



REDD+ after Cancun: Moving from negotiation to implementation

Hanoi, Vietnam, May 18–20, 2011
Workshop Report and Main Messages

Jessica Boyle
Deborah Murphy
Florence Bernard

REDD+ after Cancun: Moving from negotiation to implementation

**Hanoi, Vietnam,
May 18–20, 2011
Workshop Report and
Main Messages**

Jessica Boyle
Deborah Murphy
Florence Bernard

© 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 and Background.....	4
2.2 Opening Remarks and Introduction.....	5
2.3 Update on the Negotiations.....	5
2.4 Regional Perspectives and Country Experiences: REDD+ Progress and Actions.....	7
2.5 Addressing Safeguards and Encouraging Multiple Benefits.....	8
2.6 Measurement Reporting and Verification (MRV).....	11
2.7 Drivers of Deforestation: Agriculture.....	14
2.8 Closing Remarks.....	17
3.0 Key Messages.....	18

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ASB-ICRAF	ASB Partnership for the Tropical Forest Margins
AWG-KP	Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol
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
GOFC-GOLD	Global Observation of Forest and Land Cover Dynamics
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
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 Hanoi, Vietnam, May 18–20, 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 multiple 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 Asian region were:

Safeguards

Country experiences can provide lessons for measuring and reporting on safeguards, such as: free, prior and informed consent (FPIC); national processes that recognize conservation; community forest management; sustainable forest management; payment for ecosystem services (PES); REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (SES); 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.

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, which include technical definitions and procedures (e.g., definitions of forest, reference levels [RL], reference emissions levels [REL] and nested approaches).
- 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.
- Guidance is needed on how MRV for REDD+ is to be consistent with MRV for nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs).

- Further exploration is needed on the issue of linking of MRV and safeguard information systems.

Agriculture

- Agriculture needs to be approached from a perspective that links adaptation and mitigation. Adaptation is important from a developing country perspective.
- 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 should not be part of REDD+ at present, but addressed as a driver of deforestation, including through development of methodologies to estimate emissions and removals.
- 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 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).

Priorities for Follow-Up

- Continued information exchange across countries, with an emphasis on engaging negotiators, technical experts (foresters, land managers, social scientists, etc.), civil society and the private sector.
- Capacity building to improve the understanding of Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) guidelines for REDD+ MRV, including estimating implementation costs.
- Continued collaboration on and coordination of issues and positions, including:
 - Understanding REDD+ and land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) issues, including the management of overlaps in knowledge and processes;
 - MRV issues, particularly the development of RELs, RLs and baselines;
 - Developing an integrated mitigation and adaptation approach;
 - Developing and implementing NAMAs where appropriate;
 - Capacity building around implementing and providing information on safeguards, including simplification of criteria.

2.0 Workshop Report

2.1 Introduction and Background

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: www.iisd.org/climate/land_use/redd/.

The May 2011 Asian workshop in Hanoi, Vietnam was attended by over 45 participants and expert presenters. Participants were from Asian 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; measurement, 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 Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Vietnam (UN-REDD pilot countries); Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Nepal, The Philippines, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka (UN-REDD partner countries), Laos, Thailand and Vanuatu (FCPF countries)—13 countries in total.

2.2 Opening Remarks and Introduction

Elizabeth Simelton, ICRAF Vietnam Country Director, opened the workshop. She welcomed all participants to Hanoi and expressed her gratitude to the special guests who would give opening remarks.

Nguyen B. Ngai, Deputy Director General, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), Vietnam, welcomed participants and expressed thanks to the workshop organizers and the Government of Norway for their continued support of REDD+ initiatives. He noted the progress made in Cancun on REDD+ and the constructive framework that has been set out for moving forward. He recognized that many issues on scope, methodologies and financing remain to be clarified, and noted the importance of initiatives such as the IISD/ASB-ICRAF project in supporting inclusive partnerships to move REDD+ implementation forward.

Thea Martine Ottman, First Secretary, Royal Norwegian Embassy, Vietnam, expressed her government's satisfaction with the framework for REDD+ that is part of the Cancun Agreements. Though several details remain to be discussed, the REDD+ framework forms a solid foundation, particularly in highlighting the importance of safeguards. Norway remains committed to close cooperation across the regions on REDD+ and Ottman stated that events and workshops such as this are an important part of supporting coordination and cooperation.

The co-facilitators of the workshop, Deborah Murphy, IISD, and Peter Minang, ASB-ICRAF, 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; v) and 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

Presentations

To set the scene for the workshop, a panel of negotiators provided their perspectives on the REDD+ outcomes of the Cancun Agreements and developments (or lack thereof) at the Bangkok negotiating session in April 2011. Tony La Viña, REDD negotiator for the Philippines, expressed that many negotiators believed the workplan for REDD was clear based on the Cancun Agreements,

but in Bangkok (April 2011), there proved to be divergence amongst parties as to “what Cancun meant.” The biggest concern remains the fate of the Kyoto Protocol and how negotiations will move forward in Durban and beyond. Can parts of the Kyoto Protocol be included in an AWG-LCA agreement, or vice versa? A political solution is required for this issue in order for Durban to be successful. In Bonn (June 2011), REDD will be discussed under SBSTA in two ways:

- 1) *Technical MRV discussions*: The key discussion point here is likely to be reference levels. Negotiators will aim to reach an agreement on reference levels by the end of 2011 so further progress towards implementation of REDD can be made.
- 2) *Safeguard discussions*: As early as Copenhagen, it was agreed that a REDD framework would include respect for safeguards. The next step now is determining the architecture and modalities for a system for sharing information on how safeguards are addressed and respected, while respecting national sovereignty.

The key issue that remains to be negotiated under the AWG-LCA is financing. The approach moving forward should be to include both market and non-market mechanisms in REDD financing and broaden the discussion to include a mix of public and private sources. An agreement on REDD financing in Durban would be a big success.

George Wamukoya, Climate Change Advisor to Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa, discussed the role of agriculture in the negotiations and prospects for moving forward. Though not included as a separate item in the Cancun Agreements, agriculture is of critical importance to the climate change negotiations, from both a mitigation and adaptation perspective, particularly with respect to food security. The question moving forward is how best to approach agriculture in the negotiations. Agriculture is likely to appear on the negotiating agenda in Bonn in two different agenda items: 1) under the sectoral approaches discussion of the AWG-LCA and 2) as a driver of deforestation under REDD under SBSTA and SBI. However, neither of these options fully reflects the combined mitigation and adaptation value of addressing climate change and agriculture. There is some momentum to include agriculture as a separate agenda item under the AWG-LCA discussions. As well, agriculture could be included in NAMA discussions.

Pham Manh Cuong, REDD negotiator for Vietnam, highlighted key issues for moving forward in looking towards COP 17 in Durban. There is recognition that not all parties support the Cancun Agreements, and they may or may not be part of a future legally binding agreement. This means additional effort is needed to ensure that REDD remains “on the table” regardless of the fate of the Cancun Agreements. There are also challenges to simultaneously negotiating the details while moving forward with implementation; further coordination and cooperation is needed to ensure that the process moves forward at all levels.

Discussion

Participants noted that the relationship between REDD and agriculture requires further investigation to move towards a whole landscape approach. The importance of increasing investment in agriculture was also raised, as was the need for increased demonstration activities to contribute to a body of best practices that can be communicated at the international level and strengthening the link between REDD and agriculture. On MRV, it was expressed that common standards should be established at the international level (particularly for purpose of establishing baselines and payments), but that addressing safeguards was more of a national process. On financing, concerns were raised over “where REDD fits” in to the broader climate financing architecture and how parallel funding mechanisms might be better coordinated. The connection between MRV for carbon and MRV for safeguards was also raised as an area requiring more discussion. It was suggested that all MRV elements should be streamlined into one process to avoid overly burdensome processes for developing countries.

2.4 Regional Perspectives and Country Experiences: REDD+ Progress and Actions

Presentations

Nur Masripatin, Indonesia presented on linking REDD with NAMAs. The relationship between REDD+ and NAMAs has been increasingly discussed within the negotiations, and there are logical connections between the two. Linking REDD+ and NAMAs presents challenges for two main reasons: 1) there are many ambiguities around the Cancun decision relating to NAMAs and 2) a great deal of progress has been made on REDD+, and parties are concerned that progress could stall or back-track if REDD were more closely linked to NAMAs in the negotiations. However, the question is not if REDD should be considered a NAMA, but rather how to best harness the connections between the two. In Indonesia, work related to policy planning awareness rising, and capacity building around both REDD and NAMAs is ongoing. The critical issue for Indonesia relating to REDD+ and NAMAs is how to ensure coherence between policy, actions, and MRV of REDD+ and NAMAs.

Jean Ilunga Muneng, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), presented on the status of REDD planning in DRC, including challenges and prospects for moving forward. DRC is making progress in its national REDD planning process, including through the establishment of governance structures and identification of stakeholders and financial partners. Technical, exploratory and feasibility studies have also been undertaken. The DRC has started a small number of pilot projects and established a REDD registry of activities. Six separate REDD initiatives on key issues such as reducing the impacts of subsistence agriculture on forests, afforestation/reforestation of

provisioning basins around major cities, and integrated land management are expected to be launched in the near future. The DRC has identified a number of challenges through their REDD planning experiences, including in coordinating financial and technical activities at various levels of implementation. Flexibility and innovation is recognized as an important element in managing the process, particularly given the continued negotiation of REDD+ at the international level. Mobilization of financing remains a key challenge to the acceleration of the REDD readiness process.

Discussion

The relationship between REDD+ and NAMAs was further explored, and many countries reiterated that they are opposed to more strongly linking REDD+ and NAMAs. These countries do not want to risk the progress made on REDD as NAMAs discussions are less developed. It was noted that, despite not wanting to formally link the two issues in the negotiations, there are synergies between approaches and a majority of developing countries have included REDD activities in their NAMA submissions to the UNFCCC.

2.5 Addressing Safeguards and Encouraging Multiple Benefits

The REDD framework that is part of the Cancun Agreements includes a number of safeguard provisions that are to be addressed and respected throughout the implementation of REDD+ activities in developing countries. Presentations and discussions in this session explored some of the key issues related to safeguards in the REDD negotiations and in implementation on the ground.

Presentations

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 within 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 that go beyond “do no harm” to encourage multiple benefits.

Tim Boyle, UN-REDD, provided thoughts on lessons learned related to co-benefits and safeguards activities under the UN-REDD Programme. UN-REDD views co-benefits as “all benefits arising from forest land that are not related to carbon or climate mitigation/adaptation.” Through a case study in Cambodia, he demonstrated the role of spatial analysis and mapping in determining co-benefits. By providing information on carbon stock densities and other parameters, such analysis can help support planning and decision-making on REDD+ at national and subnational scales. In terms of safeguards, principles should be universal (at the international level), but the criteria and verifiers will more than likely be at country level. The UN-REDD Programme’s Social & Environmental Principles and Criteria have been further developed in response to the Cancun decision on REDD. Boyle also outlined the synergies between the safeguards included in the Cancun decision and the framework used by UN-REDD. A social principles risk identification and mitigation tool is also under development by UN-REDD. He also noted the importance of participatory decision-making, transparency and accountability in establishing institutional and legal frameworks for benefits distribution in REDD activities.

Belinda de la Paz, Haribon Foundation, shared information about the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards Initiative (REDD+ SES) undertaken by the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) and CARE International. The standards provide a framework for assessment of social and environmental performance using a multistakeholder assessment process, by providing a series of principles, criteria and indicators. An international standards committee oversees the initiative and has an inclusive membership of government, community, private sector and indigenous peoples stakeholders from developed and developing countries. The SES may provide a framework that can be built upon in establishing a “safeguards information system” as set out in the Cancun decision. She also highlighted some challenges identified by the initiative in implementing standards, including: coordination of multiple mechanisms, inconsistency between national legal frameworks and international obligations, ensuring and assessing free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), capacity and quality gaps in information, monitoring and verification of compliance.

Yam Malla, of the Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC), provided insights on the role of FPIC in REDD+ activities. He explored the relationship between safeguards and FPIC, noting that the framing of safeguards has shifted in recent years. The safeguards outlined in the Cancun Agreements are more focused on recipient (or stakeholder or local community) safeguards, as opposed to donor safeguards. This leads to a more holistic approach to the concept. He outlined the importance of recognizing whose perspectives are being considered in REDD activities, and the underlying reasons why different stakeholders have different views of REDD. Safeguards and FPIC provide a potential policy framework for realizing and respecting forest rights and benefits and actively engaging stakeholders in a participatory process. The importance of partnering with national

partners and capacity building at the local level was highlighted, so as to ensure policy and technical issues are communicated in ways that stakeholders can understand. The transparent and effective communication of information then supports more robust consultation processes to take place at all stages of the REDD process. Climate change-related forest strategies can succeed when they complement, rather than conflict with, forest peoples' interests and community forest management practices.

Discussion

Streamlining approaches to safeguards, standards and governance is important to ensure that implementation takes place in an effective and efficient manner. In this way, there are lessons to be learned from the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) in terms of the need to minimize transaction costs and implementation burdens on developing countries. The question of scale was also raised; safeguards at the project level and national level must be complementary. Difficulties in determining what constitutes “success” in FPIC were also highlighted, along with challenges in identifying effective governance structures for the implementation of safeguards.

Breakout Groups: Safeguards and Multiple Benefits

Participants formed into three breakout groups to discuss the following key questions on the topic of safeguards and multiple benefits in REDD+:

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?

In their reports back to plenary, Group I stressed that community involvement and leadership is critical throughout the entire process of establishing and implementing safeguards. Government should be an enabler (provide support) but not necessarily an active facilitator of the process. It was also noted that strengthened communication and coordination is needed to ensure there is not a “one-way” flow of information. The form, content, institutions and process for a safeguard information system remains to be determined. Coordination, awareness raising and communication amongst all relevant stakeholders is seen as a key enabling factor of progress.

Group II also highlighted the importance of communication with local communities, proper consultation and raising awareness. Pilot projects, demonstration activities and carbon market voluntary projects are valuable in building knowledge and lessons. Experiences from ongoing

initiatives, or mechanisms in other sectors, should be built upon in REDD. The group felt that safeguards require a standard framework with context-specific guidelines that can be adapted based on country circumstances. Fairness, transparency and accountability were noted as basic principles (e.g., fair benefits distribution to stakeholders). Effective stakeholder involvement is necessary in the design and implementation of a safeguard information system and there should be a balance between local knowledge and scientific/technical knowledge. Incentive structures should take into account the broad co-benefits associated with forests, such as ecosystem services, water and biodiversity.

Group III believed that lessons learned from country experiences with safeguards, FPIC and co-benefits should be drawn upon in further developing these systems for REDD at the international level. Safeguards should promote social forestry systems and corporate social responsibility, and institutionalize a process of stakeholder consultation. The distribution of benefits creates challenges, but equitable distribution must be the goal. With respect to a safeguard information system, further clarity is needed on what information is required, whom it is for, how it will be shared, and who is accountable for its collection, dissemination and accuracy.

2.6 Measurement Reporting and Verification (MRV)

An MRV framework for REDD+ will need to be developed in a systematic way that takes into account lessons learned from early action, while working to improve capacity and technical expertise. The scale and scope of an MRV framework is under debate, and ensuring coherence and transparency in whatever system is developed should remain key priorities. This session included both policy-based and technical issues regarding the development of MRV modalities at the international level, and ongoing initiatives at the national and jurisdiction levels.

Presentations

Florence Bernard, ASB-ICRAF, provided an overview of MRV issues and options as laid out in the draft policy paper entitled *Strengthening MRV (Measurement, Reporting and Verification) for REDD+: Approaches for enhancing MRV systems effectiveness and efficiency*. She outlined the key elements of MRV included in the Cancun Agreements, highlighting a number of outstanding issues for continued discussion in the lead-up to COP 17. The establishment of reference levels, scale, approaches to baselines, accuracy, costs, and potential scope of a REDD MRV system going beyond carbon (i.e., MRV for safeguards) are all key issues that require further discussion.

Pham Manh Cuong, Vietnam, spoke to the development of an MRV system for REDD+ in Vietnam. The national process is based on the principles of national ownership and consistency with

the international negotiations and UNFCCC requirements. It is also important that the process is reflective of national circumstances, capabilities and priorities for REDD+ implementation. He highlighted transparency, completeness, consistency, comparability and accuracy as important requirements of a robust MRV system in any country. MRV is not only an international process, but must involve and be jointly financed at the national level. Outstanding questions remain: What indicators need to be measured? How are they to be measured? By whom? Cuong also discussed several challenges to MRV development in Vietnam, including scope; definitional issues; classification of land-use categories; modalities and guidance on safeguards; potential linkages with NAMAs; and determining the applicability of Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) good practice guidelines to the national process. Vietnam plans to continue with a phased approach to MRV, consistent with the phases of REDD+ implementation as agreed in Cancun.

Patrick Van Laake, UN-REDD, highlighted the Global Observation of Forest and Land Cover Dynamics (GOFC-GOLD) *Sourcebook of Methods and Procedures for Measurement and Reporting in REDD*. He began by noting the variability of REDD+ monitoring in the different regions; Mexico, India and China are considered to have a relatively small capacity gap, while other countries have much larger gaps. The GOFC-GOLD sourcebook is a living document that aims to bring together relevant information, data and methodologies with the goal of measuring comparability and identifying gaps. It has helped to facilitate cooperation and communication between the technical and policy communities, and often used in country REDD readiness activities. As a living document, Van Laake also noted the need to update the latest version to reflect ongoing developments in the international negotiations and areas requiring further technical guidance.

Naomi Swickard, Voluntary Carbon Standard, spoke to options for scaling up MRV. After providing an overview of the VCS structure, methodologies and key areas of work, Swickard discussed in greater detail the potential of scaling up project and local level MRV through a nested approach. In many cases, methodologies exist but are limited to the project and local levels. In order to ensure robust and comparable MRV, such methodologies must be scaled up, particularly in order to address permanence and leakage at a larger scale. The compilation of good practices and establishment of criteria for jurisdictional programs, baselines and crediting can support the process of linking “top-down” and “bottom-up.” Further clarification on the scope and requirements for MRV are needed as we move forward. She also stressed the need to engage the private sector in the process.

Doddy Sukadri, National Council on Climate Change, Indonesia and Mitsura Osaki, Hokaido University, Japan, gave presentations on Indonesia’s experience in developing an MRV system for REDD. Sukadri provided policy context by outlining some of the current challenges being faced by Indonesia and their plans going forward. At present, the uneven geographical distribution of emissions and decentralization of power to local governments create challenges for the development

of an MRV system. A great deal of data collection has already taken place in the country, and gaps and levels of uncertainty identified. To improve the baseline of data available for further MRV development, the country is now focused on more precise data acquisition and integration at the national and subnational levels. Techniques and methodologies have to be tested on the ground, such as combining satellite imagery and in-situ mapping. Indonesia is also working to establish an integrated national baseline as a basis to derive emission reduction targets. For Indonesia, MRV for REDD is part of MRV for national mitigation actions, and should be in line with the development of a nationally integrated framework. Coordination and integration at all levels of government is extremely important in setting the standard and methodology, and gaining consensus among key stakeholders. Both top-down and bottom-up approaches are required to develop a comprehensive MRV system in Indonesia.

Osaki discussed some of the technical elements of the MRV system in Indonesia. He provided an overview of the various forest and peatlands areas and factors that regulate carbon in tropical peat. He further elaborated on 1) emissions by fire and the establishment of a Peat Fire Index for Indonesia, 2) emissions from oxidation of microorganisms and the Eddy covariance technique, and 3) carbon loss through waterborne carbon. All of these elements are important components of establishing a robust MRV system, given the contribution to emissions and impacts on carbon measurements.

Discussion

The potential opportunity costs of using particular methodologies were raised as a concern. Approaches need to be “user friendly” and cost-effective. Participants noted the challenges associated with managing the simultaneous processes of international negotiation and national implementation. It was also highlighted that the establishment of a national baseline is not the process of selecting a single number at the national level, but rather deriving a baseline that has been stratified from data across a given country and includes numerous sectors beyond REDD. However, capacity to set such a baseline inevitably varies based on availability of data and numerous other factors. The need to clarify forest definition and classification issues was noted as a critical first step. It is difficult to measure “if we don’t know what we’re measuring.” The importance of using both satellite (i.e., macro) approaches and participatory community-based (i.e., micro) approaches to monitoring was also stressed.

Breakout Groups

Participants formed into three breakout groups to discuss key questions on the topic of MRV, including:

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

Group I identified priority capacity-building areas for MRV: i) **integrating approaches:** bridging gaps between local and national level approaches and data, and recognizing important role of both; ii) **simplification:** supporting information sharing and awareness raising for stakeholders in MRV to effectively communicate the “why” and “how”; and iii) **standardization:** creating comparability across jurisdictions and regions.

Group II explained that “capacity building” for MRV should include human resources, technology and financing. Capacity building is critical at every level in order to ensure robust development and comparability of efforts as REDD continues to develop. Based on country experiences in the group, priority areas requiring capacity building included: assessment of drivers; assessment of carbon stocks and how it relates to emissions and trajectories (and using this to develop reference levels, scenarios of emission reductions, opportunity costs); information management systems and database management; quality control for information systems; and building in-country capacity for monitoring.

Group III conveyed the need for clarity in definitions and terminology, including what is meant by a “nested approach” to MRV. Further determination of institution capacity and potential MRV architectures at the national and institutional levels is needed moving forward. Regional initiatives should be supported in order to promote strategies for cost-effective MRV and exchange of information. The group also stressed the importance of building on country experiences and increasing information sharing on MRV methodologies.

2.7 Drivers of Deforestation: Agriculture

Agriculture is a main driver of deforestation, and negotiations and actions around agriculture are closely linked to those around REDD+. This session further explored the relationship between agriculture and climate change; between REDD and agriculture; and the ways in which agriculture may move forward within the international negotiations.

Presentations

Oscar Rodas, Guyra Paraguay, discussed the relationship between agriculture and climate change, and the potential of reducing vulnerability in the agriculture sector. Agriculture is related to climate

change not only as a driver of deforestation, but also in regard to fuel consumption and emissions attributed to agricultural production around the world. Rodas explained the circular nature of the relationship: increasing agricultural expansion often leads to deforestation, which exacerbates the impacts of climate change, often leading to decreased productivity and thus further deforestation as agricultural demand increases and productivity decreases. However, a positive circular relationship between agriculture and climate change can exist when sustainable approaches to agroforestry and forest area restoration/protection are integrated into land management practices.

In South America (and Paraguay specifically), a large portion of emissions come from the agriculture sector, and, in particular, beef production. The adaptation *and* mitigation potential of agricultural activities must be considered together in order to meaningfully reduce vulnerability. Rodas outlined the regional needs and challenges related to dealing with climate change and agriculture broadly, and the important role that new practices and technologies play in addressing these concerns. He also noted the social impact of REDD+ activities in South America, and the need to increase capacity to implement incentive structures such as payment for ecosystem services (PES) and REDD.

Fahmuddin Agus, Indonesian Soil Research Institute, presented options for achieving sustainable agriculture practices while responding to climate change goals. Agus provided some context on Indonesia in particular, noting that recent trends have been characterized by intensification of rice and maize production and rapid increases in oil palm plantations. These trends have contributed to regional development and export growth, but also lead to increasing emissions. Actions to potentially decrease emissions in all agriculture and land-use sectors include: avoided deforestation, control of peat fire, water table control, and the rehabilitation of low carbon stock land to tree-based agriculture. He explained that technical and financial support is required to further develop smallholder tree-based farming and other sustainable agriculture approaches.

Sirintornthep Towprayoon, Joint Graduate School of Energy and Environment and Earth System Science Research Center, King Mongkut's University of Thonburi, discussed the mitigation potential and value of addressing agriculture as a driver of deforestation. Innovations and technology in agricultural production can increase efficiency so as to increase productivity without increasing land use. Better livestock management, cropland management, restoration of degraded land, and use of biofuels were discussed as potential mitigation technologies. The costs and benefits of each approach must be considered, as no approach is “one size fits all.” Crop rotation was also highlighted as a potential alternate system for sustainable agriculture. In any case, policies and incentives are key to addressing agriculture as a driver of deforestation.

George Wamukoya, COMESA, provided thoughts on moving forward on agriculture in the negotiations. The question going forward is how best to include agriculture in the negotiations so as

to capture both mitigation *and* adaptation perspectives. To what extent can this relationship be adequately addressed under REDD+ discussions? Through national REDD strategies, the drivers of deforestation within the country are to be identified; this will further highlight the role that agriculture plays. Wamukoya remarked that there is also opportunity for agriculture discussions under SBSTA's work program concerning drivers of deforestation. Agriculture also remains a part of the sectoral approaches agenda item under the AWG-LCA, although this presents political challenges due to the inclusion of bunker fuels. Some countries are promoting a separate agenda item on agriculture, though this presents its own political and procedural challenges.

Discussion

Participants noted the links between agriculture discussions under the AWG-LCA and Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP). The land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) discussions under the AWG-KP have agriculture-related elements and negotiators should not duplicate efforts, but rather should search for synergies. Supply and demand issues need to be addressed. Some countries are experiencing increases in agricultural intensification and productivity without the expected decrease in prices, leading to agricultural expansion. Concerns were also raised about opportunity costs, whereby alternative livelihoods and changing agricultural practices must offer appropriate incentives and be attractive to producers to be sustainable. Governments need to work with small- and large-scale producers simultaneously to meet climate change goals in the agricultural sector

Breakout Groups

Participants formed into three breakout groups to discuss agriculture and address the following question:

1. How can agriculture best be included in the UNFCCC?

Group I suggested that addressing agriculture as a driver of deforestation can limit agriculture to this context and encourage broader discussion of both adaptation and mitigation elements. A broader REDD+ mechanism in future years that includes an AFOLU (agriculture, forestry and other land uses) approach would create ample space for agriculture discussions. However, agriculture should not be included in REDD+ at present. If agriculture is addressed only under sectoral approaches, progress will be stalled, given the ties to the bunker fuels debate. The best approach would be a separate agenda item on agriculture in the negotiations, to allow for the broadest interpretation and to allow inclusion of mitigation and adaptation perspectives.

Group II stressed the need for agriculture and climate change to be linked to food security, and approached from a perspective that links both adaptation and mitigation. The group also agreed that the ideal approach for agriculture would be a separate agenda item in the negotiations, and not included in REDD (though addressed as a driver of deforestation). Negotiators need to further consider how to address biofuels and their relationship to the agriculture debate.

Group III agreed that agriculture should not be included in REDD at present, but should be dealt with as a driver so as not to compromise the REDD discussions moving forward. A broad understanding of agriculture is necessary, and it may be helpful to differentiate between agricultural commodities and production necessary for food security and poverty alleviation.

Group III agreed that agriculture should not be included in REDD at present, but should be dealt with as a driver so as not to compromise the REDD discussions moving forward. The group also suggested that, while a broad understanding of agriculture is necessary, it might be helpful to differentiate between agricultural commodities and production necessary for food security and poverty alleviation.

2.8 Closing Remarks

Pham Minh Thoa, Director of Science, Technology and International Cooperation, Department of Forestry, MARD, Vietnam, thanked participants for attending and contributing to a successful workshop. She thanked the organizers for hosting these regional workshops to encourage increased cooperation and capacity building on REDD+.

Peter Minang, ASB-ICRAF and Deborah Murphy, IISD, thanked participants for their excellent contributions and 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 Asia 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 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.