UNEP

CBD

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WS/CB/REDD/APAC/1/2
18 March 2011

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

ASIA-PACIFIC REGIONAL CONSULTATION AND CAPACITY-BUILDING WORKSHOP ON REDUCING EMISSIONS FROM DEFORESTATION AND FOREST DEGRADATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (REDD-PLUS), INCLUDING ON RELEVANT BIODIVERSITY SAFEGUARDS
Singapore, 15 – 18 March 2011

CO-CHAIRS SUMMARY

1. This workshop is the second in a series of expert workshops to consult effectively with Parties on biodiversity aspects of REDD-plus[1], based on relevant decisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), notably decisions IX/5 and X/33 of CBD and decision 4/CP.15 and 1/CP.16 of UNFCCC. Views from CBD Parties have also been invited by notification 2011-018, with a deadline for submission of 30 April 2011.

2. The workshop results are intended to support both the CBD and UNFCCC discussions on relevant biodiversity safeguards for REDD-plus, as well as on the monitoring of biodiversity in the context of the forest-related Aichi Targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, for example through the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) meeting on indicators for the Strategic Plan, due to take place in June 2011.

3. The Aichi targets which are most relevant in the context of REDD-plus are, by 2020: to at least halve deforestation, and where feasible bring it close to zero (Target 5); to manage all areas under forestry sustainably (Target 7); to conserve at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas (Target 11); and to restore at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification (Target 15)[2].

4. The tasks for the workshop were to: (i) discuss aspects of the application of relevant safeguards for biodiversity in the context of REDD-plus, and to (ii) identify possible biodiversity indicators to assess the contribution of REDD-plus to achieving the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and assess potential mechanisms to monitor impacts on biodiversity.

[1] With reference to decision 1/CP.16 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), REDD-plus comprises 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.

[2] Decision X/2: Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Other targets of the Strategic Plan are also relevant for forests and in the context of REDD-plus, for example target 3: *By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied (…).*

/…

5. Presentations from Parties, indigenous and local communities, and relevant organizations provided an excellent basis for discussions in three working groups. The workshop also built on the results of the Global Expert Workshop on REDD-plus and Biodiversity Benefits, Nairobi, 20-23 September 2010 (UNEP/CBD/WS-REDD/1/3), as well as discussions in Nagoya and Cancun in 2010.

6. It was recognized that there are numerous challenges with advancing work in this area, for example, differences between safeguard approaches[3] in the context of REDD-plus pilot and demonstration activities. It was also realized that there was generally a lack of capacity and expertise to monitor biodiversity impacts of REDD-plus, and a need to improve indicators, and tools for enhancing biodiversity benefits. The workshop discussed at length whether recommendations should be developed for the sub-national and local level, or for the national level. It was agreed that since the Convention on Biological Diversity operates at the global, regional and national level, the focus of discussions should be limited to these levels. Therefore global indicator frameworks should be developed for implementation at the national level.

7. Building on the Nairobi Global Expert Workshop, the following points were emphasized:

(a) If REDD-plus is successful at reducing deforestation and forest degradation, and promoting forest conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, it will have significant and unprecedented benefits for biodiversity also.

(b) A well-implemented REDD-plus mechanism also has the potential to enhance the ecosystem services to deliver multiple benefits for countries, in particular to indigenous peoples and local communities.

(c) Developing safeguards for the protection and conservation of natural forests and biodiversity, for respecting the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, and also for promoting their full and effective participation in relevant REDD-plus activities and processes is essential for the success of the REDD-plus approach in general.

(d) REDD-plus efforts should enhance other ecosystem services, wherever possible, and carbon sequestration should be seen as one of many equally important ecosystem services.

(e) The meeting decided to develop guidance on biodiversity safeguards and generic indicators applicable at national level for assessing REDD-plus biodiversity impacts.

8. Findings and recommendations from the working groups relating to relevant biodiversity safeguards include:

(a) It is important to retain the spirit and effectiveness of the safeguards in UNFCCC decision 1/CP.16, when they are applied at national level. Many national level policies, laws, regulations, etc., which are applicable to REDD-plus biodiversity safeguards already exist, although they were not developed specifically for that purpose (e.g., forest and protected area legislation). Such policies, including those based on traditional ecological and local knowledge, should be considered as a basis for REDD-plus efforts.

(b) In most countries, National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) contain elements relevant for biodiversity risks and relevant safeguards, and could be an important basis for incorporating biodiversity conservation measures in REDD-plus policies. Vice-versa, the development of REDD-plus policies can contribute to improved, more comprehensive NBSAPs.

(c) There is a confusing proliferation of terms in the context of safeguards: principles, criteria, standards, policies, etc. The meaning of these terms differs although they are often used

[3] Notably, the UN REDD draft Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria; the World Bank safeguard policies on Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04), Forests (OP/BP 4.36), Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12), and Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10); and the Climate, Community and Biodiversity (CCB) Standards.

interchangeably. It was noted that there are several different emerging approaches to implementing REDD-plus safeguards, and there is a need to develop a common understanding.

(d) There are gaps in existing and emerging safeguard approaches. *Inter alia*, applying the precautionary approach to natural resource management; the principle of free prior and informed consent; spatially explicit identification of forest areas of high biodiversity value; and a monitoring system with national baselines are key principles/criteria that are not sufficiently addressed in some of the existing frameworks.

(e) In addressing biodiversity safeguards there is a need to recognise the components of biodiversity: ecosystems, species and genetic diversity.

(f) The value of biodiversity and ecosystem services needs to be better recognised to assist with the mobilization of financial resources and the development of incentives for the application of safeguards. The application of safeguards, in addition to financial resources, would also require countries to have in place appropriate legislation, policy frameworks, and full and effective stakeholder participation.

9. Findings and recommendations related to the assessment of REDD-plus impacts on biodiversity include:

(a) Essential information for biodiversity safeguards will include (i) location, extent, composition and changes over time of natural forests, and (ii) location, extent, composition, and changes over time of high biodiversity areas. Appropriate existing tools, processes and information could be the basis for biodiversity baselines and monitoring, for example, the FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment; the Global Forest Observation Initiative; the National Ecological Gap Analysis for CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas; National Reports of Parties to the CBD and national communications to the UNFCCC; and Key Biodiversity Areas, and other biodiversity indicators, for example, identified by the Global Biodiversity Indicators Partnership.

(b) Particular attention to biodiversity issues may be needed when aiming to increase the forest area in the context of REDD-plus, aiming for multi-functional forest landscapes. This requires effective land-use planning. The CBD Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Biodiversity and Climate Change guidance on biodiversity aspects of afforestation and reforestation are relevant in this context.

(c) The rights of indigenous peoples and local communities regarding customary use of traditional territories, land and natural resources should be ensured through national legislation/instruments.

(d) Plans for regular monitoring and review of biodiversity and ecosystem services need to be in place to ensure that existing livelihood opportunities and biodiversity are maintained and enhanced.

(e) There is a gap in the availability of data needed for the monitoring of biodiversity. In the framework of the principles of the conservation commons, there should be free and open access to biodiversity data and information for assessment purposes pursuant to CBD COP Decision X/7 and X/15.

10. The workshop identified *inter alia* the following capacity building needs:

(a) Enforcement of legislation and development of good governance takes time, but it should not lead to the situation of ‘perfect being the enemy of the good’. Countries can build on existing institutions, tools and processes, both for the application of safeguards, and for the assessment of biodiversity impacts. At the same time, capacity needs to be increased and sustained at all relevant levels, and national-level tools and processes should be further improved, including through technology transfer.

(b) It is important to learn from community-based natural resources management and other areas of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM), which includes aspects of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity: REDD-plus could possibly use existing SFM criteria and indicators, as appropriate.

(c) Reporting frameworks under UNFCCC and Convention on Biological Diversity are completely different and it is important to harmonize them as much as possible, to decrease the reporting burden on countries.

11. The workshop endorsed the key research and development needs as identified in the Nairobi Workshop (UNEP/CBD/WS-REDD/1/3).

12. Participants expressed interest in further enhancing their understanding of REDD-plus and safeguard approaches to REDD-plus through capacity building efforts.

13. For the development and application of relevant biodiversity safeguards, and for the assessment of REDD-plus impacts on biodiversity, developing countries require adequate and predictable financial resources, as outlined in decision X/3 of Convention on Biological Diversity on resource mobilization and relevant earlier decisions on this subject.

14. The participants requested the Secretariat to make the workshop results available to the UNFCCC, by appropriate means, as well as to Parties, relevant organizations, partnerships and initiatives, and indigenous and local communities, and to make use of its results also in the context of the subsequent regional workshops on this subject, as well as the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

II. REPORT OF THE MEETING

15. The Asia-Pacific regional consultation and capacity-building workshop on REDD-plus and relevant biodiversity safeguards was held in Singapore from 15 to 18 March 2011. It was co-organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the National Parks Board of Singapore (NParks), with the generous financial support from the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Germany, and the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB). The organizers gratefully acknowledge that several of the members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) contributed to the workshop by providing information about their work on REDD-plus.

16. Pursuant to paragraph 3 (b), of decision IX/5, the workshop aimed to support Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in the Asia-Pacific region which are in the process of planning or implementing activities to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. The workshop will be followed by regional workshops for Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean.

17. The objectives of the workshop were:

(a) To develop advice, including on the application of relevant safeguards for biodiversity, so that REDD-plus actions "are consistent with the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and avoid negative impacts on and enhance benefits for biodiversity" (see decision X/33, para. 9 (g));

(b) To identify possible indicators to assess the contribution of REDD-plus "to achieving the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and assess potential mechanisms to monitor impacts on biodiversity from these and other ecosystem-based approaches for climate change mitigation measures" (see decision X/33, para. 9 (h)); and;

(c) To contribute to capacity-building on REDD-plus in the Asia-Pacific region, including with a view to "enhancing the coordination of capacity-building efforts on issues related to biodiversity and ecosystem-based carbon sequestration and the conservation of forest carbon stocks" (see decision X/33, para. 9 (f)).

18. A list of participants of the workshop is attached as annex III.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

19. The workshop was opened at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, 15 March 2011 by Mr. Leong Chee Chiew, Deputy Chief Executive Officer (Professional Development and Services) of NParks. Mr. Leong welcomed the participants to Singapore and highlighted that although Singapore is heavily urbanised, it retains 47 per cent of its land under green cover and about three per cent of this is under natural forests. He noted that all countries and sectors must play their part to successfully tackle climate change and to achieve a fair and workable framework for REDD-plus. Mr. Leong highlighted Singapore's institutional framework for addressing climate change which includes the Inter-ministerial Committee on Climate Change, chaired by a senior minister and supported by the National Climate Change Secretariat which is under the Prime Minister's office. The committee is supported by three working groups focussing on resilience, mitigation and international negotiations respectively. He further noted that due to Singapore's limited forest area and absence of commercial forestry, the role Singapore can play in REDD-plus may be limited. However, he highlighted the need for South-South cooperation, in which Singapore can, for example, contribute in terms of training, exchange of personnel and information. Finally, he expressed appreciation to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for co-organising this workshop and to the Governments of United Kingdom and Germany through the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, and ACB for their funding support.

20. Mr. Tim Christophersen, Programme Officer of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity welcomed the participants and conveyed a statement on behalf of Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaf, the Executive Secretary of the CBD. Mr. Djoghlaf conveyed his warm greetings and conveyed his appreciation to NParks, Government of United Kingdom, GIZ and ACB for their collaboration and generous funding support. He further thanked the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) for their support to this workshop. He highlighted relevant targets under the Strategic Plan of the Convention 2011-2020 which was adopted by the tenth Conference of Parties (COP10): namely, halving and where feasible, brought close to zero the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, and to significantly reduce degradation and fragmentation; and enhancing ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity carbon stocks, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification. He further highlighted the relevant paragraphs of decision X/33 related to REDD-plus which called for the Executive Secretary to collaborate with various partners to develop advice on relevant biodiversity safeguards of REDD-plus. He hoped that the meeting will be conducted in an informal and constructive atmosphere, and that the participants will learn from one another, make best use of the knowledge shared, and develop new solutions. Finally, he also expressed his hope for a successful International Year of Forests 2011.

21. Ms. Monina Uriarte, Capacity Development Specialist of the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity delivered a statement on behalf of Mr. Rodrigo Fuentes, Executive Director of the Centre. Mr. Rodrigo expressed his appreciation to the Secretariat of the CBD and NParks for co-organising, the Government of United Kingdom for funding, and the CPF for their support to this workshop. He further acknowledged his appreciation to GIZ for funding the current regional project on Biodiversity and Climate Change which is co-funding this workshop. Mr. Rodrigo gave a brief introduction to ACB, highlighted the status and challenges of forest conservation in the region such as deforestation and conversion to other land uses, and noted efforts of ASEAN Member States efforts to address these challenges through reforestation and afforestation. He highlighted the importance of forest biodiversity and the need to translate their values into economic terms as they will be useful for decision-making. He noted that the expansion from REDD to REDD-plus could create a revenue stream for national governments to meet emission reduction targets, as well as support biodiversity conservation. Finally, he encouraged participants to share their experiences and participate actively in the workshop.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

2.1. Election of officers

22. After participants introduced themselves, they elected Mr. Jagdish Kishwan of India and Mr. Martin Brasher of United Kingdom as Co-Chairs of the workshop.

2.2. Adoption of the agenda

23. Participants adopted the agenda as proposed by the Executive Secretary in document UNEP/CBD/WS/CB/REDD/APAC/1/1.

2.3. Organization of work

24. The proposed organization of work was adopted as contained in the annotations to the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/WS/CB/REDD/APAC/1/1/Add.1.)

ITEM 3. REDD-PLUS UPDATE

Presentations by International Organizations

25. Mr. Tim Christophersen of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity reiterated the objectives of the workshop and provided an overview of the CBD's programme of work on forest biodiversity which focuses on (i) conservation, sustainable use, and benefit sharing; (ii) institutional, socio-economic enabling environment; and (iii) knowledge, assessment and monitoring (decisions VI/22 and IX/5). He highlighted CBD COP decisions related to REDD-plus. In decision IX/5, Parties, other governments and relevant international and other organisations are invited to ensure that possible actions for REDD do not run counter to the objectives of the CBD and implementation of the forest programme of work (PoW), support the PoW and provide benefits for forest biodiversity and indigenous and local communities (ILCs). He also noted decision X/33 paragraphs 9 (g) and (h). He highlighted the relevant Aichi targets of the CBD Strategic Plan which include: halving deforestation, and where feasible, bringing it close to zero by 2020 (Target 5); managing all areas under forestry sustainably by 2020 (Target 7); conserving at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas by 2020 (Target 11); and restoring at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems by 2020, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification (Target 15). A CBD Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators will meet in June 2011 to identify indicators for the targets outlined in the Strategic Plan. Mr. Christophersen also drew attention to a CBD technical series publication (Number 41, http://www.cbd.int/ts) on "Connecting Biodiversity and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation" which outlines the links between biodiversity and forest carbon and provides specific guidance for ecosystem based mitigation. He highlighted some of the issues on REDD-plus safeguards that were discussed at the Global Expert Workshop on Biodiversity Benefits on REDD, which included biodiversity risks, and risks to ILCs; the need for harmonisation of the many existing/emerging guidance for minimising biodiversity risks (such as the UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles, FCPF Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment Framework, etc.). He noted that presently there was a greater focus on avoiding risks than on enhancing biodiversity benefits of REDD-plus, while more detail on operationalization of both at the national and local levels is needed. Finally, he outlined key knowledge gaps which included the monitoring of SFM/REDD-plus biodiversity benefits, in particular the development of simple yet robust criteria and indicators; biodiversity and ecosystem services data and models; refining and/or operationalizing the definitions of certain terms such as forest degradation and classification of forest types; and REDD-plus benefits and assessment of impacts. He also noted a recent publication on "Biodiversity and Livelihoods: REDD-plus Benefits" (www.cbd.int/forest) which summarises key benefits of REDD-plus for biodiversity and livelihoods, as well as mitigation/adaptation synergies.

26. Ms. Maria Sanz-Sanchez of the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) made a presentation via electronic conferencing facility. She gave an overview of REDD before COP13 at Bali, followed by the work on the development of a framework for

REDD-plus through COP14 and COP15, which led to a decision on REDD-plus at COP16 under the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA). Ms. Sanz-Sanchez highlighted that at COP15 a decision on "Methodological guidance for activities relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries" (4/CP.15) was adopted. This decision provides methodological guidance as well as guidance for capacity-building and the work needed to support REDD activities, and the establishment of forest reference emission and forest reference levels. She further highlighted key decisions taken at COP16 in Cancun, and the REDD-plus work to be undertaken by SBSTA32, in particular pertaining to safeguards. She highlighted that the implementation of REDD-plus activities should be carried out in accordance with guidance in annex I of decision 1/CP.16 and the safeguards in that annex should be promoted and supported. Developing country Parties aiming to undertake REDD-plus activities are requested to develop a national strategy or action plan, national forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference level, robust and transparent national forest monitoring system and system for providing information on how safeguards referred to in annex 1 to decision 1/CP.16 (1) are being addressed and respected through the implementation of the REDD-plus activities while respecting sovereignty.

27. Mr. Mikko Kurppa, representing the Secretariat of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), gave an overview of the outcomes of the Ninth Session of the UNFF (24 Jan 2011 – 4 Feb 2011), in particular the UNFF9 Ministerial Declaration, the Resolution on Forests for People, Livelihoods and Poverty Eradication, and the launch of the International Year of Forests (2011). Mr. Kurppa highlighted the multiple functions and services of forests, as well as the key functions and main activities of the UNFF to promote the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests. While underscoring the 360 degree perspective of forests, he highlighted the role of forests for people, the economy and the environment, emphasizing the contribution of forests in providing food security, agriculture productivity, renewable energy, water quality and quantity, climate change mitigation and adaptation measures, biodiversity conservation, watershed protection, disaster reduction as well as preventing desertification and land degradation. Mr. Kurppa underscored the importance of cross-sectoral cooperation, multi-institutional collaboration as well as regional and multi-stakeholder involvement. In reference to the Ministerial Declaration, he stated, among other things, that forests are crucial for sustainable development and the achievement of Internationally Agreed Development Goals, including the MDGs. In this context, he mentioned the commitment of ministers to transmit the Ministerial Declaration to the Rio +20 Conference in 2012 and to take a decision on forest financing at the 10th session of the Forum (UNFF10) in 2013. Forest finance-related activities have begun this year, in particular through work on the UNFF Facilitative Process, preparations for the second Ad Hoc Expert Group on Forest Finance and other work carried out in close cooperation with CPF members. On the launch of the International Year of Forests 2011(Forests 2011), he noted an array of newsworthy stories, videos, media clips and other activities occurring in various countries all over the world. He added that Forests 2011 has raised consciousness of the multiple values of forests and helped to promote greater awareness of the success stories and challenges which many of the world's forests and the people who depend on them face. He also highlighted the key topics for the next two sessions of the Forum, namely UNFF10 in 2013 on "Forests and Economic Development" and UNFF11 in 2015 on "Forests: Progress, Challenges and the Way Forward for the International Arrangement on Forests". In this context, Mr. Kurppa noted the inter-linkages between biodiversity and forests and highlighted several areas in which the two Secretariats might carry out joint activities and collaborate further.

28. Mr. Barney Dickson of the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre gave an overview of the UN-REDD Programme with particular focus on the draft "Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria" to be presented to the UN-REDD policy board on the 21-23 March 2011. Mr. Dickson first gave some background to the UN-REDD Programme by highlighting that it is a capacity-building programme designed to assist REDD countries to prepare strategies and implement REDD. There are two main components to the UN-REDD: National Programmes in which the main focus is capacity-building for REDD; and the Global Programme, which focuses on developing guidance, advice and analyses to support country level action and global processes. He then outlined the draft Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria that were designed to assist countries to address the risks and opportunities

associated with REDD-plus. The purpose of the principles and criteria is to provide the UN-REDD Programme with a framework to ensure that its activities promote social and environmental benefits and reduce risks from REDD-plus. The principles and criteria are also meant to assist reviewers of national programmes to evaluate their potential social and environmental impacts, to support countries in operationalizing the UNFCCC's guidance and safeguards, and to contribute to the development of guidance on systems to provide information on how safeguards are addressed and respected. The set of principles includes two principles on social issues, one on policy coherence, and three on environmental issues. Principle 1 includes criteria to ensure that REDD-plus actions comply with standards of democratic governance. Principle 2 focuses on carefully assessing potential adverse impacts on stakeholders' livelihoods and mitigating these effects where appropriate. Principle 3 focuses on policy coherence, ensuring that the UN-REDD Programme contributes to a low-carbon, climate-resilient and environmentally sound development policy, consistent with commitments under international conventions and agreements. Principle 4 includes criteria to ensure the protection and conservation of natural forests. Principle 5 aims to ensure that REDD-plus increases benefits delivered through ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation. Finally, principle 6 focuses on minimising indirect adverse impacts on ecosystem services and biodiversity, for example, minimising inter-ecosystem leakage. The principles and criteria will undergo review and testing in 2011 and are expected to be finalized after UN FCCC COP 17. In the meantime, the UN-REDD Programme is also working on tools and guidelines to support their application. Finally, Mr. Dickson invited feedback from all interested parties and stakeholders on these draft principles and criteria.

29. Ms. Neeta Hooda of the World Bank presented an overview of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF). She presented the objectives of the Facility including the relevance to the biodiversity aspects as enshrined in the FCPF Charter and in the FCPF objectives. She elaborated on the FCPF mechanisms (a) the Readiness Fund which supports the capacity building efforts on REDD-plus in FCPF countries such as analysis of REDD-plus options and development of REDD-plus strategy, reference scenario and monitoring, reporting and verification systems (b) the Carbon Fund which is meant to support pilots of emission reduction for REDD-plus. She emphasized that the FCPF is a partnership consisting of participant REDD-plus countries, financial contributors and observers including the Indigenous peoples and civil society representatives. She explained the governance structure of the FCPF and the roles of the Participants Assembly, the Participants Committee and the World Bank. The World Bank has three roles in the partnership: (a) it functions as the Secretariat to the Facility, (b) as a Trustee to the Funds and (c) as a Delivery Partner in the REDD-plus countries. She explained the phases of REDD-plus wherein countries begin with the readiness activities and REDD + strategy formulation and gradually moving into the investment phase and finally into results based actions. She explained the Indigenous Peoples Capacity Building Program of the FCPF, the significance and the achievements of the program since 2008. She discussed the key World Bank safeguard policies relevant for REDD+. For REDD-plus, the most relevant policies are likely to be the policies on Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04), Forests (OP/BP 4.36), Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12), and Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10). These policies can be found at: http://go.worldbank.org/WTA1ODE7T0. In addition, the FCPF adapted the application of safeguards for the 'readiness' phase for REDD-plus through the use of Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA). SESA allows for the incorporation of environmental and social concerns into national REDD-plus strategy process and ensures that the FCPF readiness activities comply with World Bank Policies during the strategic planning phase, considering that these strategic activities could have potentially far reaching impacts. For further details visit: www.forestcarbonpartnership.org

30. Mr. Ian Gray of the GEF provided background on GEF's support for forest related projects and its more recent effort to support sustainable forest management due to growing international interest. He noted that GEF operates under the combined framework of the three Rio conventions. In 2007, under GEF-4, a sustainable forest management programme (SFM) was established, where about USD 400 million were utilised for forest related projects. Learning from the experiences of the GEF-4 SFM Programme, GEF upscaled its investment in SFM and REDD-plus under GEF-5, and provided a separate funding envelope of about USD 250 million. This is in addition to the funding derived from the three

GEF Focal Areas of climate change, biodiversity and land degradation. He noted that the funding target for SFM/ REDD-plus activities is $1 billion. He further noted that access to the incentive mechanism should include investments from at least two GEF Focal Areas in order to maximize multiple benefits. The ratio between focal area allocation and the incentive measure mechanism is 3:1, that is for every three dollars that countries invest, they will get an additional dollar from the SFM/REDD-plus account. He highlighted that the GEF-5 SFM/REDD-plus strategy aims to achieve multiple environmental benefits from improved management of all forest types with two key objectives: to reduce pressure on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystems and services; and strengthen the enabling environment to reduce GHG emissions from REDD-plus. Details of the GEF can be obtained from www.theGEF.org.

Presentations by Country Representatives

31. Mr. Islam Tariqul of Bangladesh outlined the national structure for REDD-plus planning which includes a technical committee for REDD-plus, comprising representatives from relevant government agencies, academia, civil society and international organizations. The Committee is headed by the Secretary of the Ministry of Environment and Forests. He reported that while the National REDD Strategy and Action Plan, method of monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) and institutional strengthening are under preparation, carbon stock inventory has been furnished for the Sundarbans Reserve Forest and eight other protected areas. He added that indigenous people are involved in the management process of protected areas. Mr. Tariqul highlighted the main obstacles on including biodiversity safeguards which include the lack of awareness of the value of biodiversity and ecological goods and services, lack of dedicated legislation, rapid expansion of agriculture, increased development and land use and population density. He noted the capacity-building requirements include the integration of biodiversity safeguards into the national development planning process, education and outreach to local communities, alternative livelihoods for local communities, development and enforcement of safeguard regulatory regimes and providing incentives. He further noted that criteria and indicators for REDD-plus implementation will be identified and a national ecological gap analysis will be carried out. He concluded by noting the involvement of Bangladesh in the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) on climate change related issues; and with India and Bangladesh on the Sunderbans Ecosystem Forum amongst others.

32. Mr. Tsering Gyeltshen of Bhutan shared that Bhutan is a developing country with high forest cover and diversity, and long societal, religious and governmental commitment to environmental preservation with a strong focus on community integration. Environmental preservation is one of the pillars of the Gross National Happiness (GNH) of Bhutan. Unique to Bhutan is a commitment to maintain 60 per cent of its forest cover in perpetuity. The institutional arrangement in place is the Watershed Management Division – the focal institution for climate and REDD-plus related issues under the Department of Forest and Park Services, Ministry of Agriculture and Forests. Legally, the Forest and Nature Conservation Act (2005) recognizes the traditional and customary rights of the local people to use forest and thereby respects their legitimate access to forest resources. He highlighted that Bhutan initiated a REDD-plus discussion in June 2010, and conducted a REDD-plus Scoping Study in December 2010 which showed that it was feasible to implement REDD-plus projects. He further highlighted that Bhutan has estimated that its carbon stock in 2010 amounts to 6.3 million tonnes of carbon. However, he highlighted concerns about permanence, leakages, additionality and governance. Based on these issues, he concluded that the way forward is through institutionalisation and formalisation of processes, monitoring and data-collection, and capacity-building with regional nations.

33. Mr. Monyrak Meng of Cambodia highlighted that Cambodia has established a national REDD-plus taskforce, which is supported by a REDD-plus advisory group, a secretariat and three working groups on project guidelines, benefit-sharing and MRV/Reference Emission Level. The taskforce and the relevant bodies under the task force comprised of members representing technical government agencies, non-governmental organisations, civil society and development partners who play a significant role in contributing to the REDD-plus national programme. Mr. Meng also highlighted two on-going REDD pilot projects, with more pilots and demonstration sites being prepared. Political support and capacity are

provided by various national-level strategies, policies and programmes as well as legislation. The Protected Areas and Biodiversity Programme Framework was adopted in February 2011, and consists of three components that are related to REDD-plus: strengthening the governance, policy and legal framework; sustaining sources of financing; and international cooperation and implementation of international agreements which are related to biodiversity safeguards and REDD-plus. The relevant outcomes which the Framework aims to achieve are institutional and technical capacity for protected area and biodiversity management, an integrated planning approach, the identification of trade-off and offset mechanisms for protected area and biodiversity values, and improved access and benefit-sharing for communities and key stakeholders. Challenges faced by Cambodia are that REDD-plus is a concept new to the nation. Mr. Meng mentioned that even local biodiversity experts and non-governmental organisations are new to it. Another limiting factor is the lack of ground surveys, baseline and reference, which resulted in the lack of a clear picture on which to base actions. Limited capacity and resources and the conflict of institutional arrangement and benefit-sharing were also cited as obstacles. He stated that an assessment is required before capacity-building needs can be ascertained and thus implemented. In conclusion, he highlighted that both terrestrial protected areas and marine gap analyses have been conducted.

34. Ms. Wu Shuirong of China provided an overview of China's efforts on climate change, in particular in the forest sector. She highlighted the national targets on climate change include cutting CO2 emissions per unit of GDP by 40-45 per cent by 2020 from the 2005 level, increasing forest area by 40 million hectares and forest stocking volume by 1.3 billion m^3 by 2020 from the 2005 levels, increasing the share of non-fossil fuels in primary energy consumption by 15 percent by 2020 and developing a green, low-carbon and circular economy and enhancing research, development and dissemination of climate-friendly technologies. She further highlighted that the Forestry Action Plan to Address Climate Change sets forth 5 basic principles, 3 targets, and 22 initiatives (15 actions are for mitigation and 7 for adaptation). On mitigation, the key areas include afforestation, forestry biomass energy, sustainable forest management, forest protection, forestry industry development and wetland restoration and conservation. Another key focus is adaptation of forest, desertification and wetland ecosystems. China's stand on REDD-plus emphasizes the enhancement aspect; and proposed that reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries should be treated equally. Ms. Wu also highlighted the development of forest carbon markets and establishment of the China Green Carbon Foundation which provides a platform for domestic companies and the public to pursue low-carbon activities. Since July 2010, 96.8 million RMB have been raised from companies and individuals; more than 8000 hectares have been afforested in nine provinces with the expectation of producing carbon credits among other ecosystem services. The National Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Action Plan (2011-2030) was described as one of the important responses to biodiversity safeguards. She further outlined the safeguards for indigenous people and local communities, which includes forest governance and collective forest tenure reform. In terms of the impact assessment of forestry carbon projects, she mentioned that the Climate, Community and Biodiversity (CCB) standards had been revised for Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) project design in China, which could also be adapted to the REDD-plus project design. Finally, she indicated that the Asia-Pacific Network for Sustainable Forest Management and Rehabilitation (APFNet) could be pursued as an important platform for promoting regional collaboration on REDD-plus and other forest programmes.

35. Mr. Hem Pande of India noted that forest cover in India is about 70 million hectares and that it has added 3 million hectares of forests and tree cover in the last decade. He highlighted that forests neutralize 11 per cent of India's greenhouse gas emissions. He detailed the benefits of REDD-plus, and estimated that a REDD-plus programme for India can incentivize the capture of over 1 billion tonnes of additional forest carbon over the next three decades and provide more than 3 billion USD as carbon service incentives. These benefits will be passed on to local, forest-dependent, forest-dwelling and tribal communities. He added that REDD-plus is intended to be an additional co-benefit to the goods and services already accruing to local communities, and national policies are in place to ensure that REDD-plus will not adversely impact traditional and legal rights of local communities over forests. He reiterated

India's position that REDD needs to be seen in broader context of REDD-plus, and that a unit of carbon saved by checking deforestation should be treated the same as a unit of carbon added due to conservation and afforestation measures. India's Green India Mission, launched under National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC) aims to increase forest and tree cover and improve the quality of forest cover, improve ecosystem services, biodiversity, hydrological services and carbon sequestration, increase forest-based livelihood and enhance annual carbon dioxide sequestration. He noted that a national coordinating agency was established and a technical group was set up to develop methodologies and procedures to assess and monitor the contribution of REDD-plus actions, In addition, a National Forest Carbon Accounting Programme was developed. He further noted that a study on the impact of climate change on India's forests, carried out by the Indian Network for Climate Change Assessment (INCCA), was released in November 2010.

36. Ms. Puspa Dewi Liman of Indonesia highlighted that although 71 per cent of Indonesia's land area is administratively classified as forest area, in fact 49 per cent is actually forested. She noted that there are eight priority areas, which form Indonesia's Forestry Strategic Plan for 2010-2014. The priority areas include biodiversity conservation, community development and mitigation and adaptation of climate change with reducing emission as a national target. She then provided an overview of their national strategic plan on REDD-plus, including 3 main programmes: (i) promote conservation, (ii) sustainable management of forest, and (iii) management effectiveness. On promoting conservation, key actions include protected areas management, protection of High Conservation Value Forest, and land swap for conservation areas. For sustainable management of forests, activities include forestry planning, reduced impact logging, forest fire prevention, capacity-building and incentive mechanisms for production forest. Under the programme on management effectives, activities would include developing better regulation for peatland management, restoration and rehabilitation, and enrichment planting in degraded lands. She highlighted that there were more than 30 REDD related activities, with about 9 being demonstration projects and the remaining voluntary activities. Most of these activities are in partnership with organisations such as AusAID, The Nature Conservancy, UN-REDD, ITTO, etc, with the involvement from non-governmental organisations. The scope of work of the demonstration projects include incentive distribution, capacity-building, MRV, land rehabilitation as well as lessons learnt.

37. Mr. Asghar Mohammadi Fazel of Iran highlighted that Iran's land area is about 165 million hectares of which 12 million hectares is under forest cover; and 80 percent of Iran is arid or semi-arid. He noted that the National Committee on Sustainable Development undertakes REDD-plus planning, and this committee is comprised of representatives from government, civil society and academia. There is high-level support for this process as the Vice-President of Iran chairs the National Committee on Sustainable Development. Iran is currently developing a national forest strategy which will include consideration of REDD. He noted that there is a national plan to recognize 100 per cent of natural forests as protected areas; and no experience with the voluntary carbon market. The obstacles highlighted include the increasing urbanization and the rapid economic growth called for under the national growth strategy pose technical and financial challenges to biodiversity safeguards. While the University of Environment is promoting conservation data and information sharing, the main capacity-building needs are human resources, technology and financial capacities. In terms of experiences on biodiversity safeguards with indigenous and local communities, he noted that views of ILCs can be solicited through the provincial planning councils. However, he noted that the inputs of ILCs to village and city councils are not well coordinated. In terms of regional collaboration on biodiversity safeguards and impact assessment, he noted that there are initial discussions within the Low Forest Cover Countries (LFCC) and Economic Cooperation Organisation (ECO, comprised of Afghanistan, Azerbaijian, Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan). He highlighted that it would be useful to engage regional institutes such as the ECO-Institute of Environmental Science and Technology (ECO-IEST) to fast track implementation of REDD-plus. The issue of REDD-plus will likely be discussed at the upcoming ECO ministerial meeting in June 2011.

38. Mr. Abdul Rahman Abdul Rahim of Malaysia noted that Malaysia is developing a REDD-plus Road Map, with phased implementation and will complement national level action with sub-national

implementation. In the readiness phase, Malaysia will focus on the development of a national REDD-plus strategy, institutional strengthening/arrangement and capacity-building. The next phase would be to implement the national strategy with a focus on pilot projects. The final phase would focus on quantifying changes in GHG emissions and removals. He further noted that REDD-plus issues are currently coordinated by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment and several working groups have been established to address issues such as baselines, monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV), institutional arrangement, governance, payment of benefits and capacity-building. Mr. Abdul Rahman highlighted that Malaysia's REDD-plus activities will be focused on permanent forest reserve and protected areas; and biodiversity safeguards will be promoted through sustainable forest management, enhancing conservation of natural forests and biodiversity, and carbon stocks in poorly stocked forests, with the participation of local communities where applicable. The capacity-building required includes tools for climate change impact assessment; economic valuation to layer carbon and biodiversity and ecosystem services; and analysis, comparison and evaluation of different approaches and methods used to promote biodiversity co-benefits in REDD-plus. For assessment and monitoring, proposed activities include assessing the impacts of REDD-plus activities on biodiversity and the establishment of carbon maps which will be used to overlay the sensitive, biodiversity-rich ecosystems between 1990 and 2005. In terms of regional collaboration, Malaysia is actively involved in the ASEAN Regional Knowledge Network on Forest and Climate Change and in programmes such as the Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC). Finally, he concluded that international financing should consider early action and to complement REDD-plus financing for high biodiversity areas.

39. Mr. Boldbaatar Chuluunbaatar of Mongolia noted that about 12 per cent of Mongolia is under forest cover, 92 per cent of this is recreational forests and the remaining 8 per cent is for utilization. He further noted that with a harsh continental climate, there is limited ability for forests to regenerate. Therefore, the emphasis is placed on forest conservation, sustainable forest management, and reforestation. He noted that Mongolia developed a National Implementation Plan on Climate Change in 2010 which outlines policies as well as specific measures for climate change mitigation and adaptation. He highlighted that a National Bureau on Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) was established and currently has 33 CDM projects. He further highlighted that Mongolia is involved in a UNDP regional REDD-plus project involving seven Northeast Asia and the Pacific countries. The activities to be carried out under this project includes the collection of data and the institutional mapping of programmes and projects related to forest conservation; determining the work to be undertaken in accordance with the concept and principles of REDD-plus; and developing a REDD-plus road map. One of the problems encountered is carbon accounting. He highlighted the need to learn from the experiences of other countries that have successfully implemented REDD-plus projects. In conclusion, he noted that the Mongolian government will take part in the Rio+20 meeting with a particular interest in sustainable forest development and green economy.

40. Mr. Thain Naing of Myanmar provided a brief account on the state of forests in Myanmar, highlighting that the natural forest is decreasing, and noted that REDD-plus could be seen as a mechanism to mitigate climate change and provide financial incentive to forest conservation activities. He highlighted that Myanmar has a well established structure for sustainable forest management and conservation which are aligned with REDD-plus activities including the afforestation and reforestation and Clean Development Mechanism (AR/CDM) and a comprehensive legal framework. Some basic principles behind the laws were to promote public cooperation in implementing the forestry and environmental conservation policies, develop the economy of the country and contribute towards the basic needs of the public. Mr. Thain Naing also highlighted that the forest management system of Myanmar consists of the Myanmar Selection System, a forest management plan and elephant logging which are seen to be in line with REDD-plus. Myanmar has an annual reforestation and afforestation programme of about 30,000 hectares which is seen as complementary to maintaining natural forests. Preparations for REDD-plus include the establishment of a core unit for REDD-plus and AR/CDM with the purpose of formulating a REDD-plus readiness proposal. He highlighted that awareness was an issue among people of all levels and although Myanmar has good infrastructure for implementation, the lack of awareness is hampering efforts. Experiences are not in direct relation to REDD-plus, but associated activities such as

reforestation, SFM, forest conservation and organising participation of locals. It was noted that all actions under their forest management plans are in line with the UNFCCC safeguards; however efforts are hampered by a lack of information and the means to gather it. Biodiversity safeguards are in place in the form of an NBSAP, but limited human and financial resources limit its effectiveness. There are a few NGOs involved in community-based natural resource management, biodiversity conservation and climate change issues and these are coordinated in cooperation by the Ministry of Forestry and National Commission for Environmental Affairs. The Forest Law enables local communities to establish community forests with 30-year lease of the land which is developed and managed on their own under the guidance of the Forest Department. Myanmar acknowledges customary use of biodiversity by ILCs and has already incorporated these concerns in forest management planning, but the implementation of REDD-plus is at a very early stage at the moment. Indicators have already been developed and are in place for sustainable forest management as well as biodiversity conservation, and these may be adapted for use in REDD-plus.

41. Mr. Resham Bahadur Dangi of Nepal noted that roughly about one-third of Nepal's forested area is under protected area systems (PAs), with public forests and community managed forests taking up 47 per cent and about 23 per cent respectively. The framework for National REDD-plus governance notably included experts and a multi-stakeholders forum with channels for feedback into the system. The apex body with 49 members is chaired by the Minister of the Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation, and is comprised of equal representation from government agencies and peoples organizations. The REDD working group with 12 members is chaired by the Secretary of the MOFSC, and two thirds of the members are from the public sector and the remaining from civil society and donor representatives. Nepal has developed a REDD-plus road map, with the target for readiness to carbon trade by the end of 2012. Currently, there are a number of REDD-plus piloting initiatives which involve partnerships with donor organisations and international non-governmental organisations and the activities include enhancing awareness and piloting REDD payment and benefit-sharing. Some initiatives on the voluntary carbon market were highlighted, including registration of biogas plants and the establishment of a carbon trust fund forest. In terms of regional collaboration in REDD-plus initiatives, he noted that SAARC-level collaboration could be instrumental in establishing regional funds for capacity-building and technology transfer. In conclusion, he noted some key learning points which include: a) REDD-plus and biodiversity conservation should complement each other and contribute to livelihood improvements; b) integration of economic incentives with biodiversity conservation; c) the need for institutional reform to address new public demands for biodiversity and environmental goods and services (including REDD-plus); and d) the need to strengthen capacity at all levels and improve science-policy interface.

42. Mr. Syed Said Badshah Bukhari of Pakistan briefly described the state of forestry and biodiversity in Pakistan and highlighted the structure of Pakistan's REDD-plus planning which is divided into national and provincial levels, headed by the Federal Ministry for Environment and Provincial Forest and Environment Ministries respectively. He further highlighted that a steering committee for REDD-plus has been established and a project on Sustainable Forest Management has been submitted to the GEF Council. He noted that efforts have been made to involve both biodiversity experts and local communities in the REDD-plus process. For the former, a National Steering Committee on Biodiversity has been established and a number of national consultations held. In the latter case, Joint Forest Management Committees have been established and a number of seminars held. Some of the main obstacles noted were lack of capacity, conflicting interests, population pressure, lack of awareness, and poverty and unemployment. In terms of capacity building needs on biodiversity safeguards at the government, civil society and local community levels, each has different requirements; for instance, at the government level, the need for training on biodiversity safeguard policies as well as on the MRV system of REDD-plus; at the civil society level, seminars or workshops and dissemination of awareness material; and at the local community level, awareness on outcomes of biodiversity safeguards as well as implementation procedures on safeguards. To monitor the impacts of REDD-plus, there is an Ecological Gap Analysis study under way for all provinces which will be used at the national level for REDD-plus planning. Regionally, Pakistan participates in SAARC's initiatives on REDD-plus, and these experiences have been useful in capacity building. Finally, he noted that both technical and financial supports are needed from

UN-REDD, GEF, the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank to facilitate regional collaboration on REDD-plus.

43. Ms. Eunice Dus of Papua New Guinea noted that 65 per cent (approximately 29-30 million hectares) of Papua New Guinea is under forest cover, and that 97 per cent of its land area is customarily owned. She outlined the institutional framework for climate change has high political commitment, with the Prime Minister, who is also the Minister of Climate Change. The National Climate Change Committee was created by the Chief Secretary to the PNG government chairing it. This Committee is supported by four technical working groups on REDD-plus, adaptation, low-carbon growth and consultation, while an advisory board and ministerial committee is under way. She noted that REDD-plus project guidelines which serve as safeguards against social, environmental and fiduciary risks, have been developed to ensure the quality of demonstration activities and to protect landowners' interests. Additionally, PNG's Climate-Compatible Development Strategy combines economic development with mitigation and adaptation measures, aiming to increase GDP while at the same time reducing emissions of green-house gases by at least 50 per cent by 2030 and becoming carbon neutral by 2050. In terms of biodiversity safeguards, PNG has no safeguards that are specific to REDD-plus, but has policies and laws that incorporate biodiversity safeguards in key government sectors, for example, the Department of Environment and Conservation, the PNG Forest Authority and the PNG Fisheries Authority. The main obstacle identified in terms of biodiversity safeguards were the absence of inventory on biodiversity in relation to REDD-plus. As the illiteracy rate is high, and the fact that the native population speaks more than 800 languages, a key challenge is the education and awareness of local communities. The need to support monitoring and enforcement at the provincial level was also noted. Ms. Dus highlighted that PNG is currently in the preparation or readiness phase and the current challenges include the need to develop national climate change policy and legislation, high population growth, the land tenure system, the lack of a national land use plan, the lack of secured and long term permanent forest estates, and insufficient financial and human resources to adequately implement REDD-plus.

44. Mr. Modesto Lagumbay Jr. of Philippines noted that the Department of Environment and Natural Resources - Forest Management Bureau (DENR-FMB) and CoDe-REDD, a NGO composed of forest-based communities and civil society organizations, spearheaded the formulation of the Philippine National REDD-Plus Strategy (PNRPS). This strategy, approved in mid-2010, maps out the country's REDD-plus actions, articulating a common vision among stakeholders regarding how the REDD-plus agenda is to be pursued. The Philippines are in the readiness phase, and is scaling up pilot sites to provincial and regional levels by 2012. The engagement phase, where national-level implementation and performance-based compensation takes place, is planned for 2016. For the current pilot sites, ILC leaders/representatives are regularly invited to participate. A number of workshops - forest carbon market, forest carbon financing, internal readiness on forest carbon accounting, registry, structures and mechanisms - will also be conducted within the next few weeks. Mr. Lagumbay reported an increasing level of political support and capacity for including biodiversity safeguards in policies and legislation. A lack of well-defined institutional arrangements and conflicting policies, especially between national and local levels, are some of the main challenges encountered; and the government is working to close these gaps. Key Biodiversity Area identification and profiling, monitoring and establishment of protected areas, and biodiversity assessments were noted as areas requiring further capacity-building. On safeguards for indigenous and local communities, there is legislation (for example, R.A. 8371 "The Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) of 1997") protecting their rights to engage in planning and decision-making. The PNRPS is also driven by principles recognising the peoples' right to free and prior informed consent regarding REDD-plus projects, as well as generating and developing knowledge management systems and intensifying information sharing to protect forest lands and communities. In terms of assessments of REDD-plus, a case study on MRV on biodiversity within a REDD-plus pilot site is being undertaken and the results will be presented at the end of March 2011. He noted that Philippines is also active in regional and international collaborations such as the REDD-plus Partnership, UN-REDD, Non-Legally Binding Instrument (NLBI) and ITTO among others. He concluded by noting research and development, protection and conservation of biodiversity, and development and rehabilitation of forest lands as areas where support are welcomed.

45. Mr. Geoffrey Davison of Singapore noted that Singapore is a city-state with 47 per cent of the country under green cover, with no commercial forestry and no ILCs claiming forest-related rights and access. Although a strong programme to plant trees has been in place for the past 40 years, Singapore is not a REDD-plus implementing country. He further noted that an Inter-Ministerial Committee on Climate Change (IMCCC) has been formed, and is served by the National Climate Change Secretariat. He highlighted that REDD-related activities are primarily in the form of South-South cooperation, and that Singapore is a member of the Interim REDD-plus Partnership since May 2010. He also noted that the NParks is the sole government agency with forest-related interests and forestry-trained staff. Mr. Davison highlighted that some NGOs based in Singapore, including the Nature Society (Singapore), with Birdlife International and Singapore Airlines, and the Wildlife Conservation Society, are developing REDD-plus programmes in other countries in the region, under the Voluntary Carbon Market. In terms of private sector interests, he noted that there are about 30 carbon financing/trading companies in Singapore and they conduct of an annual Carbon Forum. Mr. Davison described capacities for assessment and monitoring with regards to REDD-plus, citing the Centre for Remote Imaging and Sensing (CRISP) and the establishment of permanent plots in Bukit Timah Nature Reserve for forest dynamics and carbon by the Centre for Tropical Forest Science, National Technological University and National Parks Board. Singapore has performed a Protected Area Gap Analysis (WCMC). He finally highlighted Singapore's role in regional collaboration, using the example of capacity-building between the National Environment Agency and the Provincial Government of Jambi, Indonesia, where support, knowledge sharing and satellite technology is provided to aid Jambi in moving forward with REDD-plus initiatives. Singapore is also active in the ASEAN Regional Knowledge Network on Forests and Climate Change.

46. Mr. Joe Horokou of Solomon Islands noted that Solomon Islands with a vegetation cover of about 2 million hectares is recognised as one of the world's great centres of plant diversity. This reflects the significance of the country's biodiversity. Some of the challenges to forest biodiversity include logging, over-exploitation of natural resources and unsustainable land use practices such as commercial plantation. Biodiversity loss is compounded by natural disasters, population increase, invasive alien species and climate change. Mr. Horokou then outlined opportunities for forest biodiversity conservation through the mainstreaming of policies and legislation, an ecosystem-based approach to natural resource management, protected areas systems, capacity-building and the availability of funding. As Solomon Islands is currently being selected for the REDD-plus readiness programme, institutional arrangements for implementation have yet to be finalised. In the interim, the REDD-plus programme is coordinated by the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology which is largely in the preparatory phase. He noted that the ecological gap analyses conducted as part of CBD's Programme of Work and Protected Areas and the newly-enacted Protected Areas Act 2010 will benefit REDD-plus in developing environmental safeguards. He concluded by stating that mainstreaming of policies across relevant sectors is required for REDD-plus to be successful.

47. Mr. Panuwat Kamuttachart of Thailand noted that a REDD-plus working group has been established under the National Committee on Climate Change Policy. The Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation has been designated as the national focal point for REDD-plus. He shared that REDD-plus pilot projects will involve not only officials from relevant agencies but also biodiversity experts and local community representatives. The main challenge identified is the national land use policy that seems to support the economic plantation such as Eucalyptus and rubber trees which are monoculture plantation crops. He noted that in Thailand, the technical term for Biodiversity means different things to different people and it has been mainstreamed into other sectors; for example military, agriculture and so on. Thailand would like to advocate Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) programmes to promote biodiversity awareness at all levels. When safeguarding local communities, government agencies respond to the demands of local communities to participate in the management of biodiversity issues. Mr. Kamuttachart noted the need for regional and international support for REDD-plus implementation. He further noted that Thailand is currently preparing a Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) after obtaining funding from FCPF. He highlighted that the Regional Community Forestry Training Centre for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC) equips forestry officers with a better understanding of how to prepare for REDD-plus projects. Finally, he noted that the success of

REDD-plus depended on sound governance, intent of policy-makers, land use policies, mechanisms in place to support operations, technical and technological support such as GIS and methodologies to assess forest carbon stock, the participation and awareness of civil society and last but not least, financial support.

48. Mr. Ioan Viji of Vanuatu highlighted that 70 per cent of its land is still under forest cover, and that 80 per cent of its population is dependent on forest resources for their livelihood, and warned that biodiversity loss caused by climate change would have an impact on the locals. He further highlighted the lack of awareness on the impact of climate change on biodiversity, and the need to establish assessment, and monitoring and reporting of forest resources as major challenges. At the national level, current activities include reviewing a national forest policy relating to climate change and working towards establishing pilot projects to address REDD-plus, with the intention of developing a REDD-plus programme. At the governmental level, Vanuatu has a National Advisory Committee on Climate Change (NACCC) consisting of different government institutions. Several capacity-building workshops have been conducted in the past years. In relation to the status of REDD-plus, Mr. Viji shared that Vanuatu is at the Readiness phase.

49. Ms. Nghiem Thi Phuong Le of Viet Nam shared extensively about REDD-plus implementation at the government level in Vietnam. She noted that in 2008, that a National Target Programme to Respond to Climate Change (NTP-RCC), with REDD as one of its activities, was approved by the Prime Minister. Additionally, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) launched the Action Plan Framework (APF) for Adaptation to Climate Change in the Agriculture and Rural Development Sector for the period 2008-2020. In 2009, the National Network and Technical Working Group for REDD-plus were established. The National Network is chaired by the Vice Minister of MARD and co-chaired by an international development partner (Norwegian Embassy). There were four sub technical working groups established on MRV, local implementation, benefit distribution system and governance. In 2010, relevant laws to promote Payment for Forest Environmental Service (PFES) were enacted. Ms. Nghiem also elaborated on REDD-plus activities with other organisations such as the UN-REDD Viet Nam Programme, looking at developing an effective REDD regime in Viet Nam; the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) in terms of support to develop a Readiness Preparation Proposal; and the SNV-BMU "High-Biodiversity REDD-plus" project. Experiences with biodiversity safeguards are addressed through Viet Nam's NBSAP 2007 and the implementation of Biodiversity Law enacted in 2008. Ms. Nghiem drew attention to some of the shortcomings, which included the overlap in biodiversity management by different agencies which makes it difficult to harmonize work, insufficient funding allocated for biodiversity, and the inclusion of new and complex issues such as access and benefit-sharing, and the adoption of an ecosystem-based approach for adoption.

50. Mr. Andrew Randall of the United Kingdom provided insights on research findings rather than a country report. He noted the Cancun Agreement in relation to REDD-plus guidance and safeguards, and stressed the need for specification and advice to help REDD-plus and biodiversity actors to interpret and apply the safeguards. An analysis of on-going initiatives for developing biodiversity-related standards for REDD-plus indicated several findings that are outlined here. The provisions relevant to avoiding conversion of priority ecosystems are stronger than provisions on avoiding degradation or enhancing positive impacts; also there are a lack of indicators to establish that safeguards have been met, and lack of incentives for delivery of co-benefits. Different approaches can be taken to specify goals at relevant scales, for example, making use of procedural safeguards in addition to outcome-oriented safeguards, providing a process for national interpretation of safeguards and providing guidance and definitions. With reference to developing specific interpretation of the safeguards, there is a need to address specific risks and opportunities for biodiversity from different types of REDD-plus activities. One such example is the need to deal with opportunities for habitat restoration associated with carbon stock enhancement. There is also a need for definition of goals for biodiversity impacts from REDD-plus activities, at appropriate scales, and sufficient definition of these activities could help to ensure that implementation covers such impacts. Mr. Randall stressed the need for development of monitoring methods to indicate that goals have been met. This may be linked to CBD Strategic Plan indicators as well as the use and linkage to remote-

based monitoring systems such as Global Forest Observation Initiative (GFIO). He also highlighted capacity requirements for implementation for safeguards which included generation of data and knowledge on biodiversity values, its interaction with socio-economic factors, data analysis capability, planning and implementation of measures such as spatial planning, and also capacity for monitoring of achieved outcomes. Options to take the process further included more specific interpretation of the requirements spelt out in the Cancun Agreements, based on analysis of the opportunities and risks; avoid proliferation of standards and conflicting interpretations of the Cancun Agreements; development of indicators and monitoring methods that can be adapted for use at the national level; and support to Parties, including through capacity building and the development of further guidance.

Presentations by Indigenous and Local Communities

51. Ms. Grace Tauli Balawag of Tebtebba presented on behalf of Tebtebba, Ole Siosiomaga Society and Partners with Melanesians. She emphasized that many forests are still owned by indigenous and local communities (ILCs), whom regard forests as a source of livelihood as well as a basis of their identity. She noted that the participation of ILCs at regional and global processes are through various forums such as the International Indigenous Peoples Forum on Climate Change (IIPFCC), International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), and Indigenous Peoples Global Network on Climate Change and Sustainable Development (IPCCSD). These forums promote common agreements on key principles and proposals for advocacy and negotiation during Convention on Biological Diversity and UNFCCC processes. One of the challenges faced at such global processes is the lack of recognition of ILCs as genuine partners with significant roles and contributions. She highlighted that the safeguards for REDD-plus and biodiversity relevant to ILCs should be based on a human rights perspective and ecosystems-approach principles; and recognise the role and experience of ILCs as primary guardians of nature. Additionally, it should address governance issues such as land tenure, customary rights, local empowerment, livelihoods, and on the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. She then highlighted some key principles that safeguards should be based upon, such as recognition of the rights of IPs; ensuring full and effective participation of ILCs in all mechanisms, bodies, and procedures under the CBD; recognition and protection of indigenous knowledge and cultural heritage, innovations, technologies, spiritual beliefs and cultural expressions at all levels; and ensuring direct and immediate access of ILCs to finance, appropriate technologies and capacity-building activities. Challenges in developing safeguards include the need to define safeguards and sharing of benefits relevant for ILCs in biodiversity and REDD-plus; the need to collaborate with ILCs in national CBD and Climate Change Commissions and REDD-plus mechanisms for coordination and participation in capacity-building activities; and the need to collaborate and strengthen advocacy work at the national, sub-national and local levels related to CBD Articles 8j and 10c; and the need for more support for the participation of ILCs in all REDD-plus activities. Ms. Balawag then listed the ongoing activities on developing MRV tools and indicators to monitor REDD-plus impacts, safeguards, and benefits for ILCs; and highlighted some ways forward for collaborating with ILCs, including the need for a complaints mechanism.

Presentations by Other Relevant Organizations

52. Mr. Berthold P. Seibert of GIZ gave an overview of their biodiversity and climate change portfolio in Asia. He highlighted that there are 61 projects funded by the German Development Cooperation, of which 35 are funded by GIZ and the remaining 26 are funded by KfW Entwicklungsbank (German Development Bank). There are GIZ country-level REDD-plus projects in Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines and Viet Nam. The regional-level REDD-plus projects in Asia and Pacific include the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity: Biodiversity and Climate Change, Adaptation and Mitigation Strategies in support of ASEAN Multi-Sectoral Framework on Climate Change (AFCC), Adaptation to Climate Change in the Pacific Island Region, and Climate protection through forest conservation in the pacific islands. Mr. Seibert then focused his presentation on the ACB: Biodiversity and Climate Change Project. He provided background on the ACB which is an intergovernmental centre of excellence established by the ten member states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to facilitate cooperation and coordination with its partners on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. ACB's core objectives include providing a platform for sharing information, experiences and best practices;

facilitating discussion and resolution of transboundary biodiversity conservation issues; providing capacity-building and facilitating technology transfer services; strengthening compliance with biodiversity related multilateral agreements; and promoting public and leadership awareness of the values of biodiversity. GIZ's support to ACB is aimed at equipping the Centre with advisory strategies and instruments to advise ASEAN Member States on biodiversity conservation related measures on climate protection and adaptation to climate change. Supplementary to this, and in collaboration with the EU, is the development of instruments for biodiversity conservation through payment for ecosystem services. GIZ has expressed interests to provide supplementary financing for ACB programmes, which includes REDD-plus, ecotourism, and access and benefit-sharing.

53. Mr. Terry Sunderland of CIFOR emphasized the relationship between forests and biodiversity as well as carbon storage. He highlighted worldwide trends of net change in forest cover and gave some basic history and definitions behind the REDD-plus mechanism. He noted that recent literature suggests REDD-plus is likely to provide a net benefit for conservation, where forest conservation is competing with drivers of deforestation. Theoretically, there will also be additional co-benefits such as poverty alleviation, biodiversity conservation and improved forest governance. He noted that the efficacy of REDD-plus will depend on the details of design at the global level and implementation at national and project scales. Some of the risks and challenges involve losing sight of the conservation value of forests if they are managed for carbon alone, where biodiversity is traded for carbon value; and overlapping tenure claims. Mr. Sunderland emphasized the need for proper governance so that funds provided by REDD-plus would go towards the intended use. He further emphasized the need to consider past experiences and mistakes in order to successfully implement REDD-plus. Mr. Sunderland noted similarities between initial REDD-plus pilot projects and contemporary conservation projects which have poor track records and have been criticised for their ineffectiveness due to problems with accountability. He then highlighted some best practices of conservation projects that would be relevant to REDD-plus such as having measurable and clearly defined goals, a sense of permanence in the project duration as short term projects often had poor effectiveness, the availability of markets for participants goods and services, mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation and the use of multi-functional landscapes since most biodiversity exists outside of protected areas. He also highlighted some project practices that would require greater diligence for REDD-plus, such as the need for national policies to support project activities, the need for locally based conservation to be applied where threats and solutions are local, to recognise and negotiate for trade-offs, the need to develop an understanding of community heterogeneity and complexity as well as community needs, the need for design projects to be adaptable, the need to involve local stakeholders at all stages and to collaborate with all potential partners and the need for monitoring, reporting and verification among others.

54. Mr. Alistair Monument of FSC spoke about how FSC certification can complement REDD-plus by promoting responsible and sustainable forestry practices and its updates to include climate change in its agenda. He first introduced the background of FSC, describing it as an independent, non-governmental, not for profit organization guided by its multi-stakeholder membership. It was founded to promote environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial and economically viable management of the world's forests; and has more than 15 years of experience implementing credible safeguards. FSC sets standards based on principles for responsible forest management followed by an accreditation and certification system to monitor their implementation as well as a product-labelling system to financially reward responsible forest managers. The reach of FSC is global as work is done worldwide with internationally-recognised forest management standards, yet national indicators are developed to suit local scenarios. Its credibility comes from various mechanisms including its balanced multi-stakeholder governance, involvement of local stakeholders in forest certification processes, Chain of Custody (CoC) certification from forest to product, adhering to International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labelling Alliance (ISEAL) codes of good practice, prioritising workers and indigenous people's rights and rejecting forest conversion. To increase its relevance to REDD-plus, FSC is exploring potential system amendments to become more 'carbon-sensitive'. Mr. Monument then elaborated FSC's draft climate change engagement strategy that focuses on safeguarding, carbon stewardship, carbon accountability and carbon rewards. He expressed concern that REDD-plus safeguards were only a safety

net to avoid worst-case scenarios as opposed to ensuring responsible forest management practices and the importance of having an effective system implementation mechanism. He also described key climate change activities undertaken by FSC, such as the upcoming GEF-UNEP Project 'Enhancing FSC Forest Management Certification at the Landscape Level through incorporating additional Ecosystem Services' which had pilot activities in Chile, Indonesia, Nepal and Vietnam.

55. Mr. Chandra Silori of RECOFTC – The Center for People and Forests, highlighted that the vision of the Center is to actively involve local communities in the equitable and ecologically sustainable management of forest landscapes. He outlined the Center's four thematic programmes, (i) People, Forest and Climate Change, (ii) Expanding Community Forestry, (iii) Market Access, and (iv) Conflict management. The elements of the programmes include training and capacity-building, action research, strengthening regional networks, and advocacy of key messages and advisory services. He provided examples of activities under the different programme elements, for example, that for the period 2009-2010, 64 trainings were delivered to over 2000 participants in 20 countries. Grassroots capacity-building for REDD is one of the major contributors to these training programmes. He also highlighted the REDD-net Asia Pacific project which promotes the interest of civil society in REDD-plus through regional and global bulletins providing a knowledge exchange platform; and the REDD Learning Network, currently a network of eight countries which facilitates information sharing on REDD-plus issues and supports the development of a national REDD-plus scheme. RECOFTC also provides advisory services on free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) in REDD-plus. Finally, he noted the few future research needs on REDD-plus include examining the role of indigenous knowledge in REDD-plus, the risks and opportunities in relation to REDD-plus, for example, whether REDD-plus will escalate conflict in the forestry sector, how to ensure equitable access to and benefit sharing from carbon trade, and the costs of REDD-plus. The future policy needs includes developing policies on safeguards, including guidance on the roles and responsibilities of various actors and stakeholders; creating a policy environment conducive to facilitating good governance and stronger and clear rights to local communities; and creating an international mechanism to avoid dilution or misinterpretation of safeguards by participating countries.

ITEM 4. REDD-PLUS SAFEGUARDS AND ASSESSMENT/MONITORING OF IMPACTS

56. The participants were divided into three working groups (WG) for in-depth discussions. Each WG addressed two main issues: (i) developing advice on the application of relevant REDD-plus safeguards for biodiversity and indigenous and local communities; and (ii) identifying possible indicators and mechanisms to assess the contribution of REDD-plus to achieving the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The three WG provided detailed recommendations on these issues. The groups were facilitated by Mr. Barney Dickson (UNEP-WCMC/UN-REDD Programme), Ms. Neeta Hooda (The World Bank) and Ms. Regan Suzuki (RECOFTC- The Centre for People and Forests). Rapporteurs for the WG were Ms. Somaly Chan (WG 1); Ms. Eunice Dus and Mr. Andrew Randall (WG 2); and Mr. Ioan Viji and Ms. Elizabeth Philip (WG 3).

57. Before the reports from the WG, the workshop plenary held a teleconference dialogue with the UNFCCC Secretariat, Ms Maria Sans-Sanchez, who responded to a number of questions which were raised by workshop participants, to facilitate better understanding of the relevant UNFCCC decisions and process. A summary of the questions and answers are listed in annex I.

58. Mr. Barney Dickson, facilitator of WG 1, presented the main points and outcomes of his group's discussions. He started by describing their approach: they formulated a table listing the safeguards and addressing them from the perspectives of general comments, how to implement safeguard, information needs for implementation, capacity needs, indicators and monitoring mechanisms. He highlighted a few key points, the first being that all safeguards examined tend to be very general and brief. In order to implement them, more elaboration, detail and information is required. A proposed solution is to establish internationally-agreed safeguards, followed by national interpretations which would enable countries to develop them in more detail. A potential point of contention was the degree of freedom each country has to interpret the safeguards; there was concern that countries will interpret them in a way that suits their

agenda, rendering the safeguards meaningless. The second point addressed the safeguard to avoid conversion of natural forest. He raised the need to clearly define the terms "natural forest" and "conversion" before being able to develop and apply this safeguard, and subsequently determine if it is being complied with.

59. Mr. Dickson concluded by speaking about the challenges the group faced in identifying potential indicators. The wording of UNFCCC- and REDD-plus-developed safeguards had a degree of fluidity and open-endedness which made it difficult to identify indicators; therefore precise formulations of safeguards would assist the development of appropriate indicators. He added that the effectiveness of this WG could be increased if they had been able to review a set of suggested indicators identified by technical experts rather than starting from a blank page. Perhaps subsequent regional workshops could be provided with draft indicators to review without limiting the freedom for identifying other new indicators.

60. Mr. Andrew Randall, co-rapporteur of WG 2, summarized the issues addressed by the group based on risks and safeguards raised in the Nairobi and Cancun meetings, stating capacity-building to have emerged as a key cross-cutting theme. The group agreed that risks and safeguards had to be developed and applied at the national level, and that NBSAPs could complement this by providing another level of safeguards for biodiversity. He highlighted the need for a cautious approach to afforestation and reforestation, noting that it had to be considered in a landscape perspective and needed effective land-use planning. Other considerations are that baselines for social and biodiversity benefits had to be understood to assist the development of indicators, and good governance and stakeholders' access to decision-making processes are crucial to the implementation of safeguards. He stated that tools and data exist for establishing baselines for essential information such as the location of natural forests and areas of high biodiversity, enabling the assessment of REDD-plus impacts on biodiversity. International initiatives and free access to relevant biodiversity and carbon density data can further help countries to better assess impacts and priorities. Mr. Randall raised the caveat that countries should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good –focusing too much on the minutiae of biodiversity could set back implementation of processes. While countries can build on existing institutions, tools and processes, capacity, such as that for analysis of information to establish biodiversity baselines, needs to be increased at all relevant levels. REDD-plus can also benefit from building on existing experiences in community-based forest management and SFM. Other capacity needs raised are the effective participation of and networks for the engagement of relevant stakeholders, legislative backing and improved coordination between ministries, departments and agencies. He noted that reporting frameworks under UNFCCC and the Convention on Biological Diversity are completely different and harmonising them will decrease the reporting burden on countries. Ultimately, REDD-plus has to provide adequate and predictable financial resources for developing countries to develop and apply relevant safeguards. The group produced a paper presenting a narrative on the application of REDD-plus safeguards addressing key themes and produced a case study of Indian national level legislation and guidance which could be applied to REDD-plus biodiversity safeguards.

61. Mr. Ioan Viji, rapporteur for WG 3, presented the group's discussion on safeguards, articulating that if safeguards are designed and implemented appropriately, REDD-plus may provide a suite of benefits, including the sustainable use of forest resources and forest biodiversity conservation, improved forest governance and management, recognition of the rights of ILCs, improved livelihoods and poverty reduction. The WG participants agreed that it is important to differentiate the development of safeguards in response to addressing needs at the national or community-level. Safeguards should be expressed in generic principles and criteria and indicator frameworks should be developed to operationalize the principles and criteria at the sub-national level. The WG reviewed three sets of safeguard frameworks (World Bank safeguard policies, CCB standards, Draft UN-REDD Principles and Criteria) and agreed that the existing frameworks address crucial safeguards relevant to biodiversity and ILCs. It was noted that there are large degrees of overlap as well as significant differences between these frameworks. Though all the frameworks examined address biodiversity, there are differences in emphasis and degree of intended application. For example, some provide overarching principles and guidance useful at the national level, while others are more relevant to the implementation of project-level activities. The

frameworks also differ in their relevance to REDD-plus, as some were developed for broader programmatic purposes. Although terms differ in meaning, they are often used interchangeably; therefore there is a need to define terms to provide clarity. Working group participants agreed that identifying the "best of the best" of principles and criteria could be used as a broad-based safeguard framework for engaging in REDD-plus, a combination of existing frameworks could ensure comprehensiveness. Gaps in the existing framework were also considered by the participants. The participants then ranked the three frameworks against a set of indicators, identified a list of eight risks associated with REDD-plus, and provided recommendations to mitigate and minimise these risks.

62. The co-chairs Mr. Martin Brasher and Mr. Jagdish Kishwan provided their comments to conclude the WG discussions. They reiterated the importance of the discussion outcomes in linking comments and recommended indicators to the previous Nairobi and Cancun documents as well as providing a solid basis for upcoming regional workshops and the Ad-hoc Technical Expert Group on Indicators (AHTEG) in June 2011. Tim Christophersen, of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, also commended the WGs on producing quality content as well as fully covering the question with complementary approaches.

63. Results of the working groups are attached as annex II to this report

ITEM 5. OTHER MATTERS

64. There were no other matters.

ITEM 6. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

65. Participants adopted the present report of the meeting.

66. The meeting closed at 1 p.m. Friday, 18 March 2011.

Annex I

PLENARY DIALOGUE WITH UNFCCC SECRETARIAT (VIA ELECTRONIC CONFERENCING FACILITY)

Question 1: UNFCCC decision 1/CP.16, Annex I, Paragraph 1.(d) states 'Be consistent with the objective of environmental integrity and take into account the multiple functions of forests and other ecosystems'

a) What does 'environmental integrity' mean in this context?

b) Does the reference to 'other ecosystems' imply that countries should consider the impact of REDD-plus activities on non-forest ecosystems? For example, if deforestation is reduced this may increase the conversion pressure on other ecosystem types such as wetlands and grasslands.

Answer:

a) In the context of the UNFCCC, environmental integrity is related to the main objectives/goals of the Convention (to address cc issues). E.g. REDD-plus action should not undermine actions by Parties in other sectors to mitigate or adapt to climate change.

b) The focus is on forest ecosystems, but it is possible that other ecosystems could be affected by displacement of pressure due to REDD-plus actions, or by some of the actions as such (e.g. referring to afforestation, there would be effects on non-forest ecosystems, which need to be carefully considered, if such activities are going to take place in areas where biodiversity conservation is an issue.

Question 2: Annex II para (b) of the same decision requests SBSTA to develop guidance relating to Paragraph 71(d). What can you tell us about the process by which SBSTA will develop this guidance?

Answer: SBSTA works based on a discussion on the mandate, including on para 71 (d), and Parties will develop guidance starting in June 2011.

Question 3: Can you explain in more detail how SBSTA will presumably address modalities for guidance relating to the system for providing information on how the safeguards are addressed? Will the Secretariat prepare a document on the basis of Party submissions at SBSTA in June?

Answer: The Secretariat does not have a mandate to prepare a document before the session. The basis for discussion will be the experiences that countries have so far from, developing their national REDD plus strategies and ongoing demonstration activities in the context of ongoing bilateral and multilateral initiatives, and their work with relevant organizations. Due to that, countries are now in a better position to develop this guidance than they were when discussion on safeguards was introduced in the draft LCA text after Bali. The best way to share experiences including from this workshop, will be probably through Parties, any information sharing tool can also be used (e.g. the REDD Web Platform of the UNFCCC).

Question 4: How can the results of this workshop and the workshops for Latin America and Caribbean, and Africa, be best introduced into the UNFCCC process?

Answer: One might need to see the results of the whole series to have the full picture of Parties' views. But the best way is to inform Parties about the results, through sharing the outcomes with the relevant actors from Parties to the UNFCCC, e.g. negotiators at SBSTA and at COP. In addition, as it was said before the information can be included on the REDD Web Platform, and CBD Secretariat can submit information to UNFCCC Secretariat.

Question 5: With regard to Afforestation and Reforestation (A/R) as possible activities under REDD-plus (enhancement of carbon stocks), is there any attempt to revisit the LULUCF definition and adapt them to REDD-plus?

Answer: Enhancement of carbon stocks under REDD-plus can include A/R activities. So far, there has been no attempt to revisit the forest definition that is used under the KP. In the past, they were some unsuccessful attempts (i.e. by FAO) to provide with biome type of definitions for forest. The first thing to consider is that the forest definition should be clear from the beginning at national level, and what is more important once the definition has been set, it should not be changed later on to avoid undesirable implications when performing monitoring and reporting.

Annex II

WORKING GROUP RESULTS

Working Group 1: Advice on application of biodiversity safeguards

Safeguard (risk or opportunity to be addressed)	**General comments**	**How to implement safeguard**	**Information needs**	**Capacity needs**	**Indicators**	**Monitoring mechanisms**
All safeguards	Should be measurable (MRV) and consistent across sites, and need independent verification. Measurable indicators would require more precise formulation of safeguards. In addressing biodiversity safeguards, there is a need to recognise the three components of biodiversity: ecosystems, species and genetic diversity, including minimising genetic erosion. Further development and application of the biodiversity safeguards should be informed by the Aichi Targets.	Existing formulations need to be developed in more detail. Need to move from International to national interpretations (compliance) of safeguards. National interpretations should be developed by each country in an open and inclusive manner with best practice guidance to inform the process. There should be limits or minimum standards on national interpretations.	Need to understand spatial distribution of biodiversity	The implementation of all these safeguards is likely to require additional capacity within many REDD countries	*Difficult to identify indicators if the formulation of the safeguards themselves are not fixed since much depends on the precise wording of the safeguards.* *Perhaps this working group would have worked even more effectively if it had been able to review suggested indicators identified by a technical expert. Perhaps subsequent regional workshops could be given draft indicators to review, without limiting the freedom for subsequent workshops to identify indicators themselves.* Need a balance between process-based and measurable/quantifiable indicators. For example, process-based: holding of consultative meetings, or a consultation process. Indicators should build on the work done on indicators for the Aichi targets (5, 7, 11 and 15) as well as specific work on indicators for REDD-plus including the REDD-plus social and environmental standards and guideline 6 of the UN-REDD draft guidelines for monitoring the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and ecosystem services. It should also build on other relevant work on indicators including the relevant parts of the Cities Biodiversity Index indicators, ITTO guidelines on sustainable forest management and FSC standards.	Where possible make use of existing monitoring activities including the REDD-plus greenhouse gas monitoring.

Safeguard (risk or opportunity to be addressed)	**General comments**	**How to implement safeguard**	**Information needs**	**Capacity needs**	**Indicators**	**Monitoring mechanisms**
Avoid conversion of natural forests (note: World Bank safeguards have provisions for natural habitats)	One view is that this has to meet national regulations or circumstances, another view is that this should not be left to national choice (may be addressed at UNFCCC SBSTA) (see also Annex 1 para. 2b).		Need greater clarity on what is a natural forest.		Information that is potentially relevant in the development of an indicator, e.g., forestry management plans, protected area management plans, country's REDD strategy Area of natural forests converted over time Percentage change in area of natural forest over time Challenges: -discriminating between incentivising conversion and allowing conversion -discriminating between planned and unplanned conversion -how to capture anthropogenic causes of conversion vs. natural causes? -an agreed definition of the terms "natural forests" as well as "conversion" are essential to develop an indicator for this safeguard.	
Avoid displacement of deforestation to forests of lower carbon and high biodiversity value			Applying this safeguard has large information needs including forecasting tools.	Significant	Information relevant to developing an indicator: -information on the carbon density and biodiversity value of forests over time -need to develop baseline maps of forests, forest types, areas of high or low biodiversity value -regular programme of inventory -driver of displacement would be relevant to the kind of information needed Challenges to developing an indicator: -what is meant by high or low biodiversity value? Should these be defined at a national level or do we need an agreed upon definition? -determining if change is due to displacement. Baselines may help in this respect.	

Safeguard (risk or opportunity to be addressed)	**General comments**	**How to implement safeguard**	**Information needs**	**Capacity needs**	**Indicators**	**Monitoring mechanisms**
Avoid increased pressure on non-forest ecosystems with high biodiversity value	Extends the scope of the safeguards beyond forests. Clearly articulate how this safeguard is linked or contributes to REDD-plus.	Requires integration of REDD into broader land-use planning and link conservation management to wider landscape planning.	Huge. Develop awareness programmes of a.) what is REDD and b.) what are areas of high biodiversity value for relevant stakeholders inside and outside the forest sector	Significant	Information that would be relevant to developing the indicator: -Subsidies to different sectors, legislation	
Avoid afforestation in areas of high biodiversity value	The term "Afforestation" (as well as reforestation) does not appear in the Cancun decision. Should it be used in formulating the safeguard? Consider using the terms "Enhancement of forest carbon stocks"				Information relevant to developing the indicator: - areas of high biodiversity value converted into forest -baseline -identify areas potentially at risk Other forestry managemen t practices designed to retain biodiversity (e.g., culling trees that might be pest-infested) Challenges: -what is meant by high or low biodiversity value?	
Respect rights of indigenous peoples and local communities	This safeguard should address, in the light of Annex 1 para. 2 (c) and (d) and CBD articles 8(j) and 10(c), at least the four risks identified by the Nairobi workshop. Work on how to implement this safeguard should take account of, but not limited to: -CBD decisions and guidelines including work on indicators -UN-REDD Programme draft				When developing indicators, adhere to the relevant parts of UNDRIP, and build on indicators developed by the CBD on engagement of indigenous peoples.	

Safeguard (risk or opportunity to be addressed)	**General comments**	**How to implement safeguard**	**Information needs**	**Capacity needs**	**Indicators**	**Monitoring mechanisms**
	guidelines for monitoring impacts of REDD -World Bank policy on indigenous peoples and stakeholder engagement -Other guidelines including those developed by CCBA/CARE, RECOFTC, SFC, etc. -UNDRIP and other human rights instruments					
Enhance biodiversity conservation	Additional costs may be involved. The value of biodiversity and ecosystem services needs to be better recognised. Need to understand drivers of deforestation. Encourage states to deliver on their commitments on safeguards. Some uncertainty about the exact meaning of this safeguard – is the enhancement of biodiversity required or simply desirable?	For example, prioritise reducing deforestation in high biodiversity forests, address issues of connectivity in forest planning, promotion of multiple benefits from the implementation of SFM/SMF.	Need to understand spatial distribution of biodiversity		Information relevant to the indicator: -Forestry and PA management practices designed to retain biodiversity (e.g., culling trees that might be pest-infested) Challenge: -identifying if the changes are due to REDD activities -indicator would have to take into consideration biodiversity components -safeguard is loosely formulated Possible indicator: Area of high biodiversity forest	

WORKING GROUP 2

Basis of WG discussions: CBD Nairobi Workshop on REDD-plus and Biodiversity (September 2010), and relevant UNFCCC and CBD COP decisions, in particular decision 1/CP.16 of UNFCCC and X/33 of CBD.

It is important to consider all ecosystems services in land-use decisions, not only carbon. Tools that can help with this are, for example, The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB), and the Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services (WAVES) project of the World Bank.

Countries will undertake any REDD-plus efforts with reference to paragraph 1(e) of Annex I of decision 1/CP.16, and they will have to decide whether REDD-plus really offers added value for them from a biodiversity and social benefit perspective, for example, if they already have very effective and comprehensive forest conservation and management policies.

I. Risks and Safeguards

(a) Risks identified by the Nairobi workshop are adequately covering all relevant biodiversity and IPs/LCs risks. These risks are adequately covered by UNFCCC decision 1/CP.16 safeguards, while technical guidance on application of the safeguards exists in the CBD, notably the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group report on Biodiversity and Climate Change, including on Afforestation and Reforestation.

(b) However, the application of the safeguards at national level will be essential. Many national level policies, laws, regulations etc. exist already which are applicable to REDD-plus biodiversity safeguards, although they were not developed specifically for that purpose (e.g. forest legislation), for example in India (see case study below). Such policies should be taken stock of, including those based on traditional ecological and local knowledge, to consider them as a basis for REDD-plus efforts.

(c) In case that an analysis of existing legislation reveals gaps in terms of safeguards and assessment of biodiversity impacts, these should be filled through new policies and measures.

(d) It is necessary to draw together these applicable rules, across policy and economic sectors, and clarify how they apply to REDD-plus. National laws e.g. in Nepal already exist that would apply to safeguards, and countries could identify those that apply to the risks identified by CBD workshop, and to the safeguards under UNFCCC.

(e) In most countries, NBSAPs contain elements relevant for biodiversity risks and relevant safeguards, and could be an important basis for incorporating biodiversity conservation measures in REDD-plus policies. Vice-versa, the development of REDD-plus policies can contribute to improved, more comprehensive NBSAPs.

(f) There has to be a cautious approach to Afforestation and Reforestation (A/R), and is has to be considered in a landscape perspective, aiming for multi-functional forest landscapes. This requires effective land-use planning.

(g) Experience shows that a baseline for social and biodiversity benefits must be established, e.g. what are the existing drivers of biodiversity loss (due to deforestation and forest degradation); what

are the sustainable livelihoods of IPs and LCs? What are the existing forest-related laws and laws on IPs and LCs? From there, indicators can be developed (e.g., Tebtebba has published national policy research on baseline studies and possible indicators).

(h) Good governance, and in particular access of stakeholders to all levels of decision-making process, will be the best insurance for the implementation of social and environmental safeguards, including relevant biodiversity safeguards.

II. Assessment of REDD-plus impacts on biodiversity and indigenous and local communities

(a) Based on the text from Cancun, decision 1/CP.16 Annex I: key information needed at national level is 'Where are natural forests?' and 'Where are areas of high biodiversity value?', and how are they being impacted? Tools and information that exists right now and could be the basis for baselines and monitoring, at least at the ecosystems level, are:

(i) FRA 2010 (in particular biodiversity and SFM indicators)

(ii) National Ecological Gap Analysis for CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas

(iii) National Reports of Parties to the CBD and reports to the UNFCCC

(iv) Biodiversity hotspots/Key Biodiversity Areas (based on information and analysis, for example, provided by various NGOs, and by the UNEP-WCMC)

(v) Work of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership

(b) UN REDD Programme and FCPF and other international initiatives should help countries to progress on this.

(c) There is a gap in the availability of data, some of which is held by NGOs or consultancies rather than governments. There should be free and open access to biodiversity data for assessment purposes pursuant to CBD COP Decision X/7 and X/15.

III. Capacity needs

(a) Enforcement of legislation and development of good governance takes time, but we should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Countries can build on existing institutions, tools and processes, both for application of safeguards, and for assessment of biodiversity impacts. At the same time, capacity needs to be increased at all relevant levels, and national-level tools and processes should be further improved, including through technology transfer.

(b) Many countries lack access to and capacity to analyze information for the establishment of biodiversity baselines, for example, what is environmental integrity (and what is forest degradation, what are the baselines for biodiversity and social benefits). There is also a lack of incentives and livelihood alternatives for conservation, and a lack of tools and expertise for analyzing trade-offs, for good land-use planning.

(c) It is important to learn from community based forest management and other areas of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM), which includes aspects of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity: REDD-plus would benefit from building on existing SFM criteria and indicators, even though carbon is not a commodity like timber or other forest products.

(d) It is important to monitor the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, including the gender aspects, in decision making processes. For example, in the FCPF approach transparent and inclusive consultations with relevant stakeholders are required in the process of developing national REDD-plus strategy, policies and measures related to REDD-plus.

(e) Legislative backing, including at the community level, is important. Community agreements regarding forest resources should have legal backing or access to redress or any kind grievance mechanisms in case that a company does not comply with agreements for social benefits.

(f) Networks for wider engagement of relevant stakeholders at the national and regional level can improve the exchange of information and knowledge.

(g) Biodiversity baseline information, and reporting, is the responsibility of different Ministries, and there is often a lack of capacity and coordination. Application and monitoring of safeguards would be improved by improving coordination between Ministries and departments and agencies. Better collaboration between international institutions and processes (e.g. between FRA and new initiatives such as Global Forest Observation Initiative) could support the countries in better coordination. The regional level organizations and processes such as ASEAN, SAARC, RECOFTC can support countries in this coordination.

(h) Reporting frameworks under UNFCCC and CBD are completely different and it is important to harmonize them as far as possible, to decrease the reporting burden on countries.

(i) Key research and development needs, as identified in the CBD Nairobi Workshop of September 2010, include:

(i) Analysis of key drivers of biodiversity loss due to deforestation and forest degradation at the national and local level;

(ii) The conditions for effective and equitable distribution mechanisms;

(iii) Criteria and indicators for monitoring multiple benefits and safeguards;

(iv) Spatially explicit support tools/maps, including information on ecosystem services;

(v) Socio-economic analyses of implementing REDD-plus considering the full value of forests and multiple benefits, recognizing that there are intrinsic values that cannot be monetarized;

(vi) Reviewing and improving national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) to reflect climate change issues;

(vii) Further collaborative work on the definitions on forests and forest type.

(j) For the development and application of relevant biodiversity safeguards, and for the assessment of biodiversity impacts, developing countries require adequate and predictable financial resources, as outlined in decision X/3 of CBD on resource mobilization and relevant earlier decisions on this subject.

CASE STUDY: INDIA'S FOREST-RELATED NATIONAL POLICIES AND LEGISLATION WHICH COULD BE THE BASIS FOR RELEVANT BIODIVERSITY SAFEGUARDS AND THE ASSESSMENT OF BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS

India has about 70 m hectares of the forests (one fourth of the country's area). India has added 3 million hectares of forest during last 10 years. Progressive national forestry legislations and policies in India aimed at conservation and sustainable management of forests have reversed deforestation and have transformed India's forests into a significant net sink of CO_2. From 1995 to 2005, the carbon stocks stored in India's forests and trees have increased from 6,245 million tonnes (mt) to 6,662 mt, registering an annual increment of 38 mt of carbon or 138 mt of CO_2 equivalent.

Forest Biodiversity Safeguards

In India the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 came into effect October 25, 1980. Under the provisions of this Act, prior approval of the Central Government is essential for diversion of forest lands for the non-forestry purposes. In the national interest and in the interest of future generations (forest biological diversity conservation), this Act, therefore, regulates the diversion of forest lands to non-forestry purposes. The basic objective of the Act is, to regulate the indiscriminate diversion of forest lands for non-forestry uses and to maintain a logical balance between the developmental needs of the country and the conservation of forest biodiversity, its sustainable use.

CAMPA

India has constituted a Compensatory Afforestation Fund Management and Planning Authority (CAMPA) to receive all monies from user agencies towards Compensatory Afforestation, Additional Compensatory Afforestation, Catchment Area Treatment Plan or for compliance of any other condition(s) stipulated by the Central Government while according approval under the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980. To date it has about 3.5 billion USD for afforestation and reforestation purposes.

Forest Rights Act (FRA), 2006

Local institutions have a significant bearing on forest conservation and its sustainable use, more so at a time when market forces are putting tremendous pressure on natural resources. In India the institutions that deal with forests at the local level include: Joint Forest Management Committees (JFMC), Community Forest Management groups (a large number in Orissa), Van Panchayats (Uttarakhand), Village Councils (North East); Biodiversity Management Committees, Forest Committees set up under rule 4-e of FRA etc. Self Help Groups /Common Interest Groups have also been set up at the village level to promote forest-based livelihood activities. In India the spread of Joint Forest Management, despite several limitations and uncertainties in terms of tenurial insecurity, inadequate silvicultural development, and restricted harvesting and market access, has helped in regenerating forests and, to an extent, meeting local needs. Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) are constitutionally mandated bodies for decentralized development planning and execution at the local level. The Scheduled Tribes and Other Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006, in addition to individual rights, provides for Community Forest Rights, including the right to protect, regenerate and manage Community Forest Resource.

Green India Mission (GIM)

The Green India Mission (GIM) was launched in February 22, 2011 as part of NAPCC (National Action Plan on Climate Change) with budget of 10 billion USD over 10 year period.

Objectives of the GIM

- increase forest and tree cover in 5 m ha and improve quality of forest cover in another 5 m ha
- improve ecosystem services, biodiversity, hydrological services and carbon sequestration in 10 m ha
- increase forest-based livelihood income for 3 m forest-dependent households
- enhance annual carbon dioxide sequestration of 50-60 m tonnes by the year 2020

WORKING GROUP 3

Basis of the discussion: CBD Nairobi Workshop on REDD-plus and Biodiversity (September 2010), relevant CBD and UNFCCC decisions.

Safeguards

(a) If safeguards are designed and implemented appropriately, REDD-plus may provide a suite of benefits, including the sustainable use of forest resources and forest biodiversity conservation, improved forest governance and management, recognition of the rights of ILCs, improved livelihoods and poverty reduction.

(b) The WG participants agreed that it is important to be clear whether safeguards are developed with a focus on the national or community level. Safeguards should be expressed in generic principles and criteria and indicator framework should be developed to operationalize the principles and criteria at the sub-national level.

(c) Based on a review of three sets of existing and developing safeguard frameworks (World Bank safeguard policies, CCB standards, Draft UN-REDD Principles and Criteria), the WG participants agreed that existing frameworks address a number of important safeguards with regards to biodiversity and ILCs. There is a large degree of overlap between these frameworks, but also significant differences.

(d) All frameworks examined address biodiversity but they have differences in emphasis and intended application. For example, some provide overarching principles and guidance useful at the national level, while others are more relevant to the implementation of project-level activities. The frameworks also differ in their relevance to REDD-plus, as some were developed for broader programmatic purposes.

(e) There is a confusing proliferation of terms that need to be defined: principles, criteria, standards, policies, etc. The meaning of these terms differs although they are often used interchangeably.

(f) Following a preliminary analysis of commonalities and differences among frameworks, the WG participants ranked specific principles and criteria. Participants agreed that there is a need for identifying the “best of the best” of principles and criteria which may be used as a broadly applicable safeguards framework for engaging in REDD-plus. WG participants also agreed that there is a need to combine existing frameworks for overall comprehensiveness.

(g) The participants also identified gaps in existing frameworks. *Inter alia*, applying the precautionary approach to natural resource management, the principle of free prior and informed consent (rather than consultation), spatially explicit identification of forest areas of high biodiversity value, a functioning monitoring system with national baselines are key principles/criteria that are not sufficiently addressed in some of the existing frameworks.

Indicators to assess the contribution of REDD-plus biodiversity and mechanisms to monitor impacts

The workshop participants developed a list of key priority indicators for safeguards against the risks identified in the CBD Nairobi Workshop on REDD-plus and Biodiversity (September 2010).

Risk 1: *Conversion of natural forest to plantations and other land uses of low biodiversity value and low resilience; and the introduction of growing of biofuel crops*

(a) Biodiversity and ecosystem services potentially affected by REDD-plus are identified, prioritized and mapped at a scale and level of detail appropriate to each element/activity

(b) Clear definition of carbon enhancement to favour biodiversity systems

(c) Percentage of forest cover by forest type and changes

(d) List of flora and fauna

(e) Clear forest definitions at national level for REDD-plus to favour biodiversity

(f) Clear assessment of the value of ecosystem services. Value does not indicate monetary value

Risk 2 + 3: *Displacement of deforestation and forest degradation to areas of lower carbon value and high biodiversity value; and increased pressure on non-forest ecosystems with high biodiversity values*

(a) Comprehensive land use planning and implementation that does not only consider forest but non-forest ecosystems and related biodiversity objectives

(b) A monitoring plan and indicators are defined for measurement of the identified biodiversity and ecosystem service priorities potentially affected by REDD-plus, drawing on traditional knowledge and scientific research as appropriate

(c) An assessment of both predicted and actual environmental impacts of REDD-plus, involving Indigenous People, local communities and other stakeholders as appropriate

(d) Measure forest cover and density in forest vulnerable/exposed to displacement effects

(e) Change in number and composition of species over time in the non-forest ecosystem with high biodiversity value, where the pressure could be shifted

Risk 4: *Afforestation in areas of high biodiversity value*

(a) Biodiversity baseline (species richness, composition, diversity of native flora and fauna, endemic species) and monitoring plan in place

(b) Biodiversity friendly afforestation and management plan prepared through a multi-stakeholder process with conservation agreement for sustainable financing

(c) Plantation with native/indigenous tree species which are of multiple use value, for example for fodder, fuelwood, medicine etc.

(d) Zoning areas for production, protection and other biodiversity values

(e) Monitoring of soil and water quality

Risk 5: *The loss of traditional territories and restriction of land and natural resources rights*

(a) Establishment of a base line (through a documentation of biological resources and associated traditional knowledge), on the extent and use of traditional territories, land and natural resources by indigenous people and local communities (information will include, inter alia, demography, boundaries, social and resource mapping etc.)

(b) Rights of ILCs on the customary use of traditional territories, land and natural resources are ensured through national legislations/instruments (e.g., agreements, contracts, etc), based on international standards

(c) Fair and equitable benefit sharing mechanism are in place

(d) Regular monitoring and review plan is in place to see the existing livelihood opportunities being enhanced or maintained through REDD-plus

Risk 6: *Lack of tangible livelihood benefits to indigenous peoples and local communities and lack of equitable benefit sharing*

(a) Documented participatory stakeholder analysis

(b) Documented participatory REDD-plus programme to identify, quantify livelihood benefit and cost

(c) Means of verifying whether the distribution of benefit is equitable or not (e.g. household income from REDD+ revenues vs socio economic strata, gender, ethnicity)

Risk 7: *Exclusion from designing and implementation of policies and measures*

(a) Inclusive participatory stakeholder process to identify, design, implement, monitor, evaluate policies and measures (document for verification)

(b) Feedback receive from ILCs at all four stages (design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation)

(c) Pro-active steps taken to include marginalized groups in design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation

Risk 8: *Loss of traditional ecological knowledge*

(a) Incentives are put in place to encourage use/practice/application of traditional ecological knowledge

(b) REDD-plus project contributes to ex-situ preservation of traditional ecological knowledge with free prior informed consent

Capacity-Building

Participants stressed the need for interregional exchanges and capacity-building on what benefits should accrue to ILCs.

Annex III

CBD PARTIES

Bangladesh

Mr. Shafiul Alam Chowdury
Conservator of Forests
Department of Forest
Shere Banglanagar
Agargaon
Dhaka
Bangladesh
Email: msac1956@yahoo.com

Mr. Islam Tariqul
Assistant Chief Conservator of Forests
Department of Forest
Shere Banglanagar
Agargaon
Dhaka
Bangladesh
Email: tarik_fd@yahoo.com

Bhutan

Mr. Tsering Gyeltshen
Deputy Chief Research Officer
Watershed Management Division
Department of Forest & Park Services
Ministry of Agriculture & Forests
Thimphu
Bhutan
Email:tseringgyeltshen@yahoo.com

Mr. Karma C. Nyedrup
Joint Director
National Environment Commission Secretariat
P.O. Box 466
Thimphu
Bhutan
Tel: +975 2 323 760
Fax: +975 2 323 385
Email: kc@nec.gov.bt, nyedrupkc@yahoo.com

Cambodia

Ms Somaly Chan
Director, Department of International Conventions and Biodiversity
GDANCP
Ministry of Environment of Cambodia
48, Samdech Preah Sihanouk
Tonle Bassac, Chamkarmon
Phnom Penh
Cambodia
Tel: +855 23 721 462 / 12 457799
Fax: +855 23 721 073
Email:somalychan@hotmail.com,
icbd@moe-gdancp.org

Mr. Monyrak Meng
Deputy Director of ICBD and member of REDD Plus Task Force
GDANCP
Ministry of Environment of Cambodia
48, Samdech Preah Sihanouk
Tonle Bassac, Chamkarmon
Phnom Penh
Cambodia
Tel: +855 12 943 909
Fax: +855 23 721 073
Email:mmonyrak@gmail.com

China

Mr. Li Diqiang
Professor
Institute of Forest Ecology Environment and Protection
Chinese Academy of Forestry
Xiangshan Road, Haidian
Beijing 100091
China
Tel: +86 10 62888594
Fax: +86 10 62889551
Email: lidq@caf.ac.cn

Ms. Wu Shuirong
Associate Professor
Research Institute of Forest Policy and Information
Chinese Academy of Forestry
Wanshou Shan
Beijing 100091
China
Email:wushuirong@caf.ac.cn, wu.shuirong@gmail.com

CBD PARTIES

Germany

Mr Berthold P. Seibert
Project Manager / Team Leader to the GIZ-ACB project on Biodiversity and Climate Change
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity Headquaters
3F ERDB Building, Forestry Campus
Los Baños, Laguna 4031
Philippines
Tel: +63 02 5844247
Fax: +63 49 5361739
Mobile: +63 908 8980177
Email: berthold.seibert@giz.de
Website: www.aseanbiodiversity.org; www.giz.de

Ms. Ricarda Stuewe
Junior Professional on Climate Change
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity Headquarters
3F ERDB Building, Forestry Campus
Los Baños, Laguna 4031
Philippines
Tel: +63 02 5849247
Fax: +63 02 5361739
Mobile: +63 920 9485580
Email: ricarda.stuewe@giz.de

India

Mr. Jagdish Kishwan
Additional Director
General of Forests
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Paryavaran Bhawan, C.G.O. Complex, Lodhi Road
New Delhi 110 003
India
Tel: +91 11 24363247
Fax: +91 11 24364790
Email: jkishwan@nic.in

Mr. Hem Pande
Joint Secretary
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Paryavaran Bhawan, C.G.O. Complex, Lodhi Road
New Delhi 110 003
India
Tel: +91 11 24362551
Fax: +91 11 24360894
Email: hempande@nic.in

Indonesia

Ms Lulu Agustina
Head
Sub Division for Monitoring of Genetic Resources
The State Ministry of Environment of Indonesia
Jalan D.I. Pandjaitan Kav. 24
Kebon Nanas
Jakarta 13410
Indonesia
Tel: +62 21 85905770
Fax: +62 21 85905770
Email:lulu_sahari@menlh.go.id, luluagustina@yahoo.com

Ms. Puspa Dewi Liman
Deputy Director for Environmental Services
Directorate of Environmental Services and Nature Tourism
Ministry of Forestry
Jl. Ir. H. Juanda No. 15
Bogor West Java
Indonesia
Tel: +62 25 18324013
Fax: +62 25 18324013
Email: pdliman@gmail.com

Mr. Gatot Setiawan
Ministry of Environment of Indonesia
Directorate for Mitigation and Atmospheric Function Preservation
Jl. D. I Panjaitan Kav. 24 Build. A 6th Floor
Jakarta Timur
Indonesia
Tel: +62 21 8517164
Fax: +62 21 8517164
Email: gathut_thh@yahoo.com

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Mr. Asghar Mohammadi Fazel
Advisor to the Head of Department of Environment
University of Environment
Standard
S Q Karaj
Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Tel: +98 261 2807445
Fax: +98 261 2801422
Email: amfazel@gmail.com
Website: www.coe.ac.ir, www.epo.ir

CBD PARTIES

Lao People's Democratic Republic

Mr. Vanexay Bouttanavong
Technical Official
Department of Environment, Climate Change Office
Water, Resources, and Environment Administration
P.O. Box 7864
Nahaideaw Village
Vientiane Chanthabouly District
Lao People's Democratic Republic
Tel: +856 20 99778883
Fax: +856 21 254350
Email: btv_vanxay95@hotmail.com

Malaysia

Mr. Abdul Rahman Abdul Rahim
Deputy Director-General
Forestry Department of Peninsular Malaysia
Jalan Sultan Salahuddin
Kuala Lumpur 50660
Malaysia
Tel: +60 3 26164406
Fax: +60 3 26925657
Email: drarar@forestry.gov.my

Mr. Khang Aun Pan
Researcher
Forest Biodiversity Division
Forest Research Institute of Malaysia
Kepong
Selangor
Kuala Lumpur 52109
Malaysia
Tel: +60 3 62797701
Fax: +60 3 6284625
Email: pankhangaun@frim.gov.my, khangaun@yahoo.com
Website: www.frim.gov.my

Ms. Elizabeth Philip
Principal Assistant Secretary
Biodiversity and Forestry Management Division
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Level 6, Tower Block 4G3 Precinct 4
Putrajaya 62574
Malaysia
Tel: +60 3 88861074
Email: philip@nre.gov.my, philip@frim.gov.my

Mongolia

Mr. Boldbaatar Chuluunbaatar
Officer
Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism
Government Building No. 2, Street of United Nations 5/2
Ulaanbaatar 11
Mongolia
Tel: +976 51 266426
Email: boldbaatar@mne.gov.mn

Myanmar

Mr. Than Naing
Assistant Director
Forest Department
c/o Director General Office
Building No. 29
Nay Pyi Taw
Myanmar
Email: dg.fd@mptmail.net.mm

Ms. Le Le Thein
Head of Branch
National Commission for Environmental Affairs (NCEA)
Ministry of Forestry
Building No. 28
Nay Pyi Taw
Myanmar
Tel: +95 67 405383
Fax: +95 67 405391
Email: env.myan@mptmail.net.mm, lelethein@gmail.com

Nepal

Mr. Resham Bahadur Dangi
Deputy Director General
Community Forestry Division
Department of Forests
Babarmahal
Kathmandu
Nepal
Tel: +977 1 4227374
Email: reshamdangi@hotmail.com

CBD PARTIES

Nepal

Mr. Krishna Chandra Paudel
Chief
Environment Division
Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation
P.O. Box 5014
Singhadarbar
Kathmandu
Nepal
Tel: +977 1 4224892, +977 1 4220067
Fax: +977 1 4211798
Email: kcpaudel@hotmail.com

Pakistan

Mr. Syed Said Badshah Bukhari
Director General
Pakistan Forest Institute
Peshawar
Pakistan
Tel: +92 91 9216123
Fax: +92 91 9216203
Email: dgpfi55@gmail.com

Papua New Guinea

Ms. Eunice Dus
Policy Analyst – REDD+
Office of Climate Change and Development
P.O. Box 6601
Boroko – NCD
Papua New Guinea
Tel: +675 3250180
Fax: +675 3250182
Email: eunicejd@gmail.com

Philippines

Mr. Modesto Lagumbay Jr.
Senior Forest Management Specialist
Forest Management Bureau
Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)
Quezon Avenue
Diliman
Quezon City 1104
Philippines
Tel: +63 2 9276217
Email: mlagumbayjr@yahoo.com.ph
Website: www.denr.gov.ph

Philippines

Ms. Ana Rose Opeña
Senior Forest Management Specialist
Forest Management Bureau
Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)
Quezon Avenue
Diliman
Quezon City 1104
Philippines
Tel: +63 2 9277278
Email: anaroseopena@yahoo.com
Website: www.denr.gov.ph/fmb

Ms. Rowena Reyes-Boquiren
Conservation International – Philippines
6 Maalalahanin St.
Teacher's Village
Quezon City
Philippines
Email: rboquiren@conservation.org

Singapore

Mr. Geoffrey Davison
Assistant Director
National Biodiversity Centre
National Parks Board
1 Cluny Road
Singapore 259569
Singapore
Tel: +65 64651687
Fax: +65 64671912
Email: Geoffrey_davison@nparks.gov.sg
Website: www.nparks.gov.sg

Mr. Lua Hock Keong
Senior Biodiversity Officer
National Biodiversity Centre
National Parks Board
1 Cluny Road
Singapore 259569
Singapore
Tel: +65 64651675
Fax: +65 64671912
Email: lua_hock_keong@nparks.gov.sg
Website: www.nparks.gov.sg

CBD PARTIES

Singapore

Mr. Hassan Ibrahim
Senior Biodiversity Officer
National Biodiversity Centre
National Parks Board
1 Cluny Road
Singapore 259569
Singapore
Tel: +65 64651676
Fax: +65 64671912
Email: Hassan_ibrahim@nparks.gov.sg
Website: www.nparks.gov.sg

Solomon Islands

Mr. Joe Horokou
Director
Environment and Conservation Division
Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Meteorology
P.O. Box 21
Honiara
Solomon Islands
Tel: +677 23031, +677 88481
Fax: +677 28054
Email: horokoujoe@gmail.com

Thailand

Mr. Panuwat Kamuttachart
Senior Environmental Specialist
Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning
61 Phaholyothin Road, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900
Thailand
Email: mai_panuwat@hotmail.com

Ms. Phamumard Ladpala
Senior Forestry Official
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
61 Phaholyothin Road, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900
Thailand
Email: pladpala@hotmail.com, pladpala@gmail.com

Thailand

Mr. Anawat Sukhotanang
Senior Forestry Official
Royal Forest Department
61 Phaholyothin Road, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900
Thailand
Tel: +66 2 5614292 / 3
Email: anawat2001@hotmail.com

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Mr. Martin Brasher
Deputy Director
Biodiversity Programme
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay, Bristol, BSI 6 EB
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Tel: 0117 3723585
Fax: 0117 3728688
Email: martin.brasher@defra.gsi.gov.uk
Website: www.defra.gsi.gov.uk

Mr. Andrew Randall
Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London SW1P 3JR
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Email: andrew.randall@defra.gsi.gov.uk
Website: www.defra.gsi.gov.uk

Vanuatu

Mr. Ioan Viji
Department of Forest
Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
PMB 063
Port Vila
Vanuatu
Tel: +678 23171
Fax: +678 25051
Email: ioan.viji03@yahoo.com

CBD PARTIES

Viet Nam

Mr. Nguyen Manh Hiep
Officer in charge of nature conservation
Department of Nature Conservation
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Hanoi
Viet Nam
Email: hiep.nguyen@gmail.com

Ms. Nghiem Thi Phuong Le
Official
Biodiversity Conservation Agency
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
99 Le Duan Street
Hoan Kiem Dis.
Hanoi, Viet Nam
Tel: +84 4 39412033
Email: nghphuongle@gmail.com
Website: www.nea.gov.vn

Mr. Pham Hoang Viet
Official
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
99 Le Duan Street
Hoan Kiem Dis.
Hanoi, Viet Nam
Tel: +84 4 39412029
Fax: +84 4 39412028
Email: phamhoangviet@gmail.com
Website: www.nea.gov.vn

UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Mr. Oudara Souvannavong
Senior Forestry Officer
Biodiversity and Conservation
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
Rome 00153
Italy
Email: Oudara.Souvannavong@fao.org
Website: www.fao.org

Global Environment Facility (GEF)

Mr. Ian Gray
Global Environment Facility
1818 H Street, NW
Washington DC 20433
United States of America
Email: igray@TheGEF.org
Website: www.thegef.org

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Mr. Ravi Prabhu
United Nations Environment Programme
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: +254 20 7625723
Email: ravi.prabhu@unep.org
Website: www.unep.org

United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF)

Mr. Mikko Kurppa
United Nations Forum on Forests
UNFF Secretariat, Department of Economic and Social Affairs
One United Nations Plaza, DC1 – 1245
New York NY 10017
United States of America
Email: kurppa@un.org
Website: www.un.org/esa/forests/

The World Bank

Ms. Neeta Hooda
Senior Carbon Finance Specialist
Carbon Finance Unit
The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington DC 20433
United States of America
Email: nhooda@worldbank.org
Website: www.worldbank.org

United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP – WCMC)

Mr. Barney Dickson
Head of Climate Change and Biodiversity Programme
United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 ODL
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Tel: +44 1223 814636
Fax: +44 1223 277136
Email: barney.dickson@unep-wcmc.org
Website: www.unep-wcmc.org

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB)

Mr. Norman Emmanuel C. Ramirez
Programme Management Officer
Programme Development and Implementation
ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity
3/F, ERDB Bldg., UPLB Forestry Campus
University of the Philippines, Los Baños, College
Laguna 4031
Philippines
Tel: +63 49 5363989 / 1739
Fax: +63 49 5362865
Email: necramirez@aseanbiodiversity.org
Website: www.aseanbiodiversity.org

Ms. Monina T. Uriarte
Capacity Development Specialist
Programme Development and Implementation
ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity
3/F, ERDB Bldg., UPLB Forestry Campus
University of the Philippines, Los Baños, College
Laguna 4031
Philippines
Tel: +63 49 5363989 / 1739
Fax: +63 49 5362865
Email: mturiarte2@aseanbiodiversity.org
Website: www.aseanbiodiversity.org

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

Mr. Terry Sunderland
Senior Scientist
Center for International Forestry Research
Jalan CIFOR
Situ Gede, Sindang Barang
Bogor Barat 16115
Indonesia
Tel: +62 251 8622622
Fax: +62 251 8622100
Email: t.sunderland@cgiar.org
Website: www.cifor.cgiar.org

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Birdlife International

Ms. Belinda de la Paz
Manager, Constituency Development Department and Head, Advocacy Division
Haribon Foundation/ Birdlife Philippines
2/F, Santos and Sons Building, 973 Aurora Blvd, Cubao, Quezon City
Philippines
Email: advocacy@haribon.org.ph
Website: www.haribon.org.ph

Natural Justice (Lawyers for Communities and the Environment)

Mr. Harry Jonas
Co-Director
Natural Justice (Lawyers for Communities and the Environment)
Mercantile Building
63 Hout Street
Cape Town 8000
South Africa
Tel: +27 21 4261633
Fax: +27 21 4261633
Email: harry@naturaljustice.org.za

Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)

Mr. Alistair Monument
FSC Regional Director Asia
Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)
Room 1001, 10/F Blk A,
Seaview Estate,
2 Watson Road, North Point
Hong Kong
Tel: +852 35576029
Fax: +852 2566 6886
Mobile: +852 96877073
Email: a.monument@fsc.org, s.salvador@fsc.org
Website: www.fscchina.org

Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)

Ms. Madhu Rao
Regional Technical Advisor
WCS Singapore
Wildlife Conservation Society
2300 Southern Bl
Bronx, NY 10460
United States of America
Email: mrao@wcs.org
Website: www.wcs.org

RECOFTC – The Center for People and Forests

Ms. Regan Suzuki
RECOFTC – The Center for People and Forests
P.O. Box 1111,
Kasetsart Post Office,
Bangkok
Thailand
Email: regan@recoftc.org
Website: www.recoftc.org

Mr. Chandra Silori
RECOFTC – The Center for People and Forests
P.O. Box 1111
Kasetsart Post Office,
Bangkok
Thailand
Email: chandra.silori@recoftc.org
Website: www.recoftc.org

SNV – Netherland Development Organisation

Mr. Steven Swan
Senior REDD+ Advisor
SNV – Netherland Development Organisation
6th Floor, Building B, La Thanh Hotel
28 Doi Can
Hanoi
Viet Nam
Tel: +84 915662454
Fax: +84 438463794
Email: sswan@snvworld.org

INDIGENOUS AND LOCAL COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

Ole Siosiomaga society (OLSSI)

Mr. Fiu Mataese Elisara
Executive Director
Ole Siosiomaga Society (OLSSI)
P.O. Box 2282
Apia
Samoa
Tel: +685 7791999
Email: ngo_siosiomaga@samoa.ws, fiuelisara51@yahoo.com

Tebtebba Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research & Education (Tebtebba)

Ms. Grace Tauli Balawag
Deputy Project Coordinator of the Forest and Climate Change Programme
Tebtebba Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research & Education
No 1 Roman Ayson Road
Baguio City 2600
Philippines
Tel: +63 74 4447703
Fax: +63 74 4439459
Email: grace@tebtebba.org, gracebalawag@yahoo.com
Web: www.tebtebba.org

Partners with Melanesians

Mr. Kenn Mondiai
Executive Director
Partners with Melanesians
9 Croton Street, Sec 36, Lot 3, Hohola
PO Box 1910
Port Moresby
Papua New Guinea
Tel: +675 3236344
Email: kmondiai@pwmpng.org.pg

EDUCATION/UNIVERSITY

National University of Singapore

Mr. Jacob Phelps
Dept. Biological Sciences
National University of Singapore
145 Science Drive 4
Singapore 117543
Singapore
Mobile: +65 91220078
Email: Jacob.phelps@gmail.com

SCBD

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

Mr. Tim Christophersen
Programme Officer
Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413,Saint-Jacques Street W.
Suite 800
Montreal Quebec
Canada
Tel: +1 514 2877036
Fax: +1 514 2886588
Email: tim.christophersen@cbd.int
Web: www.cbd.int

Mr. Johannes Stahl
Junior Professional Officer
Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters
413, Saint-Jacques Street W.
Suite 800
Montreal Quebec
Canada
Tel: +1 514 2876683
Fax: +1 514 2886588
Email: johannes.stahl@cbd.int
Web: www.cbd.int
