 2010. The partnership intends to bring together countries to exchange experiences on: i) how best to design effective mitigation actions in the context of green growth plans and how to mobilize financing for planning and implementation; ii) what is needed in all countries with regard to MRV in terms of actions to reduce emissions and how best to support developing countries' domestic capacities and institutions; and iii) how transparency of the implementation of actions and performance towards commitments can be ensured in practice. The main goals of this partnership are to demystify MRV; share best practices and experiences; and test ideas, formats and processes.

Jean Roger Rakotoarijaona, National Environment Office, Madagascar, shared with participants the experience of developing an MRV system in Madagascar. Madagascar has huge biodiversity and numerous protected areas, meaning that REDD could be the right opportunity to fight biodiversity loss and alleviate poverty, through the protection of forests. Experience shows that it is important to promote existing tools and use pilot projects. Madagascar plans to implement three levels of monitoring (national, regional and local) to reach Tier 3. Geographic information systems tools (CLASlite and LIDAR) and the "Stock Change Method" methodology will be used to calculate carbon stock variations. Future MRV considerations include local community participation, assessment and monitoring of leakages, the frequency of measurements and reporting, the establishment of a new national reference levels, bottom-up or top-down nested approaches for the reference level, availability of tools, how to MRV the "+" of REDD+ and the standardization of socioeconomic statistics. A challenge is harmonizing methodologies between project-scale to national-scale levels.

Discussion

Participants shared concerns about the lack of clarity on the definition of forests and REL/RL and the link between REDD and NAMA MRV. A major point was the need for information on the nested approach and how subnational activities will link up to the national level, and how this is going to be factored into negotiations.

Methods and modules for carbon measurement, choice of carbon pools and allometric equations are needed. Many countries use generic equations and little is known about specific equations, which impacts accuracy of measurement. Countries need to assess existing and needed MRV capacities, expertise and data as a starting point. Collaboration at regional level is important to increase accessibility to information, and technology. African countries should consider nominating technical experts for UNFCCC expert and technical groups because it will improve participation at the international level, and raise awareness of African capacity.

Local communities should be included and have an active role in MRV. The Madagascar experience shows that local communities get involved progressively in MRV as they improve their capacities. Technologies used, such as remote sensing and GIS, can be quite complex; simple methodologies are needed to better involve local communities.

Translating MRV into something that makes sense to policy-makers and how to communicate the economic costs of the MRV activities is a challenge. Participants acknowledged the need for clarity in regard to the carbon market, and most participants agreed that the REDD mechanism should be seen as an opportunity to sustainably finance economic and social development. More effort should be put into adaptation, which remains a “distant cousin” to mitigation.

2.9 Drivers of Deforestation: Agriculture

This technical session provided an overview of agriculture as a main driver of deforestation, and negotiations around agriculture in the international climate change regime.

Peter Minang, Global Coordinator of the Alternatives to Slash and Burn Partnership at ICRAF, gave an overview of REDD and agricultural drivers of deforestation. He emphasized agriculture as a driver of REDD due to increased demand for food, fibre and fuel for a rising population, which leads to clearing of forested lands. Minang highlighted that there were two pathways: i) either there are increased yields in a context of inelastic demand, which could lead to lower prices and a possible drop in cultivated area; or ii) there are increased yields in a context of elastic demand, which leads to an increase in cultivated area. As such, intensification of agriculture is a necessity, but not a sufficient condition for forest protection. In order to address drivers of deforestation, decision-making processes at multiple levels are important, and including changing consumer behavior needs to be carefully considered. Minang suggested the way forward should be based on: intensification in areas already cleared (non-forested), promotion of trees on farms and areas outside forests, and increased economic benefits from forest conservation (linked to payments for ecosystem services). He stressed the need to move from intensification to multifunctionality.

Girma Amente, Oromia Regional State Forest and Wildlife Enterprise, Ethiopia, explored the links between agricultural expansion and deforestation. He first explained the main drivers of deforestation in Ethiopia: demand for agricultural land, rising population, forests regarded as agricultural land in reserve, forest resources under used and undervalued, communities excluded from decision making about the forests, gaps between demand and supply of wood products, and forest fires. Addressing these drivers include establishing Joint Forest Management systems across the forest; demarcating and mapping forest areas; promoting forest-based livelihoods; developing

PES and REDD systems and finance; community wood lots; improved energy stoves; land use planning; improving agricultural productivity in the buffer area; participatory Natural Resource Management. Promoting co-benefits of forests, and improved farming practices and agro-forestry activities in the buffer areas can help to reduce deforestation. The main lessons learned from Ethiopia's experience are: i) PFM is an appropriate tool to implement REDD+ and halt deforestation; ii) Successful implementation of REDD+ requires work outside the forestry sector and forest boundaries; iii) conservation should contribute to improved livelihoods for forest dependent communities if it is going to be sustainable; iv) REDD+ income should be treated as one of the multiple benefits of forests; and v) empowerment of local communities including women is crucial for sustainable implementation of REDD+.

George Wamukoya, Climate Change Advisor, Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa Secretariat, presented the way forward in the negotiations on agriculture. He first stressed the importance of agriculture for all countries of Africa as more than 60-80 percent of the economically active population and their dependents rely on agriculture for their livelihoods, employment and income. He emphasized on the impacts of climate change which will affect agricultural production and food security. Therefore, to finance agricultural adaptation, international financing will be a prerequisite. In the context of Africa, mitigation in agriculture is a co-benefit. Agriculture was not included in the Cancun Agreements, being addresses as driver of deforestation in the REDD+ text. Options for including agriculture in a Durban agreement include under a programme of work under SBSTA and/SBI; under sectoral approaches; and as a separate item under the AWG-LCA. It is in Africa's best interests to consider how agriculture can include the integration of adaptation and mitigation.

Discussion

Developed countries are interested in addressing agriculture as a mitigation issue with adaptation as a co-benefit; whereas the African group and Asian countries would like to address agriculture as an adaptation issue with mitigation as a co-benefit. A balance is needed between adaptation and mitigation, but adaptation is of particular importance for African countries.

Participants mostly agreed that agriculture should not be part of REDD+ at present, but addressed as a driver of deforestation. It was discussed that agriculture could be included under SBSTA/SBI, sectoral approaches, or a separate agenda item under the AWG-LCA; with countries needing to consider the various options before Bonn.

Sustainable agriculture systems are needed and agroforestry landscape systems can play an important role in finding the tradeoffs between biodiversity conservation and agricultural production. The idea

of looking at a whole landscape approach and promoting AFOLU (agriculture, forestry and other land uses) was emphasized; but there is reluctance to bring all these concepts into REDD+ at this stage. Agriculture intensification does not always result in decreasing deforestation, especially in an open economy. Ongoing research on trade and leakage shows that some countries reducing emissions have actually displaced land use (hence emissions) to other countries by importing food, fiber and wood products, and thus increasing their external emissions footprint. Deforestation is very much influenced by market dynamics. Thus far, leakage has not been avoided leakage, and we may need to consider how to include emissions related to exports and imports.

Clarity is needed on definitions (e.g., minimum land size, types of trees to qualify for a REDD project), and scope of enhancement of forest carbon stocks. Land tenure is another important issue in REDD programs. In some countries, such as Nigeria, lands were taken away from communities for industrial agriculture, such as biofuels by outside companies.

2.10 Breakout Discussions on MRV and Agriculture

Three breakout groups were formed to discuss key questions:

1. What lessons/best practices can be learned from activities in your country to inform the negotiations (e.g., REL/RL, subnational versus national level, nested approach, and institutional set-up)?
2. What are priority capacity building areas?
3. How can agriculture best be included in the UNFCCC?

Group 1 suggested different priority areas for capacity building to identify and monitor forest cover changes including: generation of data (valuation and quantification of carbon stocks in the various ecosystems), reference scenario setting, and reporting mechanisms (e.g., guidelines on what to report). Other capacity building needs included: creating and improving physical infrastructure for data collection and reporting (e.g., laboratories); database management; technologies (GIS and remote sensing, satellite imageries); logistics for inventories (allometric equations); and ensuring transparency in accounting for GHG emissions and removals. Building internal capacity is critical (as opposed to using external international consultants), and government need to identify and tap skills from universities and research institutions, and communities. Governments need to determine and build on domestic capacity, and develop methodologies that allow the involvement of local communities. Other key considerations included compliance issues, communicating REDD information and building negotiation skills. Agriculture should be left out of REDD+ in order not to overload the REDD+ mechanism.

Group 2 noted that COMIFAC countries have developed the REL/RL at the regional level with World Bank support. They used historical trends and data, adjusted for future projected growth. This decision was based on the low rate of deforestation and degradation, the low rate of development and a desire to become an emerging economy by 2025. Many African countries do not want agriculture included in the international climate change agreements, unless it is addressed as if part of adaptation.

Group 3 stressed the need for improved technical capacity, assistance to cover the costs of some technologies. Lessons learned are that monitoring biodiversity is expensive and not cost-effective; countries have ability to develop methods (i.e., arithmetic equations for measurement), but implementation remains a challenge. Participatory monitoring approaches have proven relatively cost-effective and beneficial, but the challenge is the accuracy and completeness of data. The group highlighted the need for coordination and raising awareness of activities that are already taking place, and cost-effective approaches. Building effective MRV systems will require financial and technical capacity. With regard to agriculture, Group 3 noted the need for balance between food security, agricultural productivity and addressing climate change; and that agriculture should be seen as both a mitigation and adaptation issue. Agriculture is a driver of deforestation, but also a significant source of GHG emissions in and of itself. Group 3 cautioned against overloading REDD with too many components and elements that could impact negotiations.

2.11 Plenary Discussion: Key Issues for the Way Forward

Before moving to discussion, Sudan shared their experiences with the participants. Sayeda Khalil, Head of General Administration of Afforestation and Focal Point for REDD+, explained that the Forests National Corporation implements and coordinates all forestry and REDD+ issues. Sudan has formed a national REDD+ unit to develop the framework for a REDD+ strategic plan. Participatory processes were used to formulate the Forest Policy 2006, meaning the policy is driven by society's demands and people's needs. Khalil highlighted the need for support in: estimating the opportunity costs for REDD+, developing effective and inclusive national governance systems for REDD+, developing a national REDD+ strategy plan and developing an MRV system.

Mey Ahmed, Sudanese Environment Conservation Society, explained that adaptation is very important for Sudan because over 80 per cent of Sudanese are directly dependent on natural resources for their livelihood. Adaptation in Sudan is about creating conditions to support changes in livelihoods, such as multi-purpose trees and shrubs on farm land and the successful use of agro-forestry systems and community forestry. Dealing with vulnerability to climate change and conflict, requires multi-track cooperation (decision -makers, UN agencies and donors, civil society, local communities) and coordination on different subjects (awareness raising, capacity building, networking and advocacy, new sustainable solutions, research and funding).

The plenary discussion stressed that the African group position is to not include REDD in NAMAs to prevent slowing progress on REDD, although MRV for REDD should be compatible with MRV for NAMAs. The verification part of MRV is unclear in terms of what is to be verified and who is going to verify. Countries are uncertain about the level of external scrutiny required in MRV systems, and noted the need for international processes to respect domestic policies and national sovereignty. Greater understanding is needed of the implications of linking REDD with NAMAs in terms of MRV.

2.12 Closing Remarks

Participants noted the real value in bringing together negotiators and land managers; and suggested that representatives from the private sector have greater involvement in future workshops. They also expressed the need for future workshops that could focus on the “how” of REDD implementation. Peter Minang and Deborah Murphy thanked participants for their excellent contributions and thanked all experts who shared many insights. They informed the group that the main messages from the workshop would be delivered to negotiators at the upcoming UNFCCC negotiating session in Bonn, Germany.

3.0 Key Messages

The main messages from the Africa regional workshop are set out in the executive summary of this report. The key messages of the two regional workshops held in May 2011 (Douala May 10–12 and Hanoi May 18–10) are set out below. These messages represent a summary of common ideas and views expressed; they do not necessarily represent positions of or consensus among participants.

Safeguards

- Country experiences can provide lessons for measuring and reporting on safeguards. Examples include: FPIC, community forest management, PES, REDD+ SES, Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) and forest certification. These experiences need to inform the negotiations.
- Broad participation of stakeholders is needed to identify and measure impacts of safeguards. Local communities should be involved in measuring safeguards.
- Transparency and accountability need to be basic principles of a safeguard system. Information and reports should be publicly available and readily accessible, including through the Internet.
- A safeguard information system could have international guidelines or general principles that each country can adapt to their situation. Implementation of safeguards should be country-based and not enforced externally. Safeguards need to be flexible and reflect national circumstances, and not construed as an additionality.

Multiple Benefits

- Equitable benefits sharing is an important element of going beyond “do no harm” to create multiple benefits.
- Benefits sharing requires clarification of property rights over carbon, land tenure and other rights. Benefits sharing should be very flexible and based on national and local circumstances.
- Transparency, accountability and broad participation should underlie the achievement of multiple benefits. REDD+ activities need to recognize and involve as many stakeholders as possible, including local communities, indigenous peoples and the private sector.
- Forests are more than carbon; they provide such benefits as ecosystem services, water and biodiversity. This added value should be used as an incentive to leverage additional funds and a higher price for credits.

Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV)

- Countries need support and assistance to determine available domestic skills, capacities, information and data, which will be the building blocks for developing effective MRV systems.
- Countries need to develop MRV REDD+ modalities that include technical definitions and procedures (e.g., definitions of forest, reference level [RL], reference emissions level [REL] and nested approach).
- The development of RELs, RLs and baselines should be flexible and based on the circumstances of countries. Many countries will require assistance to scale up project and subnational RLs to the national level.
- Local community and indigenous peoples' involvement, including through participatory processes, must be an important element of MRV programs to ground truth "top-down" measurements and improve accuracy.
- Capacity building (e.g., forest assessments, monitoring forest cover change, information management systems) and technology transfer (e.g., geographic information systems, remote sensing) are critical and needed.
- Developing countries should consider appointing MRV experts to UNFCCC technical and expert groups.
- Guidance is needed on how MRV for REDD+ is to be consistent with MRV for NAMAs.
- Further exploration is needed on the issue of linking of MRV and safeguard information systems.

Agriculture

- The linkages between agriculture, food security and climate change must be recognized. Consideration should be given to addressing agriculture as a special area, given its importance for poverty alleviation and livelihoods for smallholder farmers.
- Agriculture needs to be approached from a perspective that links adaptation and mitigation. Adaptation is important from a developing country perspective.
- Agriculture should not be part of REDD+ at present, but addressed as a driver of deforestation, including through development of methodologies to more fully assess agriculture's role in the mitigation of climate change.
- Further exploration is needed to determine the best way to include agriculture in a manner that addresses both mitigation and adaptation. Options include exploration under the SBSTA/SBI, sectoral approaches or a separate agenda item under the AWG-LCA.

Financing

- Funding for REDD+ from multilateral and bilateral institutions needs to be transparent, equitable and accessible to all countries.
- The REDD+ Partnership should feed into, and be closely linked to, the UNFCCC.
- Financing must facilitate the engagement of national experts and allow developing countries to contract local domestic consultants.

Priorities for Follow-Up

- Continued information exchange across countries, with an emphasis on engaging negotiators, technical experts (foresters, land managers and social scientists), civil society and the private sector.
- Capacity building to improve the understanding of IPCC guidelines for REDD+ MRV, including estimating implementation costs
- Continued collaboration on and coordination of issues and positions, including:
 - REDD+ and land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF), including the management of overlaps in knowledge and processes
 - MRV, particularly the development of RELs, RLs and baselines; and linking subnational and national approaches
 - Verification, including identifying cost-effective developing country processes for verification (such as using regional bodies);
 - Integrated mitigation and adaptation approaches;
 - Domestic REDD+ finance structures and accessing international funding;
 - The “how” of REDD+ implementation at the country level, including case studies;
 - The development and implementation of NAMAs where appropriate;
 - Capacity building around implementing and providing information on safeguards, including simplification of criteria.