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- Gender balanced (50/50)
- 3 NGOs
  - Conservation (global)
  - Social (women/agri/forest)
  - Business (SD/SFM)
- Pulp/Paper (south/global)
- Government (south/REDD)
- Forest consultancy (north/Global)
Our approach

Q 1 What is the “state of play” on REDD?
Q 2, 3 & 5 What is it about “safeguards” and “co-benefits” and “triggers” that TFD can advise negotiators about?
Q 4 Who has the “commitment” to pay for REDD and who has the “commitment” to deliver on REDD
Q1 State of play (1)

• Need for urgent action and forests must be dealt with effectively by UNFCCC and it must be REDD++
  – Dilemma is
    • SFM first and then access REDD funds…or
    • Use REDD as the incentives to move towards SFM

• Voluntary market – dynamic, fast paced, innovative, standards as key risk management strategy

• Negotiators text – confusing, conflicted, overloaded, complicated
Q1 State of Play (2)

• Carbon “baggers” are rushing to the carbon markets for often very focused objectives e.g. NGOs promoting biodiversity as the primary objective, “oh boy, have I got a deal for you..”

• Really, forest stakeholders should be leveraging carbon markets (existing voluntary and compliance when it emerges) for SFM

• SFM – balance generation of goods and services addressing economic, social and environmental needs over time/on landscape

• REDD should be supporting sustainable resource management and SD goals, not simply carbon offsets
Q 1 State of Play (3)

• If done right REDD should be “transformational”
  – Confirm/clarify ownership and tenure issues especially for marginalized groups (IP + rural women)
  – New revenue stream for the primary forest manager, responsible for generating the actual benefits
• Leverage responsive voluntary markets
• Put the effort into UNFCCC to get forests right as the compliance market (and associated rules) was the only way to scale up SFM nationally and globally
• Encourage UNFCCC to take a inclusive approach to forest sector stakeholders e.g. UNFF 9 major groups - a good MSD model
• “Overloading” REDD? Don’t’ be afraid to talk about REDD++++ actions delivering Carbon ++++ benefits
Q 2,3 & 5 – TFD advice to negotiators (1)

• TFD should take a phased approach to negotiations
  – Advocate the matrix elements as the basic requirements on REDD++ in Copenhagen text
  – Involvement in the post COP 15 real negotiations on REDD++ market design & implementation
    • Capacity building, institutions, MRV, property rights
    • NAMA, NAPA development

• REDD within UNFCCC can’t marginalize forests/SFM like the KP has
Q 2,3 & 5 – TFD advice to negotiators (2)

- With some adaption the key elements of the Montreux matrix describes the basic REDD +++ model (minimum requirements)
  - Phased approach
  - Key actions (add standards + benefit sharing)
  - Safeguards (add certification)
  - Finance sources
  - Add an additional column on Triggers/eligability (Meridian report)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Safeguards</th>
<th>Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation &amp; readiness</td>
<td>REDD strategy</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Multilateral &amp; bilateral grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protocols</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>(FCPF / UN-REDD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; measures</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Stakeholder platforms</td>
<td>Grants and loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy reform</td>
<td>Soc &amp; env audit</td>
<td>Global facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rights/ tenure</td>
<td>FPIC</td>
<td>Domestic &amp; others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilots</td>
<td>MRV system</td>
<td>Voluntary market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-based payments</td>
<td>CO₂ reduction</td>
<td>MRV system</td>
<td>Compliance market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verification</td>
<td>FPIC</td>
<td>Non-market compliance fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assess impact</td>
<td>Soc &amp; env audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q 2,3 & 5 – TFD advice to negotiators (3)

• Some terminology challenges
  1. SFM – is more about clear messaging than redefining what SFM actually is
  2. Co-benefits – outputs of SFM; linked to SD, social equity and biodiversity objectives
  3. FPIC – what is important is the intent; the link to creating and confirming property rights; effective and broader stakeholder engagement
  4. MRV – design systems for more than just carbon, and more than just forests
Q 2,3 & 5 – TFD advice to negotiators (4)

• Some observations on NAMA & NAPA

These are national processes that will involve significant legislative & regulatory changes e.g.

1. Property rights, including creation of carbon rights and liabilities

2. Benefit sharing & distribution of income and responsibilities (two e.g. Indonesia, Madagascar)

• So “up front” capacity building essential
Q 4 Commitments

• Who has to pay?
  – Annex 1 countries seeking carbon offsets linked to achieving greater emission reduction cuts

• Who has to deliver?
  – Non Annex 1 forest owners/managers under contract (be it for the voluntary or regulated markets) via SFM