A quick introduction to CIFOR

• Established in 1993
• One of 15 centers in the CGIAR
• Focus on forest policy research and global comparative studies
• Headquarters in Bogor, Indonesia
• 80 Scientific staff working in the major forests of Southeast Asia, Africa and South and Latin America
• “Center without walls”
## CIFOR’s research strategy

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enhancing the role of forests in <strong>mitigating</strong> climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Enhancing the role of forests in <strong>adapting</strong> to climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improving livelihoods through <strong>smallholder</strong> and <strong>community</strong> forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Managing trade-offs between <strong>conservation</strong> and <strong>development</strong> at the landscape scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Managing impacts of globalised <strong>trade</strong> and <strong>investment</strong> on forests and forest communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sustainably managing tropical <strong>production forests</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Global Comparative Study on REDD (GCS-REDD)

- National REDD process and strategies (C1)
- REDD demonstration activities (C2)
- Monitoring and reference levels (C3)
- Knowledge sharing (C4)

www.forestsclimatechange.org
GCS-REDD: Countries and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asia Pacific</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Latin America</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1: National policies &amp; politics</th>
<th>C2: REDD+ pilot impact assessment</th>
<th>C3: MRV &amp; reference levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparative policy process analysis</td>
<td>Comprehensive methodology: BACI</td>
<td>Field testing of methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9 policy processes &amp; selected policy studies</td>
<td>20+ projects/sites</td>
<td>Defor. &amp; degradation modelling -&gt; RL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys 2010-2011</td>
<td>Surveys 2010 - 2012/13</td>
<td>National MRV systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting 2010
Quick recap of the role of forests in the international climate negotiations

• 1997: Negotiation of the Kyoto Protocol
  – Annex I countries emission reduction commitment
    (average emissions 2008-2012 = 5% lower than 1990 levels)

• 2001: Marrakesh Agreements
  – Role of forests in the CDM defined, but only afforestation/reforestation

• 2007: REDD included in the Bali action plan
  – Early action and demonstration activity encouraged
  – Readiness investments (FCPF, UN-REDD, bilateral donors)

• 2009: Copenhagen Accord
  – “recognizes the crucial role of REDD+”, but much remains unclear

➔ Unfolding REDD+ mechanism comparable to development aid
  (different donors, rules, systems)

➔ Eventually REDD+ in UNFCCC climate deals, but not likely before 2015
The core idea of REDD+

- C value of forests
- performance-based
Realising REDD+
National strategy and policy options

Edited by Arild Angelsen

• CIFOR 2009: Book on REDD+ at national level
  - 40+ countries preparing for national REDD+ strategies (R-PPs etc.)
  - 100+ REDD demonstration activities
  - > 20 years of forest policy experience

• Options assessment:
  - 3E+: Effectiveness, efficiency, equity, co-benefits
  - Options depend on context
Structure of the book

Global REDD+ architecture and debates

1. Moving REDD+ from global to national level

National level

2. Building REDD+ institutional architecture and processes

3. Enabling REDD+ through broad policy reforms

4. Doing REDD+ by changing incentives

5. Testing REDD+ at the local level

Outcomes (3Es+)
Different national circumstances and challenges

Stage 1: Little disturbed forests
DRC, Ghana, Suriname, Mozambique

Stage 2: Forest frontiers
PNG, Brazil, Bolivia, Indonesia, Cameroon

Stage 3: Forest-agricultural mosaics
India, Costa Rica

Stage 4: Forest/plantations/agricultural mosaics
Vietnam, China

Avoid leakage & deforestation in BAU

REDD+ challenges
Promote A/R
Reduce deforestation
Continue conservation

CIFOR
Different drivers of forest carbon change
Implications from the Global REDD+ architecture

• Phased approach
• Scope of creditable REDD+ activities
• Scale of accounting
• Performance-based approach
• Sources of funding: ODA, funds, markets
• MRV and reference levels
• Participation of indigenous people and local communities
## Phased approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase 1 - Readiness</th>
<th>Phase 2 - PAMs</th>
<th>Phase 3 - PES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td>RED/REDD/REDD+</td>
<td>REDD/REDD+</td>
<td>REDD+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crediting scale</strong></td>
<td>subnational</td>
<td>nested</td>
<td>Nested or national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance indicators</strong></td>
<td>- Strategy adopted</td>
<td>- Strategy implemented</td>
<td>- Quantified forest carbon changes (tCO2) compared to reference level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consultations conducted</td>
<td>- Policies enacted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- proxies for forest carbon changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>Readiness support Fund-based</td>
<td>Fund-based</td>
<td>Primarily market-based, but global fund also possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e.g. FCPF, UN-REDD, bilateral initiatives</td>
<td>e.g. FIP, Amazon fund, voluntary C-markets</td>
<td>e.g. C-markets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nested approach:
1. Sequential:
   - first project,
   - then national
2. Simultaneous:
   - both coexist

The most flexible, but
- Harmonization issues
- Credit sharing questions
Institutional structure - the 3Is

- **Global readiness funds**
- **Global funds**
- **International carbon markets**

**Institutions**
- Verification
- Monitoring, reporting

**Incentives**
- Regular budgets (national or subnational government)
- Policies and measures (PAM)
- REDD funds (national or subnational)
- Performance payments (e.g. PES)

**Subnational activities**

**Information**

**Forest management types**
- State (production)
- State (conservation)
- Private
- Community

**Carbon rights holder**
- Concession holder
- National and subnational government agency
- Land owner
- Community

**Other stakeholders**
- Energy users
- Environmental services users
- Farmers
- Consumers
MRV systems - 3 major challenges

1. Important to link MRV to policy design
   - Understand hotspots → spatial targeting
   - Understand drivers → sectoral and actor targeting

2. Allow early participation and interim performance
   - Accept conservativeness principle (discounting)
   - Define proxies to measure interim performance
   - Establish incentives for graduation towards better MRV

3. Align national MRV and sub-national implementation
   - Provide dedicated support to subnational REDD+ activities
   - Integrate community monitoring in national MRV system:
     • cheaper and about as accurate
     • co-benefits: employment, participation, legitimacy
2-track approach to REDD+

TRANSFORMATIONAL REFORMS

- Tenure reform
- Governance
- Decentralization

SPECIFIC POLICIES

- PES
- CBNRM
- Agricultural policies
- Woodfuel policies
- Land use restrictions
- Sustainable forest management

→ may or may not in itself lead to REDD+
→ but positive effects on equity and poverty reduction, which is necessary for the long-term success of REDD+ efforts

→ Simpler, technically and politically
Enabling REDD+ through broad policy reforms

• Tenure and rights
  – Rights are critical
    • Tenure reform essential for long-term success of REDD+ (re 3Es)
    • Some ”no regret” REDD policies that should not be missed
    • carbon rights = precondition for subnational crediting (who to pay?)

• Corruption
  – Puts a severe limit, in some cases very difficult to address
    (systemic institutional changes needed)
  – MRV of C & $ can reduce risk of corruption

• Decentralization & Community-based forest mgt.
  – Enhancing 3E outcomes & legitimacy
  – Extensive research on success factors
Payments for Environmental Services

• Potentially an effective instrument, but many preconditions required:
  – Clear understanding whom to pay and for what
  – Clearly defined and secured tenure (property rights)
  – Institutions to monitor performance and channel payments

• Main recommendations:
  – Apply consequent conditionality (pay after performance)
  – Target to high threat/high carbon density areas (additionality)
  – Differentiate payments to increase cost-efficiency
ICDPs and PAs

Protected areas protect forests, even after controlling for passive protection

Have a greater role in REDD+ than so far assumed

ICDP has mixed results, but reasons for poor performance are well understood → need to learn from past experience

Table 18.1. Forest area and forest loss in humid tropical forests, by conservation status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realm</th>
<th>All forests</th>
<th>Strictly protected areas</th>
<th>All protected areas</th>
<th>Total carbon in PAs (Mt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest area (000 ha)</td>
<td>Forest loss 2000–2005 (%)</td>
<td>Forest area (000 ha)</td>
<td>Forest loss 2000–2005 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrotropics</td>
<td>185 752</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>9 184</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australasia</td>
<td>80 775</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3 998</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neotropics</td>
<td>620 290</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>44 725</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Asia</td>
<td>220 964</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>10 014</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total humid tropical forests</td>
<td>1 107 780</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>67 922</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustainable forest management

• Promote third-party certification (e.g. FSC) and make accessible for small and low intensity managed forests
• Require and support the use of reduced impact logging (RIL) techniques
• Use taxation close to felling site to discourage wastage
• Secure resource access (durable concessions, use rights, private/community ownership)
• Wildfire control and forest restoration
The landscape of emerging REDD+ projects (179 projects surveyed)

- Projects can inform national REDD+ strategies ("mini test case"), incl. reform priorities to enable local REDD
- Landscape of REDD+ projects varies significantly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>DRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned projects</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>PES</td>
<td>Buy out concessions</td>
<td>Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponents</td>
<td>Domestic actors</td>
<td>Int’l NGOs</td>
<td>Int’l NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Third party certification has a major influence (CCBS, VCS)
Testing REDD+

Step 1
Identify indicators
- Intervention to be evaluated
- Observable process indicators
- Specific outcomes of interest
- Observable outcome indicators
- Identity control group

Step 2
Collect data
BACI Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>Baseline data for control</td>
<td>Impact/process data for control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
<td>Baseline data for project</td>
<td>Impact/process data for project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3
Analysis
Processes - Impacts

Step 4
Disseminate lessons learned
Planners vs. searchers

• A lot of the REDD+ actions will be a failure (if we/they dare to evaluate them)
• More good questions than answers
• Make it a learning experience
  – ”Learning while doing”
• Learning requires a systematic approach.
  – Project design
  – Data collection
  – Analysis
• Large potential benefits: 5 % of $10 billions
The dilemmas ahead

• REDD+ must be new ... but build on what has gone before
• REDD+ must be transformational .... in a world where change is incremental
• REDD+ requires targeted interventions … and broad sectoral coordination
• REDD+ need policies ... but the bias is toward projects
• Promising REDD+ approaches .... but no silver bullets
• REDD+ is urgent .... but cannot be rushed
• We know a lot .... but need to be learning while doing
Key messages

• REDD+ is a unique opportunity
  – the money and political will is there, but past performance mixed

• Context matters – REDD+ policies need to work on 2-tracks
  – Start long-term transformational reforms, or accelerate some of those ongoing (e.g. land titling cadastre)
  – Start short-term policies, but identify ‘low-hanging fruits’ - important also to demonstrate commitment: “YES WE CAN – AND WILL DO REDD”

• REDD is about PES-like performance-based payments
  – but strong preconditions apply → rely on some old approaches (protected areas)

• Learn from the past, but also while moving forward
http://www.cifor.cgiar.org
http://www.forestsclimatechange.org