



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WS/CB/REDD/LAC/1/2
18 August 2011

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LATIN AMERICA - CARIBBEAN REGIONAL
CONSULTATION AND CAPACITY-BUILDING
WORKSHOP ON REDUCING EMISSIONS FROM
DEFORESTATION AND FOREST DEGRADATION
IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (REDD-PLUS),
INCLUDING ON RELEVANT BIODIVERSITY
SAFEGUARDS

Quito, Ecuador 5–8 July 2011

OUTCOMES OF THE LATIN AMERICA - CARIBBEAN REGIONAL CONSULTATION AND CAPACITY-BUILDING WORKSHOP ON REDUCING EMISSIONS FROM DEFORESTATION AND FOREST DEGRADATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (REDD-PLUS), INCLUDING ON RELEVANT BIODIVERSITY SAFEGUARDS

I. CO-CHAIRS SUMMARY

A. Introduction

1. This workshop is the third 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.

2. The workshop results are intended to support primarily the CBD and UNFCCC discussions on relevant biodiversity and social safeguards for REDD-plus, as well as discussions under the CBD on monitoring of the forest-related Aichi Biodiversity Targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

3. The Aichi Biodiversity 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

¹With 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, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (paragraph 70).

²Decision 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 (...).*

/...

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, to (ii) 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, and (iii) to identify ways and means to improve coordination between biodiversity and REDD-plus related commitments and achieve synergies.

5. Presentations from Parties, indigenous and local communities, and relevant organizations provided an excellent basis for discussions. 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); the regional consultation and capacity building workshop for Asia-Pacific, Singapore, 15-18 March 2011; as well as discussions in Nagoya and Cancun in 2010.

Participants adopted the following co-chairs summary:

B. Safeguards

6. A well-designed, well-implemented REDD-plus mechanism would generate unprecedented benefits for biodiversity. Several potential risks to biodiversity have been identified at the Global Expert Workshop on REDD-plus and Biodiversity, held in Nairobi in September 2010. The greatest risks for biodiversity at this stage are if REDD-plus is not well-designed, and if a REDD-plus mechanism is not sufficiently funded.

7. Biodiversity safeguards, and safeguards for indigenous peoples and local communities, will be essential for the long-term success of REDD-plus. However, the group recognized that an evolving approach to REDD-plus social and biodiversity benefits and safeguards is necessary in order to respect the variety of national situations and states of readiness.

8. While recognizing that REDD-plus cannot solve all relevant governance and environmental challenges, all safeguards and actions, including for the equitable sharing of benefits, need to be based on clear policies and understanding of sustainable land use, natural resource use, and land tenure rights. Impacts on indigenous peoples and local communities, and benefit-sharing are closely linked to solving land tenure and rights issues, including the rights to the forest carbon.

9. Many national level policies, laws, regulations and experiences are relevant to REDD-plus biodiversity safeguards, although not developed specifically for that purpose (for example, forest and protected area legislation, and mechanisms for payments for ecosystem services). Such policies and experiences should be taken into account in REDD-plus efforts.

10. Three existing frameworks for biodiversity and indigenous and local community safeguards were reviewed in detail: The *UN-REDD Programme Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria*; the relevant *World Bank Safeguard Policies*;³ and the *REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards*.⁴ These three frameworks were found to be a good basis for covering all main biodiversity risks in principle, and for addressing the 'Cancun safeguards' (UNFCCC decision 1/CP.16). However, not all safeguards are covered equally or sufficiently in all frameworks (a detailed analysis is provided in annex I). Key overall gaps include:

- (i) There are no specific safeguards that address the risk of inappropriate afforestation in areas of high biodiversity value. The guidance on afforestation, reforestation and forest restoration

³Notably, 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).

⁴ The standards were developed by the CCBA and Care International

provided by the CBD in decision X/33 paragraph 8(p)⁵ could fill this gap, to cover the possibility that such activities are considered as part of 'enhancement of forest carbon stocks' under REDD-plus;

- (ii) The potential loss of traditional knowledge and of the cultural and spiritual identity of indigenous peoples and local communities is not sufficiently covered. This includes the concern that REDD-related payments could alter and undermine the traditional way of life and related knowledge and customary practices of indigenous peoples and local communities.

11. It would be useful to further harmonize existing frameworks, to simplify application at country level and allow for compatibility at global level. The standards, guidance, and other related tools developed at the international level should be harmonized to help countries to address safeguards.

12. Lack of tangible livelihood benefits to indigenous peoples and local communities and lack of equitable benefit-sharing between relevant stakeholders is a possible threat to the success of REDD-plus, and addressing this should be a priority.

13. REDD-plus efforts should build on community-based governance systems, where appropriate, and acknowledge the shared responsibility of national governments in strengthening community-based institutions of indigenous and local communities with regards to the sustainable management, use, and control of biodiversity and natural resources.

14. The 'Cancun safeguards' (UNFCCC decision 1/CP.16) should be understood to mean that under paragraph 2 (a) in Appendix I, special attention should be placed on consistency with the other Rio conventions: the CBD and the United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification (UNCCD), and on consistency with national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

15. Sufficient financial incentives and technical capacity to ensure the application of relevant safeguards, and to achieve biodiversity benefits, are missing in most countries. Adequate technical and financial support should be delivered to REDD-plus countries to ensure the compliance of safeguards and the sustainability of these processes.

C. Indicators at national level

16. The primary indicators for measuring REDD-plus biodiversity impacts, both positive and negative, at national level should focus in particular on (i) fragmentation and connectivity of forests; (ii) status and trends of protected areas; and (iii) area of degraded habitat or ecosystem restored, (iv) distribution of invasive alien species, as well as (v) area of forests under sustainable management. However, it will be a challenge to monitor whether a change in biodiversity is directly related to REDD-plus or not.

17. Displacement of pressure on other ecosystems and biodiversity remains a key concern and it is yet unclear how this can be prevented and monitored, in particular at international level.

⁵ X/33 para 8(p) 'Invites Parties and other Governments, according to national circumstances and priorities, as well as relevant organizations and processes, to consider the guidance below on ways to conserve, sustainably use and restore biodiversity and ecosystem services while contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation: (p) When designing, implementing and monitoring afforestation, reforestation and forest restoration activities for climate change mitigation consider conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services through, for example:

- (i) Converting only land of low biodiversity value or ecosystems largely composed of non-native species, and preferably degraded ones;
- (ii) Prioritizing, whenever feasible, local and acclimated native tree species when selecting species for planting;
- (iii) Avoiding invasive alien species;
- (iv) Preventing net reduction of carbon stocks in all organic carbon pools;
- (v) Strategically locating afforestation activities within the landscape to enhance connectivity and increase the provision of ecosystem services within forest areas.

18. Assessment of biodiversity impacts and related indicators should be simple, feasible, and cost-effective. To this end, it is important that synergies with other indicator processes should be sought. Appropriate existing tools, processes and information are, for example, the FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment, and monitoring by the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO); the Global Forest Observation Initiative; the National Ecological Gap Analysis for the CBD programme of work on protected areas; national reports of Parties to CBD and national communications to UNFCCC; and maps and information on Key Biodiversity Areas, Invasive Alien Species, and other biodiversity indicators, for example, those identified by the Global Biodiversity Indicators Partnership. Available and relevant tools should be harmonized to facilitate their implementation by REDD-plus countries.

19. There is a need for monitoring the impacts of REDD-plus on indigenous peoples and local communities, in accordance with the main risks identified by the Nairobi Global Expert Workshop. Indicators could include: (i) indicators on full and effective participation; (ii) status and trends of boundaries of indigenous territories, land tenure, and access rights; (iii) involuntary resettlements; (iv) changes in livelihoods and traditional knowledge related to REDD-plus, and (v) gender equality and rights and livelihoods of women. However, it should be noted that the social indicators identified here are not necessarily indicators to be used at global level, and that any monitoring of social impacts on a significant scale will be costly and requires adequate resources and capacity.

20. Indigenous peoples and local communities can also be essential in cost-effective monitoring of impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity. This could include links to indicators about traditional knowledge, for example the quality and quantity of natural resources and biodiversity that is used for traditional purposes such as cultural ceremonies.

21. Indicators to measure the level of participation from indigenous peoples and local communities, including gender considerations, and the status of biodiversity in their territories, are important.

22. There is generally a need to build further capacity and expertise to monitor biodiversity impacts of REDD-plus.

D. Synergies between Conventions

23. It is encouraging to observe that REDD-plus has already proved to be a catalyst for increased coordination and synergies between UNFCCC and CBD, and this workshop is a clear example. However, collaboration at all levels needs to be further improved, in particular when discussing the development of financing mechanisms with relevance for biodiversity, land management and climate change; and regarding monitoring and reporting.

24. The new Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and REDD-plus efforts can be mutually supportive, while respecting the respective Convention mandates. Every effort should be made to support the success of REDD-plus and its multiple benefits, as this will directly contribute towards the forest-related targets of the Strategic Plan.

25. Whether or not existing safeguards cover all risks will depend on the details of the scope of REDD-plus and on terms and definitions. In that context, terms and definitions (such as 'natural forests' and other key concepts relating to mitigation and adaptation to climate change) should be harmonized as much as possible between the members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), while respecting the respective Convention mandates.

26. Coordination between national focal points remains a challenge in many countries and requires adequate resources.

27. The Rio conventions should enhance coordination and communication through the Secretariats. This should result in consistent messages to the Parties, including on relevant REDD-plus safeguards.

E. General observations

28. For the development and application of relevant biodiversity safeguards and for the assessment of REDD-plus impacts on biodiversity, developing countries require a reliable supply of financial resources,

as outlined in decision X/3 of Convention on Biological Diversity on resource mobilization and relevant earlier decisions on this subject.

29. 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 and other fora on this subject.

II. REPORT OF THE MEETING

1. The Latin America - Caribbean regional consultation and capacity-building workshop on REDD-plus and relevant biodiversity safeguards was held in Quito, Ecuador, from 5 to 8 July 2011. It was co-organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Ecuador, with the generous financial support of the Government of Japan, the Government of Germany through the German Development Cooperation (GIZ), the UN-REDD Programme,⁶ and the Government of Ecuador as host country. 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.

2. Pursuant to paragraph 3 (b), of decision IX/5, the workshop aimed to support Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in the Latin America - Caribbean 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 a regional workshop for Africa.

3. 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));

(c) To contribute to capacity-building on REDD-plus in the Latin America - Caribbean 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));

(d) To further enhance synergies between the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) through the design and implementation of the REDD-plus mechanism.

4. A list of participants in the workshop is attached as annex II.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

5. The workshop was opened at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, 5 July 2011 by HE Ms. Marcela Aguiñaga, Minister of the Environment of Ecuador. Ms. Aguiñaga welcomed everyone to Ecuador and stated that it was a pleasure to host this workshop, which contributed to discussions and analysis of important issues regarding the readiness for REDD-plus. She highlighted that the global environmental crisis was a constant challenge, caused by years of an unsustainable management of ecosystems, and this workshop would allow to define activities in order to contribute to essential matters such as the conservation of biodiversity as well as the battle against the challenges that climate change presented.

6. 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 Djoghla, the Executive Secretary of the CBD. Mr. Djoghla conveyed his appreciation to the Governments of Ecuador, Japan and Germany for their support. He also thanked the UN-REDD Programme for their collaboration and funding support. He highlighted relevant targets under the Strategic Plan of the Convention 2011-2020 which was adopted by the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP10), namely Target 5

⁶ United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries

(to halve, and where feasible bring close to zero, the rate deforestation, and to significantly reduce degradation and fragmentation), Target 7 (to manage all areas under forestry sustainably), Target 11 (to conserve at least 17 per cent of all terrestrial ecosystems), and Target 15 (to restore 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.

7. Mr. Jorge Meza, of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) welcomed the participants to the workshop on behalf of the UN-REDD Programme. Mr. Meza outlined the activities of the UN-REDD Programme in Latin America and the Caribbean region. He acknowledged the generous financial support of the Governments of Norway, Denmark, Spain, Japan and the European Union in support of these activities. He stressed that benefits from REDD-plus had to reach the indigenous and local communities who managed the forest resources to make sure that there were proper incentives for protecting the forest. These communities also needed to be included in the design and implementation of REDD-plus and highlighting the importance of REDD-plus considering the full range of multiple services provided by forests that supported human well-being, not only carbon storage.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

2.1. Election of officers

8. After participants introduced themselves, they elected Ms. Carola Borja of Ecuador and Mr. Martin Brasher of United Kingdom as co-chairs of the workshop.

2.2. Adoption of the agenda

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

2.3. Organization of work

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

ITEM 3. REDD-PLUS UPDATE

Presentations by International Organizations

11. 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 focused 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 the decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties related to REDD-plus. In decision IX/5, Parties, other Governments and relevant international and other organizations were invited to ensure that possible actions for REDD did not run counter to the objectives of the CBD and the 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 paragraphs 9 (g) and (h) of decision X/33. He highlighted the relevant Aichi Biodiversity Targets of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, which included: 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). Mr. Christophersen also drew attention to some of the relevant publications produced by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, like the REDD plus newsletter and a CBD Technical Series publication (Number 59, <http://www.cbd.int/ts>) on "REDD-plus and Biodiversity".

12. Ms. Monika Bertzky and Mr. Diego Martino held a presentation together on behalf of the UN-REDD Programme. Ms. Bertzky first gave some background on the UN-REDD Programme and then introduced the second draft for consultation of the UN-REDD Programme's Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria as the response of the UN-REDD Programme to both the risks and opportunities of REDD-plus. These principles and criteria had two main purposes: (i) to provide UN-REDD with a framework to ensure its activities deliver social and environmental benefits and reduce risks and (ii) to support countries in operationalizing UNFCCC agreements on safeguards. The set of principles included one principle on democratic governance, two principles on social issues, one on policy coherence, and three on environmental issues. Principle 1 included criteria to ensure that REDD-plus actions comply with standards of democratic governance. Principle 2 focused on stakeholder rights, including gender equality, free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities, cultural heritage and traditional knowledge. Principle 3 addressed sustainable livelihoods. Principle 4 focused on policy coherence with the aim to ensure that REDD-plus activities contribute to low-carbon, climate-resilient and environmentally sound development policies, consistent with commitments under international conventions and agreements. Principle 5 included criteria to ensure the protection and conservation of natural forests. Principle 6 aimed to ensure that REDD-plus maintained and enhanced multiple functions of forests to deliver benefits including biodiversity and ecosystem services. Finally, principle 7 focused on minimizing indirect adverse impacts on ecosystem services and biodiversity, for example, minimizing inter-ecosystem leakage. Ms. Bertzky informed the participants that this second draft of the principles and criteria would now be reviewed, tested and revised before a finalized version be presented to the UN-REDD Policy Board in October 2011. Diego Martino continued to present an approach of the UN-REDD Programme to supporting countries in the preparation for REDD-plus. This approach combined an analysis of land-use changes and opportunity cost leading to scenarios for deforestation/degradation and other land-use change (including opportunity cost). Following an assessment of social and environmental co-benefits, priority areas for REDD+ could be identified. Subsequently, complementary policies to ensure that REDD+ be successful in all priority areas, including those where REDD+ alone was unlikely to promote change, and could then be developed. Mr. Martino highlighted that some elements of this approach were already part of National Joint Programmes, as in the case of Ecuador and Paraguay.

13. Mr. John Leigh from the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) gave a brief presentation of the work of ITTO and the several policy guidelines it had developed over the years as regards sustainable management and conservation of tropical forests. He further mentioned that ITTO's Criteria and Indicators for the Sustainable Management of Tropical Forests would be of particular interest to the CBD, as these could serve as a basis for the further development of REDD safeguards. He also highlighted that at present, ITTO already had three ongoing field projects in Latin America related to REDD readiness: in Guatemala, Guyana and Peru. When asked to explain more about the work on REDD with indigenous peoples in Peru, Mr. Leigh explained that ITTO had partnered with the Peruvian NGO AIDER and the Indigenous Community Ese'Eja of Infierno in implementing the needed activities to formulate a REDD PDA proposal with a view toward enhancing the livelihoods of the aforementioned community in the near future based on the potential economic benefits to be accrued via REDD-plus.

Presentations by Country Representatives

14. Participants were invited to present an overview of their national experience with REDD-plus (i) with a view to safeguards for biodiversity and indigenous and local communities, (ii) with regards to assessment and monitoring of impacts of REDD-plus, and (iii) regarding possible synergies related to REDD-plus between the CBD and the UNFCCC.

15. Ms. Natalie Unterstell from Brazil presented the Brazilian experience with REDD-plus and implementing the various REDD-plus phases simultaneously. Brazil had NAMAs related to reduction of deforestation in Cerrado and in the Amazon and was getting support from the Amazon Fund, a results-based mechanism to help reduce deforestation further on. Brazil was also developing action plans on preventing deforestation to all biomes in order to meet the target to reduce deforestation by 80% relative to 2005 by 2020, as stated by President Lula at COP-15. From 2005 to 2020, Brazil would have avoided

deforestation equivalent to 4, 9 Gt CO₂, 2/3 of the total proposed EU-15 cuts for the same period. Ms. Unterstell further explained that Brazil had implemented a number of measures since the forest code was enacted in 1965 and that a legal framework existed to ensure respect for the rights of different indigenous and local forest dependent peoples. Up to one third of the Brazilian territory was protected through the conservation units and the indigenous lands and there were many rights issues related to this. Ms. Unterstell stressed the importance of recognizing the different roles played by and different means necessary toward public and private lands. She continued to explain that it was important to consider what the implementation of safeguards meant for public and private land, especially in terms of information required to report on performance. In the last five years, emissions had been reduced significantly, due to strengthening governance and work with markets to increase the economic performance. Ms. Unterstell presented the different steps used in Brazil for REDD-plus preparations with emphasis on stakeholder involvement. To build the roadmap to institutionalize the REDD-plus regime in Brazil, working groups were established including government, civil society and business sector. The civil society had developed a set of social and environmental principles and criteria that the Ministry of Environment now considered a basis for a regulatory framework on REDD-plus in Brazil. Ms. Unterstell presented this as an initiative that could be followed by any REDD-plus initiative. She also added that she believed that many national and state-level policies, laws and regulations, which were applicable to REDD-plus biodiversity safeguards already existed, although they were not developed specifically for that purpose. When asked to present her view on the forest code and how the suggested changes to this would impact REDD-plus, Ms. Unterstell informed participants that this was now going through an evaluation process and there might be ways to amend the clauses that could potentially affect negatively on REDD-plus.

16. Mr. Daniel Alvarez of Chile said on the national REDD-plus planning was at an early stage and that Chile at the moment was discussing an agreement with the World Bank to prepare a REDD-plus national strategy. Inclusion of biodiversity safeguards was part of the National Biodiversity and Climate Change Plan and of the National Biodiversity Policy. Capacity for including biodiversity safeguards was necessary in public and academic institutions. Chile had an ecological gap analysis, however the level and integrity of biodiversity information represented the major challenge for incorporating biodiversity safeguards. There was a need for enhanced capacity for biodiversity monitoring and Chile was currently at the stage of planning for tools to assess the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity and local communities. An important lesson learned so far was that the earlier biodiversity could be integrated the better it was for the overall process. Mr. Alvarez also said that Chile had several years of experience with work on the voluntary carbon market and he stressed the importance of awareness raising for political support and legitimacy of biodiversity information to further work on REDD-plus and look at carbon storage. At the end of the presentation he also expressed the importance of identifying synergies and said that Chile was developing a National Action Plan on Biodiversity and Climate Change which would seek to identify synergies between the CBD and UNFCCC.

17. Mr. Felipe Gomez Villota of Colombia introduced the Colombian REDD-plus strategy and explained that it was a part of the national Low Carbon Development Strategy and their plan for ecosystem based adaption. The work on REDD-plus in Colombia was influenced by both the regional consultative groups, the technical and scientifically advisory group and thematic consultative groups. He emphasized that the most important topics identified for REDD-plus had been: respect for cosmovision and the concept of territoriality, respect for autonomy and auto-determination, respect for traditional practises, adequate and early access to information, strengthen local involvement and reduce influence of intermediaries and maximize benefits for biodiversity and local communities. He said that there were large expectations for REDD-plus, but that still many local communities were largely uninformed. For this reason Colombia had focused on including a broad range of stakeholders. Colombia had held 20 different workshops, with, at that point in time, more than 700 participants from 280 organizations distributed over 20 events that took place in the five regions of the country. Key topics for early discussion were the basics of climate change, the role of forest and REDD-plus. This kind of consultation was mandatory in Colombia according to the constitution, but it was a costly process due to diversity and geographical complexity. Mr. Gomez also presented a number of drivers influencing deforestation in Colombia on different scales and stated that

REDD-plus was seen as one of several tools to tackle those. REDD-plus in Columbia is unlikely to bring new actions to conserve forest, but would rather contribute to better coordination of previous actions. He also stated that the uncertainties in REDD-plus negotiations made R-PP preparation and implementation more difficult. The present strategy to stop deforestation consisted of five main points; fill information gaps, policy and incentives harmonization, strengthen enforcement, generate alternative and sustainable production packages and give priority to traditional practices.

18. Ms. Sonia Lobo Valverde from Costa Rica presented the REDD-plus governance structure of Costa Rica, including the national commission of biodiversity, the bureau responsible for UNFCCC and the scientific entity for climate change. She presented the multiple levels of actors that needed to be involved in the planning of REDD-plus. Costa Rica had developed a national forest plan that included a REDD-plus strategy. The plan aimed at preparing the country to reach the REDD-plus readiness status and thus reducing deforestation. It had been approved by the World Bank and the timeline for generation of readiness plan was 2012 to 2013. An inter-institutional commission had been established to develop and implement the process and the expected products were reference scenarios, a national strategy, framework for environmental and social management and a monitoring system (MRV). At the moment it was the marked opportunities related to REDD-plus that created the basis for the main political support. Regarding the national experience with biodiversity safeguards, Costa Rica had a legal framework for use, management and conservation of biodiversity. The efforts could be incorporated to implement REDD-plus and implementation would take place within the national protected area system. The national development plan 2011- 2014 incorporated REDD-plus and in addition there was the national strategy on climate change, the strategy for conservation, management and use of biodiversity, the national forest development plan, and other policy instruments into which REDD-plus would be embedded. Ms. Lobo also mentioned the following obstacles identified for inclusion of safeguards: Land ownership conflicts, opportunity costs of land, overlap between protected areas and indigenous territories and conflicts between land-use planning objectives. Ecological gaps have been identified and were incorporated in a Payments for Environmental Services scheme. Further activities include: assessment of impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity, identification of impacts of climate change on biodiversity and ecosystem services, national consultation workshops, and others. Ms. Lobo also said that Costa Rica had a climate change strategy that included promoting synergies as a mandatory step. She emphasized that this work should not only focus on synergies between UNFCCC and CBD, but also other conventions like UNFCCC, CITES and obligations related to cultural heritage as well.

19. Ms. Alicia Mercadet Portillo from Cuba reported that there was no national REDD-plus structure in Cuba yet or any experiences with a voluntary carbon market. However, Cuba was interested in REDD-plus as there were many threats to forests. Deforestation had been documented using satellite images. The National Forest Law and the Environmental Law were main legal instruments to avoid deforestation in addition to the environmental strategy of MINAG, the national commission on biodiversity. An ecological gap analysis had not been completed yet, but there was a lot of knowledge about biodiversity in Cuba. Ms. Mercadet stressed the importance of integrating local communities in REDD-plus efforts. One of the main obstacles for the biodiversity safeguards was the lack of a law about the access and distribution of the genetic resources. This was included in the Plan of National Action for the period 2011-2015. Developing such a law was something that Cuba was working on. Ms. Mercadet presented other challenges such as fighting invasive species and handling natural disasters like hurricanes. Seven studies were done on the linkages between biodiversity and climate change. One of the challenges found in these studies was that some communities were not using local species for reforestation. Cuba was at present working on indicators and guidelines for sustainable forestry and had developed 11 indicators on the contribution of forest ecosystems to the environmental services, among them one that referred to the mitigation of climate change. In closing, Ms. Mercadet highlighted that Cuba aimed to achieve synergies among CBD and UNFCCC through its National Programme of Forest Development.

20. Ms. Daniela Carrión from the Ministry of Environment of Ecuador presented Ecuador's readiness phase, with a special emphasis on the activities carried out by the Ministry to comply with safeguards and ensure multiple benefits from REDD-plus implementation. The presentation stated that a lot of efforts

were now being held in order to reduce deforestation and contribute to climate change mitigation by implementing a REDD-plus mechanism. Although the competence for REDD-plus was under the Undersecretary of Climate Change, through the National Directorate of mitigation of CC, permanent coordination with the Undersecretary of Natural Heritage, in charge of forests management and biodiversity conservation was held. Ecuador aimed at implementing a “high quality” REDD-plus mechanism that ensured GHG emissions reductions, social and environmental benefits. The country was developing a National REDD-plus Programme. This programme had a cross-cutting element for multisakeholder engagement and another to ensure multiple benefits. Several initiatives were being implemented in Ecuador as part of these elements. Regarding stakeholder engagement, a multistakeholder programme was being built within the Ministry. The programme had four elements: information, consultancy, engagement and capacity-building. The Ministry was already implementing the first element. Regarding multiple benefits, in 2010, a workplan, together with UNEP WCMC, was developed to identify potential social and environmental benefits from REDD-plus implementation. The work resulted in a report that contributed to national REDD-plus planning by delivering spatial and statistical information that analyzed carbon contents in Ecuador overlapped with social and environmental variables, such as key biodiversity areas. Also, since 2009, Ecuador was one of the pilot countries of the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards initiative. Since June 2010, the Ministry, with two local partners, was implementing the second phase of the initiative, which consisted in the national interpretation of the Standard a pilot implementation. She further informed the audience that Ecuador got its Joint National Document (JND) approved at the 6th UN-REDD Policy Board in March 2011. She also outlined the main obstacles and capacity-building needs identified for the time to come. Ecuador needed more updated info in biodiversity and environmental services and technical assistance as well as financial resources to implement a national system for monitoring efforts to conserve biodiversity. The main challenges presented were the need to scale down the main international instruments so they fit the local level, to understand the link between biodiversity and climate change at different levels and the need to constantly update information related to biodiversity and ecosystem services.

21. Mr. Jorge Ernesto Quezada Diaz from El Salvador outlined the unique situation for El Salvador as one of the smallest countries in the world, close to the Pacific Ocean and already noticing the consequences of climate change. El Salvador was particularly vulnerable to climate change since 95 per cent of the population lived in risk areas, for e.g. landslides. El Salvador had 27 per cent of forest cover and a high level of deforestation. Mangrove areas were also seriously affected. El Salvador had two main initiatives for voluntary carbon markets, 1) Preparing R-PP with the World Bank and 2) a regional programme REDD CCAD-GIZ to develop national strategy, on establishing baselines and monitoring systems for the safeguards that were in place. A focus at the moment was intersectoral dialogue, design of mechanisms for compensation as well as monitoring and reporting. Safeguards were part of regional programme CCAD-GIZ, e.g. no conversion of areas with high biodiversity and use of native species. Mr. Quezada also said that the REDD programme was related to many other projects that were ongoing, like the national restoration programme on how to conserve local environmental services, including establishment of ecological corridors that were also very relevant for climate change adaption. Mr. Quezada went on to talk about the shade coffee plantations that covered approximately 10 per cent of the country and was also an important system that contributed to the resilience of the country, but had been threatened by a decrease in coffee prices.

22. Mr. Spencer Thomas from Grenada noted that Grenada has very limited experience with REDD-plus planning and preparation. Reforestation and afforestation become a national priority after the hurricane Ivan which damaged 90 per cent of the forest, but this effort was not done in a REDD-plus framework. Mr. Thomas said that Grenada had 20 per cent forest cover from which most was protected and the forest was very much integrated in the total landscape. There were no indigenous people in Grenada, but local communities were very much involved. Mr. Spencer said that Grenada had not done anything on voluntary carbon market. Most of the reports/strategies/action for the three Rio conventions plans were prepared before REDD-plus came into the international agenda, so there had not been specific focus on REDD-plus safeguards. Grenada public education and awareness were key points from now as well as resources. Grenada had a national forest policy, but it did not have any reference to carbon since it

was finished before REDD-plus became a topic. Grenada had done a gap analysis. Mr. Spencer pointed out that there was a resistance to commodifying biodiversity some believe one was doing in the climate negotiations through putting a price tag on nature. Regarding synergies between the conventions, he highlighted the importance of also including UNFCCC and CITES. Grenada was very interested in a common reporting framework between the conventions. There were many issues related to synergies, like biofuels. He also mentioned that Grenada was hoping that IPBES would start soon and that it would be useful for promoting synergies. He said that many actors still did work in silos both on the global and national level and this was an important point of improvement for the future.

23. Mr. Alberto Lainez from Honduras found it important not only to focus on deforestation, but also on forest degradation. There were many stakeholders that were involved in Honduras, both local communities, business etc some of which tried to exploit REDD-plus. More than 20 cases of people selling oxygen had been documented in the country. Honduras has a national forestry research programme and a project for forest monitoring including a forest inventory. This effort was building on more than 30 years of info gathered. Honduras had been approved R-PIN for REDD-plus, the World Bank mission to the country took place in February 2011 and as of 20 June, it had been accepted as UN-REDD country. Honduras first tried to unify criteria, define the main actors of the programme and the criteria to choose areas for the REDD-plus programme, since there were more than 600 potential areas in Honduras. The country started working on REDD-plus readiness proposals since June 2011. Several projects had since been developed to prepare for REDD-plus: P.ECOSISTEMAS, CATIE-FINFOR and others. A Forest Monitoring Unit was established in April 2011. A project on monitoring and evaluation of forest, forest inventory MOSEF was going to include quantification parameters for CO₂. A challenge for the time to come was establishing land rights. Mr. Lainez emphasized that Honduras had to use multiple communication channels to communicate the information on REDD-plus, e.g. newspapers.

24. Mr. José Maria Michel from Mexico presented what he called early actions in his country. He worked in the national forestry commission under the Ministry of environment that worked with carbon capture and storage among other issues. Mexico had an intersectoral commission on climate change responsible for preparing the national REDD-plus strategy together with a technical advisory committee on REDD-plus. This commission included several ministries, including the ministry of agriculture. Mexico's vision for REDD-plus, towards a national strategy – report had been published and included three steps: strategy design (FCPF-R-PPP, multi- and bi-lateral, USAID), implementation and early actions and activities based on results. Mr. Michel pointed out that Mexico had not reached the third step yet. Many of the detailed topics about REDD-plus are still under discussion, for example, it is necessary to further define critical aspects of the mechanism, such as modalities for setting baselines, monitoring systems, reporting and verification as well as the report of compliance with safeguards. Mexico had 68 million hectares of forest and 70 per cent was owned by indigenous and local communities. 55 Per cent of the population in Mexico lived in poverty so Mr. Michel stressed the importance of reaching the objectives of REDD-plus through different national policy tools that created development opportunities for local communities. Mexico was now running a pilot project in Jalisco in which all different programmes would be integrated. For this to happen, an administrative council had been established, combining the federal and national government, the municipal government, universities, and civil society. The model of collaboration between the municipal and higher government was first established in Jalisco, but would now be hopefully transferred to other places. Mr. Michele emphasized his belief that REDD-plus should not only focus on forest, but forest as a part of a larger landscape that produced valuable ecosystem services like clean water and agriculture.

25. Mr. Edilberto Duarte Lopez from Nicaragua said that his main message was that REDD-plus was a very valuable instrument that could become very powerful in his country. Nicaragua had a number of relevant policies for e.g. forestry and climate change that were still valid. They were developed before REDD-plus but could now be linked to REDD-plus efforts. Nicaragua had a proposal for the preparation phase of REDD-plus in the framework of national efforts to fight against deforestation and forest degradation. Mr. Duarte emphasized that REDD-plus needed to address all the different drivers that caused deforestation and the importance of stakeholder participation. REDD-plus had to become a

mechanism that reached out to those that actually controlled the forest resources. Due to this, Nicaragua had a national human development plan.

26. Mr. Jorge Garcia from the biodiversity and wildlife department in Panama presented Panama's REDD-plus strategy from 2008, which contained seven main components: (i) institutional communication, (ii) generation of a REDD-plus baseline, (iii) environmental monitoring (including technologies to observe deforestation within protected areas), (iv) supervision and control, (v) environmental culture, (vi) environmental investments and (vii) administration to coordinate all other components. This strategy was used to apply for funds from the FCPF managed by UNDP. In 2010, the Government of Panama, the World Bank and the United Nations agencies agreed that it would be good to have one joint document with a logical framework outlining how the different activities were coherent and comprehensive to achieve REDD-plus objectives. This allowed to generate a single coordination unit, establish a single working group on REDD-plus, develop a joint consultation process, integrate and administer a proposal on how to access funds from both initiatives. Mr. Garcia also said that they had found out that a range of stakeholders had to be included so they had involved both people working on climate change, biodiversity and agriculture, lawyers, educators and different local and indigenous community groups. Indigenous groups were important in the process of the preparation of REDD-plus documentation, but also in the implementation and coordination. There were a few successful experiences with the voluntary carbon market in Panama. Mr. Garcia said that Panama had contracted a consultancy to look at safeguards, identify social and environmental impacts. Panama supported the process of developing safeguards and the country was now at the stage of negotiating how Panama could inform people about safeguards. Mr. Garcia stressed the importance of securing that the information shared to stakeholders regarding safeguards was neutral and that it was official.

27. Ms. Diana Gauto from Paraguay pointed out that the Ministry of Environment was Paraguay's focal point for CBD and UNFCCC. Ms. Gauto furthermore noted that Paraguay had a high level political committee, national committee on REDD-plus, and a technical REDD-plus team, which were working jointly on REDD-plus preparation. The national joint programme still had to be signed, but this would probably happen in the course of the current meeting and it would be followed by the preparation of a national work plan. Ms. Gauto said that two initiatives on voluntary carbon market existed. The main message learned from REDD-plus so far presented by Ms. Gauto was the importance of cooperation between government, non government and ILC. This also included the recognition of local traditional knowledge. Social environmental safeguards had been implemented in this national programme, but there was a need for strengthening knowledge about safeguards in government organizations, NGO and local government. At the national level, Paraguay had a national map of biodiversity and this would be compared with one of national carbon reserves. Paraguay was also at the moment working on a national forestry inventory. Regarding monitoring, Paraguay was planning to generate a mechanism for evaluation involving all different sectors. Ms. Gauto ended her presentation by outlining how Paraguay aimed at achieving synergies. Paraguay had a 5-year plan for climate change, national strategy for biodiversity and other policy instruments that take both biodiversity and climate change issues into account.

28. Mr. Adams Toussaint from Saint Lucia said that his Government was interested in understanding REDD-plus and in safeguarding biodiversity in Saint Lucia. Saint Lucia did not have a structure for implementing REDD -plus yet, but the Guyana REDD-Plus Investment Plan and discussions on a Green Economy framework at the CARICUM Preparatory Meeting on Input to Rio+20 had generated new interest in REDD-Plus. Even though Saint Lucia was not working directly on REDD-plus, many project and government initiatives were linked to REDD-plus objectives, e.g. the national forest demarcation and bio-physical resource inventory project, as this for example created an updated forest monitoring system and provided spatial and statistical forest management data. Priority areas for biodiversity conservation outside the forest reserve had been identified. They were in private hands and thus very vulnerable. Initiatives to address this included working with land owners to conserve these areas or try and include them in the protected areas system. Mr. Toussaint noted that Saint Lucia had 35 per cent forest cover and the 2009 biodiversity inventory led to many first time records for species and highlighted the importance of the country for biodiversity. An important safeguard for biodiversity pointed out by Mr. Toussaint was

identifying priority areas for biodiversity inside and outside the forest. Saint Lucia had done a review of traditional livelihood activities and this revealed that these were not sustainable. This led to a pilot project to improve sustainable use of biological resources, including sustainable management of species that were of importance for local communities. Mr. Toussaint also mentioned that the focal points of CBD and UNFCCC cooperated with the aim to promote synergies. At the end of the presentation Mr. Toussaint stated that it was a challenge that Santa Lucia considered to be irrelevant for REDD-plus due to its small size. Saint Lucia needed to strengthen national understanding of importance of forest biodiversity conservation, with special attention to the contribution of forest in mitigation and adaptation to climate change and biodiversity conservation. Mr. Toussaint also made the point that Saint Lucia needed to foster development of civil society organizations and local experts' capacity for lobbying for sustainable forest management.

29. Ms. Rachele Rijker from Suriname noted that Suriname was still in an initial phase of REDD-plus. As signatory to UNFCCC, Suriname organized national preparatory meetings with relevant stakeholders and tried to ensure participation in all preparatory meetings, workshops and conferences of the parties to UNFCCC by country representatives including in the FCPF and REDD+ Partnership. Due to a change in administration within the Government of Suriname in 2010, preparations on the Readiness Project Proposal (RPP) slightly stagnated. Ms. Rijker outlined the REDD -plus Readiness preparation in Suriname that included: Increased national discussions in the way forward in finalizing the RPP, development of a MRV and a forest Cover Map and implementation of a 3 year project on capacity improvement for Efficient Forest Carbon Stock Assessment. Ms. Rijker noted that the participation involvement process in Suriname was such that relevant stakeholders were convened in consultation meetings by the different ministries responsible for environmental related policies. As for the formulation of the REDD-plus strategy, consultation plan as well as the formulation of the Readiness Project Proposal, all relevant stakeholders including representatives of indigenous en tribal communities were involved. Similar procedure was also applied for the formulation of the National Forest Policy, National Biodiversity Strategy, National Biodiversity Action Plan, and National Climate Action Plan. During the formulation of the RPP, all relevant stakeholders, including representatives of the indigenous and tribal community were trained and informed about REDD -plus and RPP to ensure that the level of information to all the stakeholders was on the same level. As the negotiations were ongoing at international level (UNFCCC meetings) on whether adapting a REDD-plus mechanism, Suriname had started with preparatory activities such as Readiness Project Proposal (RPP), MRV and (initial) Forest Carbon Assessments, all carried out by the Ministry of Physical Planning Land and Forest Management. Suriname had no experiences in the voluntary carbon market. Regarding biodiversity safeguards, Ms. Rijker explained that Suriname had a well established legislation which prescribed conservation, safeguard and sustainable use. There was however a need to revise and update current legislation. Ms. Rijker said that the main obstacle for including biodiversity safeguards was a general lack of mainstreaming and integration of biodiversity issues into other sectors and lack of/insufficient (scientific) knowledge on such safeguards. A main lesson learned so far regarding safeguards pointed out was that different stakeholders had a different interpretations/understanding of safeguards. This was a complex issue and would have a great impact in the social, economic development of the country. Capacity-building strengthening was hence needed. Suriname had not completed the National Ecological Gap analysis under the CBD, but in the RPP, a rapid preliminary gap analysis had been carried out. In preparation of the Rio-plus 20 meeting to be held in 2012, Suriname had already conducted a National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) on the Rio conventions.

30. Mr. Luis Ordeig Di Leone from Uruguay said that Uruguay had no experience with REDD-plus, but a lot of experience around climate change. Uruguay had ratified UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol and had a separate Climate Change Unit since 1994. Uruguay had published a national plan and had finished its third national communication. Mr. Ordeig Di Leone gave a brief introduction to the country and its varied landscape. The native forestry had a variety of forest types from wet forest up to the forest on hills that provided a range of valuable ecosystem services. Uruguay had a policy on protecting native forest, creating new forest while avoiding non native species. The most important value of forest pointed out by Mr. Ordeig Di Leone was ecosystem services and also ecological corridors they provided

important for climate change adaption. The main carbon emissions in Uruguay came from the cattle sector. Uruguay had a law protecting forests, but Mr. Ordeig Di Leone stressed that Uruguay still had problems to conserve the forest resources. One of the challenges emphasized was invasive alien species. There was awareness about this and Uruguay was working to try to monitor development on this matter. The ministry of the environment was working on the development of indicators and on promoting synergies between the conventions. In 2002 Uruguay carried out an assessment of national capacity for synergies in which opportunities for joint plans were identified relating to the protection of ecosystems and native species and land-use planning. Mr. Ordeig Di Leone ended his presentation by pointing out that even though the forest area in Uruguay was increasing, there were problems that needed to be dealt with and to do this and a need for funding.

Presentations by Indigenous and Local Communities

31. Mr. Jaime Retamozo from Bolivia made a presentation on behalf of the ILC representatives. He said that in order to understand indigenous communities it was important to respect their structures, their traditions and their territories. Indigenous representatives had to be included in all phases of REDD-plus planning and implementation. He also highlighted that the attendance of only one indigenous representative was not enough to ensure that there was consensus from the indigenous community through the communities' own governance bodies. Safeguards needed to have real implications. He also stated that there should be super national commitments regarding this in order to make sure that Governments enforced them. It was further stressed that one should not only focus on carbon but the whole range of important ecosystem services provided by forests. For the last part of the presentation Ms. Yolanda Teran of Red de Mujeres Indigenas Sobre Biodiversidad continued to elaborate on the situation of indigenous women. She stressed the continuous struggle faced by indigenous women in order to be included in stakeholder processes.

Presentations by other relevant organizations

32. Ms. Doris Cordero of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) started her presentation by giving a presentation on the work of IUCN and introduced the available tools and publications produced. IUCN worked in many parts of the world and Ms Cordero mentioned in particular the work done in Guatemala and Ecuador. IUCN had recently launched a report from the work done in Ecuador. IUCN was working on the preparation of regional guidelines. Ms. Cordero pointed out the importance of strengthening the right of indigenous peoples and of spreading information about REDD-plus to many different organizations. Lessons learned were presented, like the need for more awareness raising, especially in the Amazon region. She also underlined the need to have all the main political players included in the process, which could sometimes be difficult, but was still necessary since there were often hidden political/economic issues influencing the process. Ms. Cordero continued to outline that some actors had the impression that REDD-plus was only about forest protection, but that in reality it was a much more complex issue with a wide range of implications.

33. Ms. Montserrat Alban of Conservation International presented the REDD plus Social and Environmental Standards initiative, promoted by the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA). She stated that the aim of the standards was to make sure that information was transparent to those who make decisions regarding REDD plus processes to support them in making decisions that lead to positive results. These standards had been developed so countries could choose to implement them to enforce their National REDD Strategies. In addition, companies and financial agencies working on REDD-plus credits that can have a certain guarantee through the application of standards co-benefits are generated. This initiative was now in its second phase, where the standards were running pilots in seven countries. She thereafter presented all the standards/principles and gave a general presentation of the different main topics related to them.

34. Ms. Mary Menton of CIFOR started by presenting briefly CIFOR's work. CIFOR was working on a global comparative study that they were carrying out with financial support from Norway, to disseminate info about REDD-plus to all partners and more generally the REDD-plus community. The study looked both at livelihood alternatives at the local level, and reference levels, monitoring and

knowledge sharing. Right now projects were on the way in several countries and CIFOR was using the same methodology in all the countries for them to be comparable. Ms. Menton informed participants that CIFOR had a lot of information available on their webpage that could be relevant and especially encouraged people to look at their recent publications and the CIFOR blog. CIFOR had a number of publications specific to Latin America, e.g. the political process of REDD-plus in Brazil and another on the media discourse on REDD-plus – what does media say about REDD-plus in REDD-plus relevant countries. CIFOR was also doing a lot of work on forest governance and impacts for local communities, livelihood alternatives and benefit-sharing. Ms. Menton ended her presentation by encouraging participants to contact her if they had information on any studies or projects that could be relevant to the work CIFOR was doing or if they had questions.

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

35. The participants were divided into three working groups (WG) for in-depth discussions. Each working group addressed the following 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 working groups also discussed possibilities for enhancing synergies at national level between CBD and UNFCCC with regard to REDD-plus. Specifically, the working group were asked to address the following questions: (i) do the existing safeguard frameworks adequately cover the main risks to biodiversity and indigenous peoples and local communities? (ii) are there any gaps in the frameworks and if so how could they be closed?, (iii) are these frameworks relevant to country needs? What are the challenges and constraints in terms of applying them? (iv) are the existing indicators feasible, and are they sufficient? (v) what information is needed at national level to assess REDD-plus impacts? and (vi) are there any gaps in the availability of data at national level? How could those gaps be closed?

36. The three working groups provided detailed recommendations on these issues. The groups were facilitated by Ms. Maria Montserrat Alban Ricaurte (Conservation International), Ms. Monika Bertzky (UNEP-WCMC/UN-REDD Programme), and Ms. Mary Menton (CIFOR). Rapporteurs for the WG were Ms. Josefina Braña (WG 1); Ms. Aurelie Lhumeau (WG 2); and Mr Alberto Lainez. (WG 3).

37. Results of the working groups are attached as annex I to this report

ITEM 5. OTHER MATTERS

38. Mr. David Cooper of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity gave a presentation on the linkages between the work done on REDD-plus and the development of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs). Mr. Cooper highlighted the importance of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 in relation to REDD-plus, especially Aichi Targets 5, 7, 11 and 15. He also gave an overview of the status of biodiversity globally as shown in the Global Biodiversity Outlook 3, and noted that a series of regional capacity-building workshops were under way to support Parties in developing, revising and updating their NBSAPs. He also pointed out that the Global Environment Facility (GEF) had allocated up to US\$ 500,000 per eligible country for the revision of NBSAPs. A regional workshop on NBSAPs for the Amazon countries would take place from 11 to 15 July, in Quito, in collaboration with the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization (ACTO).

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

39. Participants adopted the present report of the meeting.

40. The meeting closed at 4:30 p.m. Thursday, 7 July 2011.

41. The meeting was followed by an excursion to a Socio Bosque Community⁷ near the city of Tena (Amazon).

⁷ The Socio Bosque Programme is an incentive policy for conservation of forests, Andean highlands and other native ecosystems of Ecuador. The programme is aimed at delivering economic incentives to private landowners and communities that voluntarily wish to protect their forests, Andean highlands and other native vegetation. The programme aims at preserving 4 million acres of forest, Andean highlands or other native vegetation to benefit 1 million people and significantly reducing GHG emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. It has been implemented as of September 2008. In December 2010 agreements for more than 600,000 acres have been signed, benefiting over 50,000 people.

Annex I

Working Group 1

Facilitator: Ms. Maria Montserrat Alban Ricaurte (Conservation International)

Rapporteur: Ms. C. Josefina Braña Varela (Mexico)

Session 1 (safeguards)

Are the frameworks adequate?

- Participants reviewed existing safeguard frameworks (World Bank safeguard policies, REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards, Draft UN-REDD Principles and Criteria) and agreed that they are adequate in principle. At the same time participants agreed that not all safeguards are covered equally by all frameworks. (For example WB safeguard policies are not explicitly addressing REDD-plus but broader WB issues).
- What is missing is a financial and technical incentive system at national level for applying the safeguards.
- It is fundamental to support countries at the local level so that they can implement the existing frameworks.
- There is a need to consolidate the existing frameworks. This consolidation exercise would be similar to the matrix discussed by the participants but organized through a broader process.

Are there gaps in the frameworks and how can they be closed?

- Gaps often exist with regards to implementation. All important safeguard criteria and indicators may be covered in the frameworks but in implementation there are often gaps. This means that implementation of safeguards need to be monitored and controlled at national level.
- Often safeguard policies exist but the process of applying them is drawn out over years and in the meantime the policies are not enforced (e.g. in WB projects).

What the challenges in applying the frameworks?

- Participants identified a lack of capacity and resources to make the Cancun safeguards concrete and applicable at the national level.
- Participants acknowledged the usefulness of the frameworks to fill the gap between the global Cancun safeguards and their implementation at the national level.
- There need to be national instruments to assure application of the global safeguards at the national level. This includes creating incentives and capacities in the countries in which safeguards should be applied.
- The participants recognized the need to get a definition for forest for REDD-plus.
- The participants recognized the need to strengthen safeguards relating to indigenous and local communities' rights to territories.

Session 2 (indicators)

Are the indicators feasible and sufficient?

- Participants agreed that there needs to be an analysis of which of the existing indicator frameworks are applicable to REDD-plus (e.g. Draft AHTEG indicators, FRA indicators, CCB standards). The analysis should clarify which information is necessary to apply the indicators at the national level. This analysis also needs to reveal whether there are gaps in the indicator frameworks and make suggestions on how these gaps can be closed.

- Participants agreed that indicators need to be developed primarily to measure the effectiveness of REDD-plus safeguards.
- Participants agreed that measuring the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity is expensive. Therefore, efforts to do so should draw on synergies with other indicator processes such as FAO FRA. It should also be connected to the measurement of social impacts (e.g. equitable distribution of benefits). Using proxy indicators can help reduce costs.
- Participants pointed out that the indicator frameworks reviewed here provided only frameworks, not the indicators themselves. The indicators themselves need to be developed at national level.

What information is needed at the national level to assess REDD-plus impacts?

- Participants discussed the necessary characteristics of an indicator. Easy to measure, identifiable, measurable, consistent application must be possible in a timeframe, easily understood by local people.
- Participants discussed the types of information necessary to develop indicators to measure REDD-plus impacts on biodiversity: Maps of ecosystems, maps of high biodiversity areas, overlaps of the two, species levels, PA systems, keystone species, IAS, indigenous territories, biodiversity indexes and other existing instruments.

Are there gaps in the availability of data at the national level? How could the gaps be closed?

- At the national level, there is a lack of resources and capacities to measure REDD-plus impacts on biodiversity. These need to be created.
- To close the gaps, the strong input from ILCs is needed. It is fundamental.
- The national efforts should take into account the development of communication strategies and dissemination of information in appropriate language for all relevant stakeholders, including ILCs.
- To close the gaps, Parties will have to seek synergies with NGOs and academic institutions to generate the required information.

Social indicators

- Participants highlighted that with regards to REDD-plus respect for human rights, indigenous territories, traditional knowledge and intellectual property, as well as FPIC, are priorities for indigenous peoples. Therefore indicators to measure the impacts of REDD-plus on these need to be developed
- Participants agreed that the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and ILO Convention 169 should be respected in REDD-plus design and implementation and indicators should be developed to measure the impacts of REDD-plus on the rights therein.
- Participants agreed that indicators should be developed to measure the satisfaction of ILCs with REDD-plus at the local level.

Session 3 (synergies)

- Participants agreed that at national level and at the level of the conventions, REDD-plus offers important opportunities for achieving synergies.

International level

- Participants agreed that synergies should also be sought between the UN-REDD Programme, the FCPF and other initiatives at different levels.

- CBD and UNFCCC Secretariats should work together on a single set of social and environmental safeguards. The Secretariats should work on integrating common frameworks, principles and guidance and should communicate them in a consistent way. One important aspect of this would be enhancing coordination when organizing workshops and meetings.

National level

- Synergies between CBD and UNFCCC biodiversity safeguards should be sought at the national level.
- Since focal points for climate change and biodiversity are often in different ministries or departments, communication among them could be improved. This coordination should also involve other actors such as academic institutions, NGOs, the private sector, and indigenous people.
- Participants highlighted that international targets should be incorporated in national policies and programmes in a coordinated way (e.g. in action and development plans).
- MRV provides an important opportunity to achieve synergies (e.g. by creating common platforms for evaluating REDD-plus). In these platforms all stakeholders should be involved.
- At national level, inter-institutional committees or platforms have been created to achieve synergies, including private sector actors and NGOs.
- Participants agreed that synergies should be sought in terms of finance, education and communication.
- Financial mechanisms should aim at achieving synergies by providing incentives for the implementation of integrated biodiversity and climate change strategies.
- There needs to be better inter-institutional coordination among the various actors involved in REDD-plus (e.g. better coordination of meetings and workshops at all levels).
- Participants agreed that environmental education and awareness raising is an important field for synergies among the conventions.

Working Group 2 results

Facilitator: Ms Monika Bertzky (UN-REDD Programme)

Rapporteur: Ms. Aurelie Lhumeau (Ecuador)

The Group built on the results of the Nairobi expert workshop, September 2010, and a comparative matrix of safeguards and relevant approaches.

Safeguards

1. The mandate of the group was not to change wording of Cancun safeguards or the wording of the existing frameworks, but (i) to identify gaps, and (ii) develop recommendations for their interpretation, and for their application at national level. E.g. (e) 'actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biodiversity...' (para 2 (a) of the UNFCCC Dec 1/CP.16, Appendix 1) should be understood in a way that 'actions' includes policies and measures.
2. Cancun safeguards should be understood in way that under e.g. para 2 (a) special attention should be placed on consistency with CBD and UNCCD, specifically the CBD programme of work on forest biodiversity, and on consistency with biodiversity-related strategies and programmes, in particular the national biodiversity strategies and action plans, as well as with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
3. REDD-plus incentives need to be able to compete with opportunity costs for other measures, and measures should ensure that restoration costs are higher than costs of conservation (a potential gap in the safeguards).
4. In order to make basic requirements of REDD-plus safeguards work, key enabling conditions need to be in place such as described in Cancun safeguards 2 (b) on transparent and effective national governance.
5. There is a need for greater clarity as to what is included in REDD-plus, e.g. is afforestation and reforestation included in enhancement of forest carbon stocks? This will determine whether current safeguards are actually adequate.
6. All safeguards and actions, including for equitable sharing of benefits, need to be based on clear land use, natural resource use, and land tenure rights. Impacts on indigenous peoples and local communities, and benefit-sharing, is closely linked to solving land tenure and rights issues, including the rights to the forest carbon. There should be a link between REDD-plus payments and actual implementation of activities under REDD-plus.
7. Guidance on safeguards and information on application at national level, e.g. through indicators, can be useful to help countries to interpret and apply the Cancun safeguards.

Safeguards

8. No specific safeguards exist that address the risk of afforestation in high biodiversity areas. Need to include a specific provision on afforestation, reforestation and forest restoration based on the existing CBD guidance (decision X/33, para 8 (p)).
9. Safeguards are needed to prevent direct or indirect land degradation in other ecosystems (e.g. land degradation through intensification of land use).
10. The risk of lack of tangible livelihood benefits to indigenous peoples and local communities and lack of equitable benefit-sharing is a concern for the success of REDD-plus, and is not specifically covered in Cancun safeguards. However, e.g. REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (SES) Principle 2 covers this. This should be a priority for national level. Points 2.2.1. and 2.2.2. under REDD+ SES provide very useful guidance on this.

11. Potential loss of traditional knowledge and cultural and spiritual identity is not sufficiently covered under any safeguard. This includes the risk that REDD-plus and related payments could change and undermine the traditional way of life and related knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, potentially resulting in lack of food security. The holistic loss of indigenous peoples traditional knowledge, which includes the loss of spirituality, the lack of education through oral tradition because the forests are places to teach, the deterioration of relationship with the forest which is the center of life and the fundamental base for social and spiritual relationships of ILCs.

12. With reference to the lack of clarity of equitable benefit-sharing, some participants expressed concerns that women are not sufficiently included in the REDD-plus mechanism and this is creating confusion within the indigenous peoples and local communities.

13. According to some participants, the lack of inclusion of indigenous peoples and local communities in the REDD mechanism from the very beginning has created problems which now have to be resolved in order to develop an inclusive mechanism with the views of indigenous peoples.

Main discussion points in existing safeguard frameworks⁸

Biodiversity risk	Cancun safeguard 1/CP.16 Appendix I	Comments/Recommendations
1. The conversion of natural forests to plantations and other land uses of low biodiversity value and low resilience; and the introduction of growing of biofuel crops;	(e) Actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biodiversity	Group recommends that this should be understood in a way that 'actions' includes policies and measures. The importance of customary law was also emphasized in this regard as a source of knowledge that could contribute to reducing risk.
2. Displacement of deforestation and forest degradation to areas of lower carbon value and high biodiversity value;	(g) actions to reduce the displacement of emissions REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards 5.1.3	Group questioned the scale of this safeguard: global, national, local? There is a need to also include dryland forests with specific reference to compliance with UNCCD decisions
3. Increased pressure on non-forest ecosystems with high biodiversity value;	1 (d) environmental integrity and multiple functions of other ecosystems (a) consistent with objectives of NFP and international conventions and agreements	Other ecosystems mentioned under para 1, but needs specific operationalization at national level Risks 1 and 2 should be more explicitly included in all three approaches, and have more specificity at national level, for naturally occurring grasslands
4. Afforestation in areas of high biodiversity value	1 (d) and 2 (d) Criterion 17 of UN-REDD P&C CBD Decision X/33 provides guidance on afforestation and reforestation: 8(p) When designing, implementing and monitoring afforestation, reforestation and	It was unclear whether afforestation is contemplated under REDD-plus (request clarification from UNFCCC)? Clarification of the Cancun safeguards is needed with regard to afforestation and reforestation and forest restoration. There is also now specific mention of A/R in the three safeguard approaches,

⁸ World Bank safeguard policies, REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards, Draft UN-REDD Principles and Criteria.

	<p>forest restoration activities for climate-change mitigation consider conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services through, for example:</p> <p>(i) Converting only land of low biodiversity value or ecosystems largely composed of non-native species, and preferably degraded ones;</p> <p>(ii) Prioritizing, whenever feasible, local and acclimated native tree species when selecting species for planting;</p> <p>(iii) Avoiding invasive alien species;</p> <p>(iv) Preventing net reduction of carbon stocks in all organic carbon pools;</p> <p>(v) Strategically locating afforestation activities within the landscape to enhance connectivity and increase the provision of ecosystem services within forest areas.</p>	<p>although several principles and criteria address it indirectly. This also goes for the introduction of biofuel crops through plantations for biofuels</p> <p>Afforestation in degraded areas (of low biodiversity value) is acceptable, as it can relieve pressure on areas of high biodiversity value</p> <p>The form and modalities of afforestation should be taken into account; Cancun safeguards do not clarify type of afforestation (mono-culture, exotic species, etc.)</p> <p>Whether or not biodiversity concerns are addressed depends to a large degree on the interpretation of certain terms, including 'natural forests' and</p>
5. The loss of traditional territories and restriction of land and natural resource rights	<p>REDD+ SES Principles 1 and 3</p> <p>UN-REDD P&C Principle 2</p>	<p>Issue of territorial rights (and tenure) is not sufficiently (not explicitly enough) covered by the Cancun safeguards and the current approaches.</p>
6. Lack of tangible livelihood benefits to indigenous peoples and local communities and lack of equitable benefit-sharing;	<p>Not covered by Cancun, but covered e.g. REDD+ SES 2 and 3 and in UN-REDD P&C 2, in particular 2.2.1. and 2.2.2. under REDD+ SES</p>	<p>Risk of lack of benefit sharing is a concern for the success of REDD-plus, and this point should be a priority at national level.</p>
7. Exclusion from designing and implementation of policies and measures;	<p>2 (b), (c) and (d)</p> <p>REDD+ SES 6 and in UN-REDD P&C 1</p>	<p>Indigenous peoples and local communities must be included from the very beginning in the development (e.g. in REDD, this was not the case in the 2007 Bali discussions).</p>
8. Loss of traditional ecological knowledge.	<p>Not covered under any safeguard (Cancun or other)</p>	<p>This is understood as the risk that REDD-plus and related payments could change and undermine the traditional way of life and related knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities. This is also linked to the lack of food security and cultural identity, and spiritual identity. There is a lack of specific focus on women.</p>

Possible CBD indicators for measuring REDD-plus impacts at national level

15. Indicators should be kept simple, and be based as much as possible on existing work on indicators, including the work to measure the 2020 biodiversity targets, as well as the Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA).

16. Many indicators (including AHTEG) are formulated in a negative way (e.g. monitoring degradation), while monitoring REDD-plus impacts on biodiversity should be neutral or measure positive impacts.

17. The most important AHTEG and FRA indicators important for REDD-plus are the extent, condition and vulnerability of ecosystems, in particular (i) fragmentation of forests; (ii) status and trends in protected areas and indigenous territories, including ecological connectivity and ecological corridors; and (iii) area of degraded habitat or ecosystem restored, as well as (iv) area of forests under sustainable management.

18. Qualitative, policy related indicators should be added, including linkages between biodiversity-related strategies and plans, forest management plans, and indicators to measure level of participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, to assess their full and effective participation.

19. It is important to consider biodiversity at all levels (ecosystems, species, and genetic level), and the main drivers of biodiversity loss: habitat transformation (including conversion), pollution, overexploitation, invasive alien species, climate change.

20. The use of non-wood forest product should be monitored, including the levels of hunting. Wildlife directly impacts ecosystem functioning, including carbon storage.

21. It should be noted that the social indicators identified here may not be appropriate for use at global level, but could support monitoring at national and local levels, as well as independent monitoring. For example, understanding where REDD-plus implementation leads to conflict and whether mechanisms are in place to solve such conflicts is essential for the success of REDD-plus, but may not be considered appropriate to report at global scale. Indicators under Article 8(j) of the CBD could be used in this respect.

22. It is important to differentiate between people living in local communities, or representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities. Information on social indicators should be gathered from people who are directly affected by REDD-plus, rather than from the people who are designing and organizing REDD-plus.

23. Social indicators should reflect the risks identified by the Nairobi expert workshop:

Risk	Possible indicator framework
The loss of traditional territories and restriction of land and natural resource rights	Loss of traditional territories and rights (status and trends of access to land and natural resources) Involuntary resettlements
Lack of tangible livelihood benefits to indigenous peoples and local communities and lack of equitable benefit-sharing	Gender equality and rights and livelihoods of women; governance structures at difference levels; statistics on economic development from REDD-plus areas
Exclusion from designing and implementation of policies and measures	(i) Involvement in the set-up of REDD-plus rules, and (ii) knowledge about REDD-plus and its rules, (iii) if people are informed about the rules, (iv) how they were informed, and (v) whether they are respecting the rules.
Loss of traditional ecological knowledge	<i>(Use appropriate indicators of CBD Article 8(j))</i>

24. Indigenous peoples and local communities can be of great help to inform about the status of trends of biodiversity as a result of implementation of REDD-plus. This could include links to indicators about traditional knowledge, e.g. the quality and quantity of natural resources and biodiversity that is used for traditional purposes such as cultural ceremonies. Community monitoring can help increase ownership

at local level and may be more cost-effective than the establishment of complex ecological monitoring systems.

25. It is important to measure how REDD-plus has affected the ways of life of IPLCs, including their customary sustainable use of biodiversity. This could include (i) livelihood changes due to REDD-plus, (ii) changes in their well-being and traditional knowledge and practices. Information should also be provided on mechanism to solve conflicts; information on traditional uses of the territory and biodiversity; land tenure; collective rights; and social benefits.

26. It was noted that several of the social indicators that were considered important are interlinked, e.g. where rights to access to natural resources are reduced as a result of REDD-plus implementation, this may negatively impact on traditional knowledge and cultural identity.

Proposed REDD-plus biodiversity indicators based on the AHTEG draft report:

Headline Indicator identified by CBD AHTEG in June 2011	Priority indicator and ready for use globally	Relevant for REDD-plus and Comments	Aichi Target
Number and extent of invasive alien species		Yes. Need to consider also invasive species which are not alien, but aggressively taking over habitats	5 and 9
Status and trend of natural capital that deliver bundles of ecosystem services	(i) Status and trends in habitats that provide carbon storage (ii) Status and trends in ecosystems that provide ecosystem services (e.g. Provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural)	Yes. Status and trends in habitats that provide carbon storage might overlook biodiversity values of these habitats Forest cover and forest carbon stocks are the most important indicators in this respect	14 and 15
Pressures from habitat conversion, overexploitation and underlying drivers	(i) Degradation of natural habitats (ii) Integrity of ecosystems vulnerable to climate change Add: (iii) Restoration of natural habitats	Yes Formulate more neutrally (e.g. changes in status of natural habitats) Need to monitor link between reduced deforestation/degradation, and overall forest ecosystems resilience/stability (e.g. Amazon dieback) under (ii), even if ecosystem is not vulnerable at this stage. Need to monitor also integrity of dry-land ecosystems under (ii)	5, 9, 10 and 15
Areas of sustainably used ecosystems	(i) Areas of forests under sustainable forest management	Yes	7

Synergies between conventions:

27. Terms and definitions (such as natural forests) should be harmonized as much as possible between CBD and UNFCCC and other relevant Conventions.

28. Specific areas for collaboration should e.g. include coordination between NBSAPs and national ecological gap analysis, and NAPAs, NAMAs, and REDD-plus plans, as well as National Action Plans under UNCCD. For example in Suriname, national level capacity self-assessment involves experts from all three Rio conventions, to indicate gaps in policies and in implementation, and key policies are developed in coordination between key focal points.

29. However, coordination between national focal points remains a challenge in many countries and requires adequate resources.

30. This workshop is a clear example of synergies between UNFCCC and CBD, and this kind of inputs from one Convention to the other should be enhanced, in particular regarding the development of financing mechanisms which will impact the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.
31. Collaboration and harmonization, for mutual benefit, between the Rio conventions should continue, including through the Joint Liaison Group; CPF Task Force on Streamlining Forest-related Reporting; and Rio Conventions Pavilion.
32. Global Environment Facility (GEF) pilot projects for joint reporting to the Rio conventions exist. This should be further strengthened and expanded.
33. The work at subnational and local levels can inform the national and global level about synergies. There are many examples at local level for achieving synergies between the Conventions.

Group 3 – Synthesis of Group Discussion

Facilitator: Ms Mary Menton

Rapporteur: Mr. Alberto Lainez

Risks	Relevant principles	Relevant indicators
Biodiversity		
a) The conversion of natural forests to plantations and other land uses of low biodiversity value and low resilience, and the introduction of growing of biofuel crops	(e) from Cancun UN-REDD P4,5,6 REDD+ SES P5	1, 2 from Aichi T5
b) Displacement of deforestation and forest degradation to areas of lower carbon value and high biodiversity value.	Covered partially in those mentioned above but lacks explicit inclusion of the low carbon/high biodiversity issue.	1,2 from Aichi T5
c) Increased pressure on non-forest ecosystems with high biodiversity value	As above but failure to explicitly cover non-forest ecosystems	
d) Afforestation in areas of high biodiversity value. (lack of consensus on definitions)	UN-REDD P6 REDD-SES P5 Lack of coverage on non-forest ecosystems	Fragmentation of natural habitats, Extension of natural habitats Diversity of ecosystems present.
e) Undervalue other ecosystem services, Considering connectivity, representativity and integrity, and reduce them to a sole focus on carbon.	UN-REDD 3, 5,6 REDD+ SES 5	
f) Application of forest management practices	P6 – UNREDD and (e) from Cancun (need to include non-forest ecosystems)	Fragmentation of natural habitats 3 levels – national (fragmentation), community (loss of diversity) and species (genetic diversity).
Indigenous peoples and local communities		
a) Loss of traditional territories and restriction of land and natural resource rights		Evaluation of rights and laws Mapping of territory extents
c) lack of tangible benefits to indigenous peoples and local communities and lack of equitable benefit sharing		Before-After, Control-Intervention studies of socio-economic parameters Percent of REDD income which goes to communities

Risks	Relevant principles	Relevant indicators
c) Exclusion from designing and implementation of p and measures	Partially by (d) of Cancun Prin 1 UN-REDD, P6 of SES	Develop REDD strategies and implementation that consider the participation of indigenous groups in each phase and proof of that participation
D) Loss of traditional ecological knowledge AND use of that knowledge	(c) of Cancun, P2,C7 of UNREDD Lack of specification in SES SES P1,3,8 relevant but not specifically	From C6.4, one could choose indicators of communication and from 6.1.1 establish and recognize traditional knowledge.
e) Lack of communication and adequate transfer of information to local communities can create misunderstandings and inappropriate implementation of REDD.	(d) partially, UNREDD p1 and SES P6, P7	Communication strategies are currently insufficient. c.4 ; P7.1; P7.2 could be used as a basis: Aichi 18. Aichi 19 Aichi 18 (indigenous languages).

Risks

The group identified additional risks that were not included in the Nairobi list:

1e) Undervalue other ecosystem services, considering connectivity, representativity, and integrity, and reduce them to a sole focus on carbon.

1f) Application of forest management practices that compromise biodiversity

2d) it is not only the loss of knowledge but also the loss of the USE of that knowledge and related changes in livelihood approaches.

2e) Lack of communication and adequate transfer of information to local communities can create misunderstandings and inappropriate implementation of REDD.

(obs is also relevant more broadly to issues in definitions and clarity / consensus.)

Safeguards

- Many of the principles cover the risks but are often very general and do not cover all aspects of biodiversity and community risks.
- Key gaps exist:
 - Non-forest ecosystems are not fully protected or considered
 - Non-carbon ecosystem services are also not protected or considered sufficiently
- Need to discuss and determine safeguards at a national level (not imposed from above).
- In many countries, laws exist that guarantee these safeguards – there is a need to review these laws and make sure that there is intersectoral communication within the country to make sure there is coherence in actions taken.
- International support for implementation of safeguards would be helpful – translate into culturally appropriate language to ensure complete understanding of the safeguards.

- Problem of differences between safeguard frameworks – can cause confusion and additional burden on REDD countries. Yet, at the same time, there is a need to use locally accepted and locally appropriate safeguards.

Indicators

- There are many indicators currently available but there will need to be consultation at the national level to determine which are appropriate for any given national context.
- It will be critical to form better indicators for the effects of fire (assess not only frequency but also intensity and related effects on biodiversity)

Key Biodiversity Indicators

- a) Fragmentation / connectivity
- b) Degradation -- species abundancies and presence / absence of exotic species, quality of ecosystem services
 - a. Obs: Challenge to separate degradation from CC vs direct anthropogenic effects
- c) Genetic diversity - given limited resources, monitor keystone species / indicator species
- d) Diversity of ecosystems – hectares/area of each ecosystem type, diversity of communities within these systems.
- e) Ecosystem resilience
 - a. Fragmentation and connectivity, indicator species
 - b. Monitor functional groups

Challenges to implementation at National level

1. Costs
 - a. Countries have legislation but lack resources to put it in place
 - b. Some support from GIS,. GEF, FAO, UNREDD etc
2. Access to information
 - a. Collaboration between organizations – make information more clearly and readily available
 - b. Databases to systematize information
 - c. Overcome resistance of some parties in sharing their data / information
 - d. Each country needs to organize it's information and create an adequate baseline of the current status of biodiversity at a national level
3. Technical Capacity
 - a. Capacity building at local level – train communities to be able to help in monitoring and data collection
 - b. Communication between institutions so as not to duplicate efforts and take advantage of institutions that have a given strength.

It will be CRITICAL to develop accurate baselines for REDD that do not consider only carbon but also biodiversity by including these indicators in baseline development.

With or without REDD, we must monitor biodiversity.

Synergies

- There are many clear synergies at the convention level, but they are not necessarily being implemented and it may be more relevant to focus on these at the national and local levels in actual operationalization of CC and Biodiversity monitoring.
- Need for a systematic review of the resolutions from Nagoya, COP 9, etc to identify opportunities for synergies.
- There are currently a number of initiatives at national and local levels that seek to take advantage of synergies.
- Interinstitutional platforms to identify overlapping responsibilities.
- Creation of national strategies that integrate biodiversity and CC.
- Several examples of task forces / committees within national strategies to look at BD and CC.
- Mercosur cooperation on CC, BD, and hydrological resources
- Opportunities for collaborations and sharing of lessons-learned amongst REDD countries
- Importance to carry out CC and biodiversity monitoring activities in the same forests.
- We cannot forget about the connections between adaptation and mitigation → REDD cannot ignore the importance and role of adaptation.

Annex II

List of Participants

CBD Parties

Brazil

1. Ms. Natalie Unterstell
Coordinator, climate and forest unit
Secretariat on Climate Change
Ministry of the Environment
Esplanada dos Ministerios Bloco B
Brasilia DF70068-900
Brazil
Tel.: + 55 61 20281230
Fax: +55 61 20281230
E-Mail: natalieunterstell@gmail.com
Web: <http://www.mma.gov.br>
2. Mr Ricardo Melamed
Coordination of Biodiversity and Ecosystem
Management
Ministry of Science and Technology
Esplanada dos Ministerios Bloco E
Brasilia DF70068-900
Brazil
Tel.: + 55 61 33178111
E-Mail: rmelamed@mct.gov.br
Web: <http://www.mma.gov.br>

Chile

3. Mr. Daniel Alvarez
Coordinador del Plan de Accion Nacional
Biodiversidad y Cambio Climatico
NBSAP Climate Change
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente
Teatinos 258, Piso 6
Santiago
Chile
Tel.: 56 2 240 56 35
Fax: 56 2 241 18 88
E-Mail: dalvarezl@mma.gob.cl

Colombia

4. Mr. Felipe Gomez Villota
Asesor del Grupo de Mitigacion de Cambio Climatico
Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y Desarrollo
Territorial
Calle 37 #8-40, Piso 4
Bogota
Colombia
Tel.: 57 1 3323434 ext. 1173

E-Mail: fgomez@minambiente.gov.co;
felgovi@gmail.com
Web: <http://www.minambiente.gov.co/>

5. Ms. Luz Stella Pulido Perez
Coordinadora del Grupo de desarrollo Sostenible de
Bosques
Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y Desarrollo
Territorial
Edificio Anexo Piso 4
Calle 37 #8-40
Bogota
Colombia
Tel.: +571 3323400 ext. 1343
E-Mail: Lspulido@minambiente.gov.co
Web: <http://www.minambiente.gov.co/>

Costa Rica

6. Ms. Sonia Maria Lobo Valverde
Ingeniera Forestal con Licensiatura en Manejo de
Recursos Naturales
Sistema Nacional de Areas de Conservacion (SINAC)
Ministerio de Ambiente, Energia y Telecomunicaciones
Apartado Postal 10104-1000
San José
Costa Rica
Tel.: (506) 2256 0917 ext.109
Fax: (506) 2256 2446
E-Mail: sonia.lobo@sinac.go.cr

Cuba

7. Ms. Arlety Ajete Hernandez
Instituto Nacional Forestal, Estacion de Baracoa
Ministry of Agriculture
La Havana
Cuba
E-Mail: arlety@forestales.co.cu

8. Ms. Alicia Mercadet Portillo
Instituto Investigaciones Agro-Forestales
Ministry of Agriculture
La Havana
Cuba
E-Mail: mercadet@forestales.co.cu

Ecuador

9. Ms. Carola Borja
Head of the Climate Change Mitigation Directorate
from the Undersecretary of Climate Change
Ministerio del Ambiente
Casilla 1721109
Quito
Ecuador
E-Mail: cborja@ambiente.gob.ec
10. Ms. Daniela Carrión
REDD+ Expert from the Undersecretary of Climate
Change
Ministerio del Ambiente
Casilla 1721109
Quito
Ecuador
E-Mail: dcarrion@ambiente.gob.ec
11. Mr. Marco Chíu
Undersecretary of Climate Change
Ministerio del Ambiente
Casilla 1721109
Quito
Ecuador
E-Mail: mchiu@ambiente.gob.ec
12. Ms. Aurelie Lhumeau
Especialista beneficios múltiples y participación para
REDD+
Ministerio del Ambiente
Casilla 1721109
Quito
Ecuador
E-Mail: alhumeau@ambiente.gob.ec
13. Mr. Wilson Rojas
CBD's Focal Point and Expert from the Biodiversity
Directorate from the Undersecretary of Natural
Heritage
Division Nacional de Biodiversidad
Ministerio del Ambiente
Casilla 1721109
Quito
Ecuador
Tel.: 593-2-3987600 ext1420
E-Mail: wrojas@ambiente.gob.ec
14. Mr. Christian Velasco
Expert from the Forestry Directorate from the
Undersecretary of Natural Heritage
Ministerio del Ambiente
Casilla 1721109
Quito
Ecuador
E-Mail: cvelasco@ambiente.gob.ec

El Salvador

15. Mr. Jorge Ernesto Quezada Diaz
Punto Focal Nacional para el CBD
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales

Km 5½ Carretera a Santa Tecla
Calle las Mercedes, Colonia las Mercedes
San Salvador
El Salvador
Tel.: +503 21329407
Fax: +503 2 267 9326
E-Mail: jquezada@marn.gov.sv,
jordiquebu@hotmail.com
Web: <http://www.marn.gob.sv>

Grenada

16. Mr. Spencer L. Thomas
Special envoy and Ambassador to Multilateral
Agreement
Ministry of the Environment, Foreign Trade and Export
Development
Financial Complex
Carenage
St. George's
Grenada
Tel.: +1 473 407 5165
Fax: +1 473 4352132
E-Mail: sthomas@ectel.int
Web: <http://grenada.biodiv-chm.org>

Honduras

17. Mr. Jorge Alberto Lainez Alfaro
Ingeniero Ambiental, Coordinador Unidad de
Mitigación.
Direccion Nacional de Cambio Climatico
Colonia Monte Verde, bloque J, Casa 29
Tegucigalpa
Honduras
Tel.: (504) 2232-182, (504) 9675-4509
Fax: (504) 2232-1828
E-Mail: lainezalberto@yahoo.com,
alberto.lainez@gmail.com

Mexico

18. Ms. C. Josefina Braña Varela
Directora de cambio climatico
Comision Nacional Forestal
Carretera a Nogales esq. Periferico Pte. s/n 5 piso
Col. San Juan de Ocotan 45010
Zapopan, Jalisco
Mexico
E-Mail: jbrana@conafor.gob.mx
19. Mr. José Maria Michel
Subdirector de proyectos de carbono
Comision Nacional Forestal
Carretera a Nogales esq. Periferico Pte. s/n 5 piso
Col. San Juan de Ocotan 45010
Zapopan, Jalisco

Mexico

Tel.: +52 (33) 3777-7000 EXT. 2032

E-Mail: jmichel@conafor.gob.mx

Nicaragua

20. Mr. Edilberto Duarte Lopez
Ingeniero Forestal Msc en Manejo de Bosques y
Agroforesterial
Ministerio del Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
(MARENA)
Km 12.5 de la carretera Norte, frente a zona franca.
Tel.: +505 2263 1994
Fax: +505-22334455
E-Mail: eduarte@marena.gob.ni, edil05@yahoo.com

Panama

21. Mr. Jorge U. Garcia Dominguez
Biodiversity and wildlife technician
Wildlife and Protected Areas Directorate
National Environmental Authority
ALBROOK, BUILDING 804,
Panama City
Panama
Tel.: (507) 500-0855 ext 6066
Fax: (507) 500-0913
E-Mail: Jorge.garcia@anam.gob.pa

Paraguay

22. Ms. Karem Rocío A. Elizeche G.
Ingeniera Forestal
Dirección General de Bosques
Instituto Forestal Nacional
Tel.: 0984787804-0992287778 (mobile)
E-Mail: karemelizeche@gmail.com
23. Ms. Diana Gauto
Climate Change Specialist
Planificación Estratégica
Secretaría del Ambiente
Madame Lynch 3500 c/ Primer Presidente
Asuncion
Paraguay
Tel.: 595 21 615806/7
E-Mail: diana.gauto@gmail.com
24. Ms. Mirta Isabel Medina Ruiz
Biodiversity Specialist
Dirección de Planificación Estratégica
Secretaría del Ambiente
Madame Lynch 3500 c/ Primer Presidente
Asuncion
Paraguay
Tel.: 59521615806
Fax: 59521615807

Saint Lucia

25. Mr. Adams Toussaint
Assistant Chief Forestry Officer
Forestry Department
Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry and Fisheries
Sir Stanislaus James Building, 5th Floor
Waterfront
Castries
Saint Lucia
Tel.: 7584685641
Fax: 7584502287
E-Mail: toussaintadams@yahoo.com
Web: <http://www.maff.egov.lc>

Suriname

26. Mr. Rewiechand Matai
Head of the Forest Economic Department
Foundation for Forest Management and Control
Suriname
Tel.: +597 442011
E-Mail: rewiechamatai@yahoo.com
27. Ms. Rachèle Rijkers
Junior Environmental Policy Officer, Environmental
Section
Environmental Section
Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and
Environment
Prins Hendrikstr 17
Paramaribo
Suriname
Tel.: +597 420960
Fax: +597 475574
E-Mail: milieu_atm@yahoo.com,
secmilieu@atm.gov.sr, bio_milieu@yahoo.com

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

28. Mr. Martin Brasher
Deputy Director
Biodiversity Programme
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Temple Quay House, 2 The Square,
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6 EB
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Tel.: 0117 372 8277
Fax: 0117 372 8688
E-Mail: martin.brasher@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Uruguay

29. Mr. Luis Ordeig Di Leone
Licenciado en Ciencias Biológicas
Unidad de Cambio Climático-Dirección Nacional de
Medio Ambiente
Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y
Medio Ambiente
Galicia 1133, entre piso
Montevideo
Uruguay
Tel.: 2917 0710
E-Mail: luis.ordeig@gmail.com

United Nations and Specialized Agencies

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

30. Mr. Jorge Meza
FAO (Subregional Office for South America)
Ciencias Veterinarias
Edificio Viceministerio de Ganadería, Km 20,5
San Lorenzo
Paraguay
E-Mail: Jorge.Meza@fao.org

The Global Mechanism - UNCCD

31. Ms. Soledad Bastidas
Regional Advisor for LAC
The Global Mechanism - UNCCD
E-Mail: s.bastidas@global-mechanism.org

UN-REDD (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries)

32. Ms. Monica Bertzky
UN-REDD (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation
and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries)
Cambridge
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 1223 814648
E-Mail: Monika.Bertzky@unep-wcmc.org
33. Mr. Diego Martino
UN-REDD (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation
and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries)
Montevideo
Uruguay

Tel: +598 24123357
E-Mail: diego.martino@pnuma.org

31/05/2011

Inter-Governmental Organizations

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

34. Ms. Mary Menton
Center for International Forestry Research
c/o CIP
Av La Molina
Lima 12
Peru
E-Mail: m.menton@cgiar.org
Web: <http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/>

International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)

35. Mr. John Leigh
Conservation Officer
Division of Reforestation and Forest Management
International Tropical Timber Organization
International Organizations Center - 5th Floor
Pacifico-Yokohama 1-1-1, Minato-Mirai, Nishi-ku
Yokohama 220-0012
Japan
Tel.: 045-223-1110
Fax: 045-223-1111
E-Mail: leigh@itto.int
Web: <http://www.itto.or.jp>

International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

36. Ms. Doris Cordero
Forest and Climate Change Programme Officer
IUCN-SUR
IUCN - International Union for Conservation of Nature
Quinteno Libre E15-12 y La Combre
Sector Bellavista
Quito
Ecuador
Tel: 2261 075 ext.30
E-Mail: doris.cordero@iucn.org
Web: <http://www.iucn.org>
37. Mr. Arturo Mora
Programme Officer, Species Evaluation and
Economics
Species and Red List, IUCN-SUR
IUCN - International Union for Conservation of Nature
Quinteno Libre E15 - 12 y la Cumbre

Sector Bellavista, PO Box 17-17-626, Pichincha
Quito
Ecuador
Tel.: + 593 (2) 2261 075 ext 22
E-Mail: arturo.mora@iucn.org,
arturo.mora@sur.iucn.org

Non-Governmental Organizations

Conservation International

38. Ms. Maria Montserrat Alban Ricaurte
Program Coordinator for Ecosystem Services
Conservation International - Ecuador
E-Mail: m.alban@conservation.org,
montse_alban@yahoo.com

Fauna & Flora International (FFI)

39. Ms. Jane Dunlop
REDD Community Specialist, Environmental Markets
Team
Fauna & Flora International
Jupiter House, 4th Floor
Station Road
Cambridge CB1 2JD
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Tel.: +62(0)8111117809
E-Mail: jane.dunlop@fauna-flora.org
Web: <http://www.fauna-flora.org>

Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)

40. Ms. Miriam Factos
Responsible Componente 1
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
Amazonas y Eloy Alfaro Edif. MAGAP Piso 8
Tel.: (593-2) 2500162
Fax: (593-2) 2500163
E-Mail: miriam.factos@giz.de
41. Ms. Rhena Hoffmann
Coordinadora de componente cc y REDD+
Programa gesoren
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
Amazonas y Eloy Alfaro Edif. MAGAP 8 Piso
Tel.: (593-2) 2500162 EXT.108
Fax: (593-2) 2500163
E-Mail: rhena.hoffmann@giz.de

Rainforest Foundation Norway - CEPALES

42. Mr. Lourdes Barragán Alvarado
Punto Focal en Ecuador: Programa Derechos, Cambio
Climático y Bosques
Sarmiento N 39-198 y Hugo Moncayo
P.O. Box 17-11-6127
Quito
Ecuador
Tel.: (593) 2 250 659
Fax: (593) 2 2459 417
E-Mail: lourdes.barragan.alvarado@gmail.com
Web: <http://www.rainforest.no>;
<http://derechosybosques.com>

Wildlife Conservation Society

43. Ms. Malgorzata Bryja
Technical Director
Wildlife Conservation Society
ELOY ALFARO N37-224 y COREMO
Quito
Ecuador
Tel.: 593-22-249763/249758
Fax: 593-22-249763/249758
E-Mail: gbryja@wcs.org

Indigenous and Local Community Organizations

Confederación de Pueblos Indígenas de Bolivia

44. Mr. Jaime Retamozo Fernández
Ingeniero Agrónomo
Confederación de Pueblos Indígenas de Bolivia
Villa Primero De Mayo Calle N° 2
Santa Cruz,
Bolivia
Tel.: 0591-70201505
Fax: 0591-70201505
E-Mail: ijawi@hotmail.com

Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica - COICA

45. Mr. Rodrigo de la Cruz
Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la
Cuenca Amazonica - COICA
Calle Sevilla N24 - 358 y Guipuzcoa. La Floresta
Quito
Ecuador

E-Mail: rdelacruz@punto.net.ec

Web: <http://www.coica.org.ec>

46. Mr. Juan Carlos Jintiach Arcos
Area Coordinator of the International Cooperation and
Autonomous Indigenous Development
Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la
Cuenca Amazonica - COICA
Calle Sevilla N24 - 358 y Guipuzcoa. La Floresta
Quito
Ecuador
Tel.: +20278533
Fax: + 202 785 8701
E-Mail: juancarlos.jintiach@gmail.com,
juanka@coica.org.ec
Web: <http://www.coica.org.ec>

Coordinadora Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas de Panama (COONAPIP)

47. Mr. Candido Mezua
Coordinadora Nacional de Pueblos Indígenas de
Panama (COONAPIP)
Panama
Tel: +507 295 5121
Tel: +507 6669 1549
E-Mail: cmezua@yahoo.es

Federación por la Autodeterminación de los Pueblos Indígenas

48. Ms. Mirta Pereira Giménez
Federación por la Autodeterminación de los Pueblos
Indígenas
Dr. Gaspar Rodríguez de Francia, entre Brasil y
Teniente Rojas Silva Nro.1187
Asunción
Paraguay
Tel.: (595) 21 232723, (595) 21 422236 - (595) 981
365532
Fax: (595) 491 433511
E-Mail: mirtapereira@capi.org.py,
pereiramirta@hotmail.com

Red de mujeres indígenas sobre biodiversidad

49. Ms. Maria Yolanda Teran Maigua
Doctora en educacion
Red de mujeres indígenas sobre biodiversidad
Avenida Peru Alle 41, Bellavista, Edificio Las
Camelias, Pisa 3, Local 302
Panama
Tel.: (507) 3921074
Fax: (507) 3921497
E-Mail: yolanda_teran2003@yahoo.com

Business

PROFAFOR S.A.

50. Mr. Luis Fernando Jara
General Manager
PROFAFOR S.A.
Av. Amazonas N33-319 y Rumipamba
Edif. Torre Carolina, Ofic. 301
Quito
Ecuador
Tel.: 2267651/2257016
E-Mail: luisjara@profafor.com

Universities

Lund University

51. Mr. Wain Collen
Lund University
Tel: 082 821 961
E-Mail: awcollen@gmail.com
52. Mr. Torsten Krause
Lund University
E-mail: torsten.krause@lucid.lu.se

CBD Secretariat

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

53. Mr. Tim Christophersen
Programme Officer - Environmental Affairs / Forest
Biodiversity
Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W.
Suite 800
Montreal Quebec
Canada
Tel.: +1-514-287-7036
Fax: +1-514-288-6588
E-Mail: Tim.Christophersen@cbd.int
Web: www.cbd.int
54. Mr. David Cooper
Senior Programme Officer
Implementation and Technical Support
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

413, Saint-Jacques Street W.
Suite 800
Montreal Quebec
Canada

Tel.: +1 514 287 8709
Fax: +1 514 288 6588
E-Mail: david.cooper@cbd.int
Web: www.cbd.int

55. Ms. Marte Sendstad
Resource person
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W.
Suite 800

Montreal Quebec
Canada

E-Mail: marte.sendstad.intern@cbd.int
Web: www.cbd.int

56. Mr. Johannes Stahl
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W.
Suite 800
Montreal Quebec
Canada
Tel.: +514 287 6683
Fax: +514 288 6588
E-Mail: johannes.stahl@cbd.int