CBD

UNEP

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WS-REDD/1/3
23 September 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GLOBAL EXPERT WORKSHOP ON BIODIVERSITY
BENEFITS OF REDUCING EMISSIONS FROM
DEFORESTATION AND FOREST DEGRADATION
IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
Nairobi, 20-23 September 2010

OUTCOMES OF THE GLOBAL EXPERT WORKSHOP ON BIODIVERSITY BENEFITS OF REDUCING EMISSIONS FROM DEFORESTATION AND FOREST DEGRADATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

I. CO-CHAIRS SUMMARY

1. If REDD-plus[1] is successful at reducing deforestation and forest degradation, and promoting forest conservation, it will have significant and unprecedented benefits for biodiversity.

2. A well designed REDD-plus mechanism also has the potential to deliver significant benefits to indigenous peoples and local communities.

3. Both biodiversity and the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities are necessary for the success of REDD-plus. The permanent storage of carbon depends on well-functioning and resilient forest ecosystems, and on indigenous and local community participation and ownership.

4. Multiple benefits of REDD-plus, such as biodiversity benefits and benefits for indigenous peoples and local communities, are already being realized in many countries that are taking REDD-plus activities forward, e.g. through mapping exercises and through developing integrated REDD-plus national plans.

5. At this stage, the biggest risk to biodiversity and indigenous peoples and local communities from REDD-plus is that a well-designed REDD-plus mechanism is not agreed upon and successfully implemented.

6. Other specific risks for biodiversity identified by the meeting include:

(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;

[1] In this report, REDD-plus refers to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries. As negotiations under the UNFCCC are ongoing, acronyms within the co-chairs summary are used for the purpose of shortening the text, without any attempt to pre-empt or pre-judge ongoing or future negotiations under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The Plurinational State of Bolivia expressed its reservation to the use of the acronym REDD-plus in the co-chairs summary and refers to this mechanism as 'forest-related activities', considering that a) forests are not only important for emission reduction but they also have other multiple benefits as expressed in the co-chairs' summary and b) in accordance with CBD decision IX/5 the mandate for this workshop refers to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries.

/…

(b) Displacement of deforestation and forest degradation to areas of lower carbon value and high biodiversity value;

(c) Increased pressure on non-forest ecosystems with high biodiversity value;

(d) Afforestation in areas of high biodiversity value.

7. Other specific risks of REDD-plus for indigenous peoples and local communities include:

(a) The loss of traditional territories and restriction of land and natural resource rights;

(b) Lack of tangible livelihood benefits to indigenous peoples and local communities and lack of equitable benefit sharing;

(c) Exclusion from designing and implementation of policies and measures;

(d) Loss of traditional ecological knowledge.

8. Safeguards, if designed and implemented appropriately, will reduce the risks and enhance the potential benefits of REDD-plus, for example by ensuring that conversion of natural forests is avoided, and ensuring full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities based on the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, in particular the principle of free, prior and informed consent.

9. Action for multiple benefits needs to be taken at several levels. National governments play the key role in ensuring multiple benefits through the implementation of REDD-plus. National plans and national approaches benefit from the integration of climate change, biodiversity, and development objectives and strategies. This requires effective cross-sectoral coordination and harmonization of relevant policies and laws (agriculture, energy, environment, forests, biodiversity, and others), and integrated land use planning at the national scale.

10. Successful implementation of REDD-plus is dependent on transparent and effective national governance structures.

11. The CBD can support the implementation of REDD-plus through its programmes of work and its biodiversity monitoring efforts, including by:

(a) Encouraging the Parties to maximize the benefits for biodiversity, for example through prioritizing the conservation of natural forests;

(b) Supporting the work of the UNFCCC to operationalize safeguards[2];

(c) Developing a framework for monitoring the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity.

12. Capacity building efforts across all levels founded on comprehensive national self-capacity needs assessments, as well as information sharing, are needed in order to achieve multiple benefits of REDD-plus, including through coordinated efforts of the members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests and other relevant organizations.

13. Identifying and realizing multiple benefits can be supported through the application of:

(a) Spatially explicit tools, such as maps and ecological gap analyses, to identify synergies and tradeoffs among climate change, biodiversity, and social issues;

(b) The results of the The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) process;

(c) Social and environmental standards for REDD-plus;

(d) The recommendations of the CBD second Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Biodiversity and Climate Change.[3]

[2] Without prejudging ongoing or future negotiations.

[3] CBD Technical Series 41: *Connecting Biodiversity and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation*, available at www.cbd.int/ts

14. Key research and development needs in the context of REDD-plus multiple benefits include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

(g) Further collaborative work on the definitions on forests and forest types.

15. The workshop participants requested the Secretariat to make the workshop results available to the national focal points for the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. To further advance the results of this meeting, the experts recommended that the CBD could explore possibilities for a technical workshop organized jointly by the CBD and UNFCCC Secretariat on how the CBD can support REDD-plus safeguards, without prejudice to the negotiations.

II. WORKSHOP REPORT

16. The Global Expert Workshop on Biodiversity Benefits of Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries was held in Nairobi from 20 to 23 September 2010, with the generous financial support from the Government of Germany. It was co-organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the UN REDD Programme, with the aim to support the efforts of Parties in reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries in the framework of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, in a way that contributes to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity.[4]

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

17. The meeting was opened by Mr. Tim Christophersen (Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity) who welcomed participants to the workshop on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). He thanked the Government of Kenya and the United Nations Environment Programme as the hosts of the workshop, and the Government of Germany for the generous financial contribution that made the workshop possible, as well as the UN REDD Programme for the excellent collaboration in co-organizing the workshop.

18. Mr. Tim Kasten (United Nations Environment Programme) welcomed participants on behalf of the UN REDD Programme. He emphasized the interlinkages between biological diversity, climate change, and sustainable development. He thanked the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity for its commitment to the issue of multiple benefits of REDD-plus.

19. Ms. Alice Kaudia, the Environment Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources assured participants of the support of the Government of Kenya to the process and the workshop and urged them to optimize the diverse expertise at the workshop as they share their respective knowledge and experience. Having just concluded a national workshop on biodiversity, land-use and climate change, the government of Kenya appreciates the strong links between the UNFCCC and CBD initiatives on REDD-plus.

[4] Pursuant to decision IX/5 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

20. The workshop participants introduced themselves, outlining their affiliation, expertise and workshop expectations. A list of participants is included in annex II.

21. Mr. Tim Christophersen (Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity) outlined the organization of work.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

22. Ms. Alice Kaudia (Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, Kenya) and Mr. Martin Brasher (Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs, United Kingdom) were elected by acclamation as co-chairs of the meeting.

23. Mr. Martin Brasher, on behalf of the Government of the United Kingdom, emphasized that the workshop was expected to provide timely and pertinent information for Parties to the CBD, and was also relevant for the Parties to the UNFCCC. He expressed his hope that participants would share information and expertise in an informal setting rather than a negotiating forum. Such an approach could lead to a particularly productive outcome.

24. The workshop agenda (UNEP/CBD/WS-REDD/1/1) and organization of work (UNEP/CBD/WS-REDD/1/1/Add.1) were adopted.

ITEM 3. REDD-PLUS UPDATE

Presentations by international organizations

25. Mr. Tim Christophersen (Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity) provided an introduction to the CBD Secretariat activities in relation to CBD decisions IX/5, IX/6, IX/16 and IX/18. He introduced COP 10 draft decisions regarding REDD and outlined the linkages between biodiversity and forest carbon, underlining the role of biodiversity for forest resilience and thus the long term stability of carbon stocks. Mr. Christophersen introduced key tools for capturing multiple benefits of REDD. He concluded by outlining key knowledge gaps regarding biodiversity and REDD.

26. Ms. Maria Sanz-Sanchez (Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) presented the UNFCCC's perspective on REDD-plus. She outlined the state of UNFCCC negotiations on REDD-plus and gave an overview of UNFCCC decisions on methodological guidance and of the status of REDD-plus under the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long Term Collaborative Action (AWG-LCA). She also outlined knowledge gaps and opportunities with regards to REDD-plus from the perspective of the UNFCCC. Ms. Sanz concluded by encouraging participants to makes use of the UNFCCC REDD Web Platform, where information submitted by Parties and stakeholders can be posted.

27. Ms. J. Catalina Santamaria (Secretariat of the United Nations Forum on Forests) addressed the relationship between REDD-plus and developments on forest financing. Ms. Santamaria highlighted that the distortion of funding set only to a certain forest aspect could undermine a comprehensive approach to forest financing more broadly. She argued for a 360 degree view on forest financing to value other forest functions beyond carbon and timber. Ms. Santamaria also gave an overview of the work of the UNFF on forest financing, including the results of the recently held UNFF Ad Hoc Expert Group (AHEG) on forest finance which met from 13-17 September 2010 in Nairobi, Kenya. She also introduced the logo of International Year of Forests 2011, illustrating the multiple values and services of forests. Moreover, she mentioned Forests 2011 as an opportunity for a celebration of all things forests, reinforcing the message that forests are vital for the survival and well being of people everywhere.

28. Mr. Ravi Prabhu (United Nations Environment Programme/UN-REDD Programme) introduced the UN-REDD Programme. He focused on biodiversity aspects in the work of the UN-REDD Programme. Mr. Prabhu highlighted the win – win potential of the REDD-plus and sustainable development agendas. He also highlighted that REDD-plus with its potential to generate multiple benefits is a unique opportunity to transform the forest sector and forest landscapes because it unlocks the

potential of many ecosystem services. Mr. Prabhu introduced a suite of tools developed by the UN-REDD Programme to maximise benefits for climate, conservation and development

29. Mr. Eduardo Mansur (International Tropical Timber Organization) introduced the International Tropical Timber Organization which covers 80% of the world's tropical forests, and 90% of the world's tropical timber trade. He gave an overview of the ITTO REDDES Programme, which focuses on a wide range of environmental services of forests, and discussed lessons learnt from the programme. Mr. Mansur emphasized the complementarity of the REDDES Programme to other REDD programmes.

30. Mr. Dirk Gaul (Secretariat of the Global Environment Facility) introduced the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and focused on the newly created SFM/REDD-plus Program of the fifth replenishment cycle (2010-2014). In GEF-5, SFM/REDD-plus projects and programs will mainly be financed through individual GEF country allocations in three focal areas - biodiversity, climate change mitigation and land degradation. In addition, and learning from GEF-4 experiences, the GEF will provide clear incentives for its beneficiary countries to aim at optimizing multiple environmental and social benefits that can be gained from forest conservation and management projects. In that context, Mr. Gaul pointed out the creation of a separate funding envelope for the SFM/REDD-plus Program ($250 million), which shall be used as an incentive mechanism for countries to combine resources ($2 million - $30 million) from at least two GEF focal areas to create multiple benefits from REDD-plus and SFM projects. The ratio between focal area allocations and the incentive mechanism is 3:1, meaning that for every three dollars that countries invest in SFM/REDD-plus, they would get an additional dollar from the SFM/REDD-plus account. In total, the GEF Secretariat will provide up to $1 Billion for investments in SFM and REDD-plus for the period 2010 – 2014.

Presentations by country representatives

31. Ms. Julieta Bono (Argentina) provided an overview of the national monitoring system for native forests in Argentina. Ms. Bono also outlined key national legislation for the environmental protection of native forests and the national structure for REDD-plus planning. Argentina is a federal country of 23 provinces which each have jurisdiction over their forest resources. Efforts are ongoing to measure and monitor deforestation and forest degradation. Native forest carbon stock for whole country is based on field inventory. A new law requires that all jurisdictions should carry out land planning of native forests in their territory through a participatory process, based on defined environmental and social criteria. Key government institutions (e.g. Economy, Agriculture, Environment, provincial government), private sector stakeholders, and indigenous and local communities are involved in the participatory development of REDD-plus. Carbon, biodiversity and ecosystem services are addressed through specific mapping to plan for biodiversity and carbon priorities, including through national biomass carbon map. Ms. Bono concluded with lessons learned, in particular emphasising the usefulness of national and regional maps in order to take informed decisions, the need for spatial information at national level (ecosystem services, biodiversity and social and economic variables), the usefulness of overlapping information to identify areas where there is synergy between carbon and other REDD benefits, and the difficulty of monitoring co-benefits at the national level. Countries should start a monitoring process at local scale after exploration of co-benefits.

32. Mr. Eduardo Canina (Brazil) gave an overview of activities in Brazil related to REDD-plus. He pointed out some initiatives to protect and promote sustainable development in Brazilian tropical rainforests, for example, PPG7 (Pilot Programme for Tropical Forests), ARPA (Amazon Protected Areas), the Sustainable Amazon Plan (2008) and the Amazon Fund (2008). In 2004, the government launched the plan for prevention and control of deforestation in Amazon (PPCDAm), focusing on forest cover monitoring, enforcement of the forest law, land use planning, assignment of property rights, and promotion of sustainable use of forests. Since the inception of the plan, deforestation rates have decreased. In a preliminary survey 21 individual initiatives were identified, self-labeled as REDD-plus. About financing, Norway has pledged to provide up to 1 billion USD up the 2015, and Germany provides funds to the Amazon fund and technical cooperation. The UK supports the Amazon Fund, and south-south cooperation and the GEF provides funds to ARPA II. Brazil will launch a National Web Platform

for REDD-plus in October 2010. To finalize Mr. Canina reinforced that Brazil has other ecosystems as important as Amazon forest that have to be conserved.

33. Mr. Heng Chan Thoeun (Cambodia) introduced Cambodia's national experience with multiple benefits of REDD-plus. He emphasized that the Cambodia moves ahead with REDD readiness. Cambodia is currently preparing a REDD-plus roadmap which will be proposed the FCPF and UN-REDD Programme. Capacity building is a key issue for REDD readiness in Cambodia. Consultation of stakeholders in REDD readiness will proceed in three waves: internal government; with key development partners; and with environmental and conservation NGOs working on REDD, and consultation with indigenous peoples representations. Demonstration activities include e.g. 180,000 ha area to reduce deforestation, including monitoring. Cambodia includes the results of the CBD programme of work ecological gap analysis into national REDD planning. Based on existing policy frameworks, laws and regulations, Cambodia has established a National Protected Areas Strategic Management Plan, a Strategic Planning Framework for Fisheries, and a Biodiversity Master Plan (2011-2015). Key challenges for Cambodia lie in forest management and conservation, in particular in the establishment of forest plantations, biodiversity conservation in protected areas, national land use planning, improvement of forest management, lack of boundary demarcation, insufficient law enforcement, lack of capacity regarding REDD issues.

34. Mr. Haman Unusa (Cameroon) provided an overview of REDD and REDD-plus readiness preparation in Cameroon. In his presentation, he mentioned that Cameroon hosted a capacity building pilot project implemented by GAF-AG, MINEP, GTZ and MINFOF. The pilot project was funded by the German Bank for Reconstruction and Development (KfW), and based on this project experience, a REDD Pilot National Committee was formed in 2009 to coordinate the development of REDD activities in Cameroon and to oversee the implementation of the capacity building pilot project. A technical expert group was also designated by the Minister of Environment and Protection of Nature in 2009 to coordinate the elaboration of the R-PP for Cameroon. Within the REDD Pilot National Committee, various Ministerial departments, NGOs and indigenous organizations are represented. Experts on biodiversity from research institutes and universities are also involved. The project aims to extend collaboration with other COMIFAC countries. IUCN, WWF, WCS and the Center for Environment and Development (CED) are involved in REDD pilot initiatives, for example through the Pro-Poor REDD project of IUCN which focuses on the involvement and improvement of the livelihood of indigenous communities. HELVETAS also carried out a project with local and indigenous communities, training them on how to use hand-held GPS devices to identify sites of timber felling and in monitoring the proper implementation of SFM in forest concessions. At present, no carbon overlay maps have been developed. Cameroon is planning to extend the pilot projects to various ecological regions (mangrove forest, mountain forest, etc.), before deciding on the approach to adopt. The REDD Pilot National Committee will also be transformed into a national REDD committee.

35. Mr. Lucio Santos (Colombia) presented Colombia's national experience with multiple benefits of REDD-plus, including those for indigenous and local communities. A REDD Intersectoral Committee within the Ministry of Environment consults with government entities, NGOs, and local communities. A research project will support the planning and implementation of REDD to address key knowledge gaps and document the experience in REDD planning stages. Capacity building and methodologies for analyzing drivers of deforestation, and for forest monitoring, are being developed at national level including with a view to devolve forests to sub-national level. The R-PP under FCPF will be formally launched shortly. For the R-PP, relevant experiences have been made on participatory approach and consultations on key issues such as land tenure and community management. NGOs and local and indigenous people organizations are involved in the development of the R-PP and REDD Roadmap. Local communities manage around 80% of forest lands in Colombia. Relevant tools at national level include the CBD ecological gap analysis, including opportunities for ecological corridors; research projects on overlaying key information layers. Large amounts of geo-referenced information on ecosystems and eco-regions, exist, but this information needs to be further operationalized. A key challenge is include making sure that a good coordination exists between relevant actors; at the same time south-south collaboration

can serve to enhance capacity building and technology transfer. Another important challenge is developing a system that truly provides benefits to local communities and indigenous peoples

36. Mr. Mike Ipanga (Democratic Republic of the Congo) shared DRC's experience in the implementation of REDD-plus. In DRC, a national structure for REDD planning is composed of a national REDD Committee, an Interministerial Committee, and the National REDD Coordination (NC-REDD). An R-PP was submitted and approved in March 2010, the implementation phase has started. Deforestation pressure is growing around a large area of primary forests, while the eastern edge of the Cuvette is facing the highest deforestation rate in the country and is one of the most biodiverse areas in the world. Mr. Ipanga outlined the how biodiversity experts and indigenous and local communities are involved in REDD-plus activities. A REDD registry for project initiatives will be online in early 2011, inter alia with the aim to identify hotspot areas and to avoid double counting. DRC shares regional experience through an international exchange workshop, other south-south cooperation includes collaboration with Brazil. DRC has voluntary carbon market experience from 5 ongoing projects. Civil society is organized through the Groupe de Travail Climate REDD (GTCR), a network of over 500 NGOs that are also represented in the National REDD Committee. Given limited infrastructure, information dissemination and consultation are key challenges in DRC. DRC has not completed the national ecological gap analysis and this is not considered in REDD planning, but the gap analysis of biodiversity areas for REDD will be done based on IUCN and other regional work. DRC will develop a model to support decision making on REDD as well as general land use planning, to maximize multiple benefits of REDD, focusing mainly on economic development potential, priority investment in infrastructure and will integration biodiversity concerns in order to support decision on future protected areas. Main opportunities include a high level of support for biodiversity conservation, including goal to have at least 15% of total area of national territory in protected areas, and a Presidential Pledge to reach this objective. Challenges include low level of capacity, and high transaction costs because of infrastructure challenges.

37. Ms. Daniela Carrion (Ecuador) presented on how Ecuador takes into account multiple benefits in its REDD-plus plans. Ecuador is one of the 17 megadiverse countries. It also has one of the highest deforestation rates in South America, with almost 200.000 hectares lost annually. Strong political will exists to change this trend, reducing the deforestation rate is a national priority and the implementation of a REDD-plus mechanism is one of the alternatives to accomplish this goal, therefore REDD-plus is also a priority for Ecuador. Ecuador is developing its National Climate Change Strategy, it has two programmes (adaptation and mitigation), it is also developing a new forestry governance model and a National REDD-plus Strategy, which will contribute to both objectives, those of the National CC Strategy and the Forestry Governance Model. Multiple benefits are part of the national strategy as a cross-cutting element, for the country it is relevant that a REDD-plus mechanism delivers both, social and environmental benefits such as the maintenance of biodiversity and ecosystem services or the improvement of human wellbeing. Ecuador aims for a 'high quality' REDD-plus mechanism, which links forests with multiple benefits and sustainable development. The country's national REDD-plus strategy has six elements, including SFM/SMF and tenure regularization. Since September 2008, the programme 'Socio Bosque', an incentive-based policy for conservation of native forests and other ecosystems, gives incentives to local communities and forest dwellers who voluntarily conserve their forests. The goal is to conserve 4 million hectares in 7 years, through 1 million beneficiaries. In December 2009 Socio Bosque had 40,000 beneficiaries; in July 2010 conservation agreements were signed for 516.000 ha. Since 2009, Ecuador is also one of the countries that develops the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standard, through a work program with CCBA-CARE to apply in order to guarantee that all REDD-plus activities in the country deliver social and environmental benefits. Ms. Carrion further outlined the recent collaboration between Ministry of Environment and UNEP-WCMC to produce country level maps that overlay carbon/biodiversity/protected areas and other parameters (including social variables such as poverty, population density, indigenous communities, health, education, etc). Challenges for achieving multiple benefits include the need to unlock the economic value of multiple benefits and enhance this potential at country level; integration of the enhancement of multiple benefits in REDD-plus planning; capacity building to understand and promote multiple benefits; generation of country level information and data as

a tool for decision making ; monitoring of co-benefits; improving coordination between national agencies; generating forest finance; and raising general awareness of the linkages between forests and development.

38. Mr. Kefa Wamichwe (Kenya) shared the Kenyan experience with REDD-plus preparations. Kenya depends on forests and forest resources for a number of key ecosystem services, including water storage and purification and energy (fuelwood and charcoal). Deforestation is around 12,000 hectares per year. Since 2005, new forest legislation has improved the conditions for sustainable forest management. Forests are key reservoirs for biodiversity in Kenya, although they only cover 2% of the land. Based on support by the FCPF, Kenya started the process of preparing a readiness package through a multi-stakeholder, multi-institutional process. In 2008, the R-PIN was developed, currently the R-PP is being formulated, and implementation is foreseen for 2010-2013. Key steps in the development of the R-PP included a detailed analysis of deforestation drivers (including pressure of agricultural expansion; energy demands; infrastructure), analysis of policies relevant to REDD-plus (including forest, agriculture, infrastructure policies) and legal and technical requirements for different policies and measures; setting of Reference Emission Levels (REL); and confirmation of institutional roles and oversight for REDD-plus arrangements. For the implementation of REDD-plus, Kenya will focus on Community Forest Associations (CFAs) for projects, including afforestation and reforestation activities. Kenya also invests in water tower forests, including a massive restoration campaign for the Mau Forest Ecosystem (400,000 ha), which would be linked to REDD-plus pilot efforts. Key challenges include forest assessments to establish an emission reference scenario, establishing a monitoring system for emissions and emission reductions, generating synergies in support of REDD-plus activities across the stakeholder spectrum, enlisting formal support across the government to facilitate and entrench cross-sectoral collaboration, and the development of a benefit sharing framework.

39. Mr. Nathaniel Blama (Liberia) provided an overview of Liberia's REDD-plus preparations. Liberia is an important country for biodiversity, containing 42% of the Upper Guinea Forest in West Africa. Liberia's R-PP is the basis for the government's approach to REDD-plus, following the required stakeholder consultation, assessment of land use, forest policy, and governance. Part of the national experience with multiple benefits of REDD-plus efforts is that the ecological gap analysis under the CBD will be the basis for a tool for spatial analysis to support decision making regarding REDD-plus and its multiple benefits (see www.carbon-biodiversity.net). Opportunities include high level political will, e.g. REDD-plus will be linked directly to the office of the President, where the advisor to the President on energy and climate change drives the REDD-plus process. Challenges include the need to make decision makers fully understand the multiple benefits of REDD-plus, and to improve the capacity at all levels to achieve multiple benefits.

40. Ms. Karla Barclay (Mexico) presented on Mexico's experience regarding REDD-plus in public policy and its implementation. Mexico is a pilot country for both FCPF and the UN-REDD Programme. The country aims at a 'triple track' approach for REDD-plus that combines benefits for adaption, mitigation and biodiversity, with a view that conservation helps to increase carbon storage. Climate change is a cross-cutting issue in the design of national public policy. Ms. Barclay also gave an overview of Mexico's institutional framework for REDD-plus, pilot local experiences, and social co-benefits defined in the REDD readiness process. She emphasized that climate change is recognized in Mexico as a cross cutting issue in public policy. This is expressed inter alia in the creation of an Interministerial Climate Change Commission (CICC), consisting of 9 Ministries. After CICC was created, Mexico formulated the National Climate Change Strategy (ENACC) and a Special Programme of Climate Change (PECC). Mexico's National Structure for REDD-plus development consists of two planning bodies. CONAFOR, the National Forestry Commission, is planning for REDD through its REDD Technical Consultation Council, which includes civil society, Indigenous Peoples and academia. In addition, there is a special government working group of government officials for REDD-plus, which will develop the national vision for REDD-plus by December 2010, and a national REDD-plus strategy in 2011. Ms Barclay furthermore outlined Mexico's efforts of integrating the "triple track" of REDD-plus (mitigation, adaptation and conservation) and Mexico's partnership with Norway to develop a national MRV system. She concluded that Mexico's strengths regarding REDD-plus planning lie in the active participation of

civil society and indigenous and local communities, in the country's robust institutional framework for REDD, and its local pilot experience. Current challenges lie in enhancing the development of an MRV system and in the need to integrate mitigation, adaptation and conservation.

41. Mr. Krishna Acharya (Nepal) presented on the status of REDD-plus in Nepal. Nepal is a FCPF pilot country and UN REDD observer country. The R-PP has been assessed, and a grant allocated in July 2010. The R-PP aims at reducing greenhouse gas emissions resulting from deforestation and forest degradation by forest conservation and enhancement, by addressing the livelihoods concerns of poor and socially marginalized forest dependent people. Key principles include aligning the National REDD Strategy with Nepal's overall development strategy, enhancing coordination, ensuring multi-stakeholder involvement, utilising and building the capacity of existing multi-stakeholder institutions. The implementation of REDD has potential to capture and fully value the wide range of ecosystem benefits coming from forests including maintenance of biodiversity, soil and water conservation, sustainable development and economic growth as well as the value of timber and non-timber forest products. Mr. Acharya highlighted the importance of establishing a clear link between carbon ownership rights and land tenure and clarifying issues of rights to forests as a priority. Finally, recognising the important role that forests play in adaptation to climate change as well as their role in climate change mitigation through REDD-plus was emphasized. A main obstacle for achieving multiple benefits is that the real value of forest ecosystem services is not known or appreciated in decision making. Other challenges include addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation (e.g. high levels of firewood consumption), capacity building on biodiversity and local benefits at all levels, forest monitoring and data generation, and generation of forest investments.

42. Mr. Salisu Dahiru (Nigeria) gave an overview of the Nigerian experience with multi benefits of REDD-plus. Nigeria is in the planning stage for REDD-plus through observer status for UN-REDD Programme. Its R-PIN is developed for submission in 2010. The main planning organ is the National Technical Committee, which includes biodiversity experts from relevant organizations and representatives of indigenous and local communities. There is no voluntary carbon market experience to draw from. National ecological gap analysis will be considered in REDD-plus planning, and Nigeria has collaborated with UNEP-WCMC to start the process of developing multi-benefit tools including the mapping of biodiversity and carbon overlays at both national and state levels. The main obstacles in achieving multiple benefits from REDD-plus include poor funding, lack of awareness, poverty driven pressure on forest resources, and poor institutional capacity. Main lessons learned include the insight that so far the concept of multiple benefits is poorly understood, poorly assessed, not inventorized, and poorly harnessed.

43. Ms. Mayumi Quintos-Natividad (Philippines) introduced National REDD-plus planning in the Philippines. The Forest Management Bureau (FMB) under the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) together with the Code REDD spearheaded the formulation of the National REDD-Plus Strategy in the country. FMB is the national agency responsible for recommending policies pertaining to forest management. CoDe-REDD which stands for *Community Development, Community Developing-* and *Conservation and Development* through REDD is a nongovernment organization composed of forest-based communities and civil society organizations that are involved in livelihood, conservation, and community development projects in Philippine forests and are working towards pro-community and pro-conservation REDD through REDD-plus advocacy. Through Republic Act 9729 of 2009 which created the Climate Change Commission (CCC), climate change was mainstreamed into the government policy and established the Framework Strategy and Program on Climate Change. Likewise, through Executive Order 881 which was issued in April 2010, the CCC was designated to coordinate existing climate change initiatives, including REDD plus and other similar mechanisms while the DENR was designated to be the operational implementer of REDD-plus. At present, the Philippine National REDD-Plus Strategy (PNRPS) is already completed, as well as action plans for its implementation. The PNRPS articulates a common vision among stakeholders regarding the ways in which the REDD-plus agenda should be pursued in the Philippines. It presents a broad range of strategies and corresponding activities over a 10-year time horizon (2010-2020). It is a result of a series of consultations &

workshops/writeshops involving more than 500 stakeholders from various sectors of the society such as government agencies, local government units, research institutions, academia, non-government organizations, Peoples' Organizations, Indigenous Peoples, & community-based organizations. The strategy has seven major components which include enabling policies, forest sector governance, forest management, MRV, capacity building, research and development and sustainable financing. The national gap analysis had already been done and was used as one of the inputs in identifying and mapping Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs). The PNRPS prioritizes REDD-plus development in the following areas: a) sites where emission can be achieved at a reasonable scale and cost while also seeking to maximize co-benefits; b) tenured areas such as ancestral domain and community-based forest management areas where safeguards are strongest and there is greatest opportunity to deliver multiple benefits; and c) areas of key biodiversity concerns where REDD-plus can be leveraged to deliver maximum emission reductions, biodiversity conservation and ecosystem service protection. Opportunities include increasing level of political support for multiple benefits and the establishment of a multi-stakeholder REDD-Plus Council. Main obstacles for achieving multiple benefits lie in the fact that relevant safeguards, institutional arrangements, and conflicting policies are still to be addressed.

44. Mr. Lyndon John (Saint Lucia) presented on Saint Lucia's national experience with REDD-plus. Saint Lucia is a small island developing state, and as such, very vulnerable to climate change. Therefore, climate change is a national priority. 35% of the country is covered by forests, which are very divers and include a range of different forest types and ecosystems, and many endemic species. Forests are mainly in government reserves, which were established with the aim to secure water supply. The rate of deforestation has decreased substantially within 1994 – 2000 to approximately 100 hectares per year (due to fall in banana commodity prices). A biodiversity and forest inventory was carried out with EU support in 2009, including the development of maps that overlay fauna and flora, but not carbon. There is no REDD planning at the moment, but CARICOM members have a cautious, observing approach to REDD-plus, welcoming the opportunities to increase the value of standing forests. Saint Lucia recognizes that forest conservation and avoided deforestation and forest restoration are important climate change mitigation and adaptation measures. Saint Lucia's forestry department leads on terrestrial biodiversity assessment. Few or no experiences from the voluntary carbon market exists in any SIDS (as far as is known to Saint Lucia). A national ecological gap analysis is not directly done under the CBD but a priority exercise has been carried out to identify gaps. Opportunities include that Saint Lucia chairs the Sustainable Development on CARICOM, and that the country has a long tradition in multiple purpose forestry, and REDD-plus would fit the development and policy objectives. Challenges include the present lack of funds, but also lack of valuation of many ecosystem services, the general uncertainty about a post-Kyoto framework, and a lack of awareness at all levels. Saint Lucia would welcome support for REDD-plus preparations through the UN-REDD Programme or others.

45. Mr. George Kafumu (United Republic of Tanzania) gave an overview of REDD-plus activities in the United Republic of Tanzania. He said that the country is one of Africa's ten most forested countries, at about 39 per cent, but annual deforestation is estimated at 412,000 hectares. Forests provide many essential ecosystem services. The Government of Norway is supporting REDD-plus activities, and a national REDD Task Force was established to oversee development of the National REDD Strategy and Action Plan. All information is available on the national REDD website: www.reddtz.org. National stakeholders workshops were the basis for the draft strategy framework. Six demonstration projects are being implemented to explore various REDD-plus issues. In-depth studies were presented recently, including a study on existing voluntary carbon markets, and one on the role of REDD-plus for rural development. Opportunities include that REDD-plus offers new options for forest conservation and national, district, and village levels, and it can redress existing inequalities, e.g. through legal reforms and decentralised forest management, and land tenure reforms. REDD-plus will contribute to biodiversity conservation and ecosystem stability, including through the establishment of wildlife corridors and restoration of habitats. Challenges include, inter alia, information and data gaps, forest fires as a threat to carbon permanence, and leakage and REDD-related land use changes which may lead to increasing food insecurity. Other challenges include forest land grabbing, marginalization of the poor, funding for REDD-

plus activities, and high opportunity costs for REDD-plus in comparison to charcoal making and commercial logging.

46. Ms. Ngyuen Ngoc Linh (Viet Nam) introduced the status of REDD-plus in Viet Nam, as well as the prospects and constraints. The country's forests are home to over 20 million people, most of them poor and belonging to ethnic minorities. Forest cover has changed dramatically over time, especially in the time from 1975 to the present. From 1995 to 2006, forest cover increased but the changes are not always positive, as they include many plantations with low biodiversity and low carbon stock. Climate change response activities, including REDD-plus, are a high priority for the government. Vietnam's R-PIN was approved in 2008, and its R-PP is being developed. Wide consultations were held in the process. Approval by the UN-REDD Programme was achieved in March 2009. A pilot project area in the highlands is used to explore pertinent issues. The national REDD strategy has the objective to promote socio-economic development and alleviate poverty, including through restoration activities. A National Steering Committee includes Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, and other line ministries, chaired by the Prime Minister. A climate change network of IGOs is chaired by CARE, and a climate change network of NGOs has also been established. Opportunities include high political attention and support, alignment of the interests of multiple constituencies, and ongoing programmes and strategies. It is expected that REDD-plus will bring biodiversity co-benefits, and improved livelihoods, as well as improved forest management and governance. It is recognized that the involvement of indigenous and local communities is essential for the success of REDD-plus. A key challenge for REDD-plus activities lies in re-framing forest policy in the context of climate change. Further challenges include capacity building; integration and coordination among national agencies and other stakeholders, programmes and donors; integration of biodiversity conservation, establishing mechanisms for benefit sharing, clarification of tenure rights, and obtaining financial support and substantial investment from the donor community.

47. Mr. Aggrey Rwetsiba (Uganda) submitted a report on the national status of REDD-plus preparations. Uganda is in the process of completing: (i) a National REDD-plus Strategy or action plan and, as part of Uganda's low-carbon emission strategy; (ii) a National baseline over which to estimate any actions on REDD-plus ; and (iii) a robust and transparent national forest monitoring system for the monitoring and reporting of REDD-plus activities. In addition, Uganda is analyzing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and other issues required for participation in the pilot activities under the FCPF and UN REDD Programme. With the support of the initial FCPF grant of US$ 200,000, on the basis of the R-PIN submitted in 2008, is carrying out the development of the R-PP in a participatory manner. The activities in this regard include: (i) conducting workshops for stakeholder awareness about REDD-plus potential, issues, strategies and to develop support for REDD-plus activities; (ii) Preparation of an assessment of Uganda's land use, forest policies and governance to inform REDD-plus strategy development; (iii) setting-up of a multi-stakeholder national REDD-plus working group responsible for following up on REDD-plus activities; (iv) preparation of a consultation and outreach plan to be implemented during the implementation phase of the Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP), including conducting of consultations among key stakeholders; (v) preparation of an assessment of candidate activities for a REDD-plus strategy; (vi) preparation of terms of reference for the design of a national REDD-plus implementation framework, and risk assessment of a REDD-plus strategy; (vii) preparation of an assessment of the social and environmental impacts of candidate REDD-plus strategy activities; (viii) assessment of the investment and capacity building needs for the implementation of a national REDD-plus strategy; (ix) development of a reference scenario for emissions deforestation and degradation; and (x) completion and submission of the Readiness Plan template. The Readiness Proposal development process involves an assessment of drivers and impact of deforestation and forest degradation and relevant forest governance issues; development of strategy options and a set of actions to reduce deforestation and/or forest degradation, development of an institutional and legal implementation framework for REDD-plus Strategy; developing a monitoring system to measure, report and verify (MRV) the effect of the REDD-plus strategies and; a multi stakeholder consultation and participant plan outlining the participation and inclusion of relevant stakeholders in the planning and decision making process of REDD-plus implementation. With regard to progress towards REDD readiness, a national REDD-plus Working Group was formed and has been operational since March 2010. Three sub-groups

were also formed from the main working group under the themes of Methodology group, Consultations group and policy group. A secretariat was formed to support the national REDD-plus focal point. Opportunities include: high level political support; high interest of stakeholders in the consultations, including key decision makers at regional and local level. Challenges include lack of awareness, and delays in the schedule of work.

48. Mr. Mike Barrett (United Kingdom) presented ideas on how REDD-plus process might move forward, with a specific view to achieving multiple benefits. It seems clear that the scale of the benefits of REDD-plus for biodiversity and for human livelihoods will depend on how REDD-plus is designed and implemented. It is important to address safeguards for biodiversity in connection with social safeguards, because both are essential for the success of REDD-plus. Co-benefits are also essential for the credibility of REDD-plus, as any harm to biodiversity or indigenous and local communities could erode market and donor support. Safeguards are included in the present draft decision that emerged from UNFCCC COP 15, but there is no COP decision on safeguards yet. Options for implementing safeguards might include non-binding recommendations (arguably the existing text in the AWG-LCA constitutes a non-binding recommendation); financial support for positive activities for co-benefits ('preferential support'); establishment of minimum standards, or creation of additional incentives (where additional economic benefits are proportionate to the level of performance on co-benefits). Under the CBD, two draft targets of the new Strategic Plan are linked to REDD-plus (including target 5 and target 7). To determine whether risks are being minimised and whether co-benefits are being delivered will require a means to measure the impact of REDD-plus programmes. This in turn will require agreement upon the criteria (indicators) to be measured. One of the 'relevant international conventions' referred to under paragraph 2a of the draft UNFCCC Decision on REDD-plus is the Convention for Biological Diversity. This implies that, if the REDD-plus Decision is adopted by the UNFCCC in its current form, then the safeguards should reflect the objectives agreed within the CBD Strategic Plan. Key questions raised by the UK for the workshop discussions were: Will it be helpful for the CBD Strategic Plan to include a target that covers forest biodiversity and with that the development of indicators to measure progress on forest biodiversity? Should the targets and associated indicators for forest biodiversity that could be developed under the CBD be used to help implement REDD-plus safeguards and thereby support the objectives of the UNFCCC? How can we ensure coherency between safeguards for biodiversity and those for social criteria and reporting on carbon emissions?

Presentation of indigenous and local communities

49. Mr. Elifuraha Laltaika (Community Research and Development Services (CORDS), Tanzania) gave a presentation on behalf of indigenous representatives from Africa. Many African countries do not recognize the existence of indigenous peoples within their borders, partly due to colonial history. Lack of recognition has resulted in lack of constitutional, legislative and administrative measures to ensure that indigenous peoples enjoy their rights on equal footing with other communities. Many countries voted in favour of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Another window for promotion of indigenous people's rights in the continent is the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights (ACHPR) which established the Working Group of Experts on the Rights of Indigenous Populations (WGIRIP). The working group identifies some groups as being indigenous peoples of Africa. Despite lack of recognition at the national level, many groups organize themselves around the concept of Indigenous Peoples and engage in REDD-plus development at local and international levels. The focal point for their engagement is the Indigenous People Forum for Climate Change (IPFCC). There is a strong realization amongst Indigenous Peoples that climate change is increasingly and disproportionately affecting their lives. In this context, they view REDD-plus as an important opportunity for the recognition of Indigenous Peoples and their rights, but also for conserving the biodiversity and forest they depend on. Indigenous Peoples in Africa see a need for minimum safeguards and standards for peoples and the environment, which should reflect the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) as well as the Ecosystem Approach (EA), and they should be based on the principle of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), and related to Article 8(j) of the CBD. There is a risk of land grab related to REDD-plus and its financial flows, and a perpetuation of the negative stereotype linked to

Indigenous Peoples. REDD-plus also carries the risk that laws, policies and plans might negatively affect Indigenous Peoples' rights to land, natural resources, livelihoods and culture. Governments are likely to implement projects that will impact negatively on Indigenous Peoples' lives. Risks also stem from the fact that benefit sharing is not being taken into account and that REDD-plus may cause evictions from ancestral land. Multiple benefits are in line with indigenous peoples' conception of forest management. Most of the indigenous peoples' lands in Africa are already under some sort of legal protection (such as protected areas). In the view of indigenous peoples, forests mean much more than mere carbon stocks, they entail very important cultural and spiritual values. A holistic approach will ensure acting in accordance with international instruments such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and not focus solely on monetary benefits. Mr. Laltaika concluded that land tenure issues need to be considered more seriously; that there is a need to build capacities of policy makers on Indigenous Peoples issues, and that there is a need to promote the UNDRIP as a working tool for engagement of indigenous peoples in REDD issues.

Presentations by other relevant organizations

50. Ms. Celia Harvey (Conservation International) highlighted the parallels between efforts to address biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation (REDD-plus) in forests. Both require good governance and active participation and support of local stakeholders. The synergies are very obvious, but there are some differences between mitigation and biodiversity agenda: Seen through the 'climate lens', differences among forests lie only in their carbon stock, however, from a biodiversity perspective, it is important to look at the forest type and the forest interventions (from primary, intact forests to plantations). Areas that are of highest priorities for mitigation are not necessarily the highest priorities for biodiversity conservation. (For climate change mitigation high priority areas are those of high risk of deforestation, high carbon, and low opportunity and transaction costs. For biodiversity conservation, high priority areas are those with high numbers of endemic and threatened species, with biodiversity under greatest threat, and ecosystems that are underrepresented in current protected areas.) Geographic priorities also do not always overlap, e.g. Madagascar or the Brazilian cerrado are very important for biodiversity, but do not have as much carbon as (other) tropical forests. Possible options for ensuring biodiversity benefits in REDD-plus include safeguards, but also require the MRV of safeguards / benefits. Furthermore, forest management in areas that are still primary/pristine should be prevented. These areas should be conserved. The definition of forests at international level will be important, in particular regarding forest types and types of forest use. More information is required on deforestation risks, as well as on costs (opportunity, transaction and implementation costs). REDD-plus should be planned and implemented in a landscape context. Forest conservation must be accompanied by sustainable wildlife policies and measures; and ecological connectivity should be a key biodiversity benefit.

51. Ms. Christine Schmitt (University of Freiburg, Germany) presented the policy paper 'Greening REDD-plus: Challenges and opportunities for forest biodiversity conservation', an output of the research project 'The protection of forests under global biodiversity and climate policy'. Ms. Schmitt gave a brief overview of the wording on biodiversity safeguards and benefits in the latest AWG-LCA negotiation text of the UNFCCC. She pointed out that biodiversity safeguards could be viewed as the minimum requirements for avoiding apparent risks for biodiversity that need to be endorsed at the international level. In contrast, she referred to biodiversity benefits as activities contributing to both mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and biodiversity conservation that need to be specified according to national and local circumstances. Regarding biodiversity safeguards, pending issues that need to be resolved internationally include agreement on adequate definitions for forest types and forests-related management activities under REDD-plus, consideration of inter-ecosystem leakage, and the documentation of safeguards. The implementation of biodiversity benefits strongly depends on the design of the national REDD-plus strategies and requires integrated land-use planning, clear biodiversity objectives and a national documentation system for safeguards and benefits. Ms Schmitt highlighted that countries can draw from a wealth of existing biodiversity data and expertise generated by national and international organisations and suggested the establishment of a national biodiversity data base to facilitate the

development, assessment and monitoring of national and sub-national biodiversity objectives and indicators. She also pointed out that activities under the CBD can support countries in incorporating biodiversity consideration into their national REDD-plus strategies, and that the CBD needs to take a proactive stance in addressing biodiversity issues under REDD-plus nationally and internationally.

52. Mr. Robert Nasi (Center for International Forestry Research) gave an overview of research needs related to REDD-plus and biodiversity. He pointed out that forests are the best form of land use for retaining a high carbon stock, even with forestry interventions such as selective logging, when compared to forest conversion. When compared to spending on other policies, measures and commodities (e.g. economic stimulus spending in the past years), funding needs for REDD-plus are relatively small. Key research questions are related to land tenure and land use rights, and to MRV (reference levels; what to monitor; and which reference levels). In terms of social benefits, research is needed on equity issues, in particular related to Indigenous Peoples and minority groups, and gender. Definitional issues include the need to define FPIC, and the assessment of social impacts. Especially important is the development of objectively verifiable and easily measured indicators, and knowledge on context specific synergies and trade-offs. Also, market research is important on investors' attitudes and concerns about co-benefits.

ITEM 4. RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES OF REDD-PLUS IN THE CONTEXT OF CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF BIODIVERSITY

53. The workshop participants broke out into three working groups for in-depth discussions. Each working group addressed four main issues: (i) identifying main risks associated with REDD-plus, and how these could be addressed; and (ii) identifying main opportunities for synergies between the implementation of REDD-plus and the CBD programme of work on forest biodiversity, (iii) identifying the main risks and opportunities of REDD-plus for indigenous and local communities, and (iv) key research needs in relation to REDD-plus and biodiversity and indigenous and local communities. The three working groups provided detailed recommendations on these issues. The groups were facilitated by Mr. Tim Christophersen (Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity), Mr. Niklas Hagelberg (United Nations Environment Programme/UN-REDD Programme), and Ms. Celia Harvey (Conservation International). Rapporteurs for the Groups were Ms. Karla Barclay (Mexico), Ms. Daniela Carrion (Ecuador), and Mr. C. Lyndon John (Saint Lucia).

54. Following discussions in the working groups and reports back to plenary, the participants adopted a set of recommendations on REDD-plus attached as Annex I to this report.

ITEM 5. ADOPTION OF THE WORKSHOP REPORT

55. Following discussion in plenary, the participants adopted the present report.

ITEM 6. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

56. The Co-Chairs congratulated participants for their work and closed the meeting at 5 p.m. on 23 September 2010.

Annex I

CONSOLIDATED WORKING GROUP RESULTS

Topic 1: Biodiversity safeguards: identifying main risks associated with REDD-plus, and developing recommendations setting out how these risks can be avoided or mitigated.

Biodiversity risks

If REDD-plus is not agreed upon or designed and implemented in an effective way, the expected biodiversity benefits will not materialize. Unless REDD-plus also emphasizes the conservation of forests, it may deliver only very limited biodiversity benefits.

Risks related to lack of knowledge

Unless there is a good understanding of the terminology and concept of biodiversity among key decision makers, REDD-plus may not achieve biodiversity benefits.

Risks related to carbon stock enhancement:

- Depending on how "carbon stock enhancement" is defined and implemented, this could incentivize the use of exotic tree species or new fast-growing species, some of which may become invasive or could have other negative impacts for biodiversity.
- Some of the activities eligible under REDD-plus, if planned inappropriately, could impact negatively on intact natural forest and their biodiversity.

Risks related to forest management

- If not planned appropriately, forest management activities could result in negative consequences for natural ecosystems and their functions, and may lead to the future conversion of natural forests into mono-culture/plantations

Risks related to conflicting policies:

- Without comprehensive land use planning, REDD-plus may not be successful in delivering the expected biodiversity benefits, because there could be diverging priorities relating to carbon and biodiversity objectives.
- Policies designed to place an economic value on forests, especially on carbon, may not capture the biodiversity value of forests.

Risks related to leakage:

- REDD-plus may result in increased land pressure (for timber, agriculture, firewood, etc.), a shift of deforestation or forest degradation to areas of low carbon, but of high biodiversity value or non-forested ecosystems, negatively impacting the biodiversity of those systems, within or between countries.

Risk related to definitions and scope of REDD-plus:

- If REDD-plus does not incentivize the conservation of standing forests, countries with low deforestation rates may not benefit from the implementation of the mechanism; on the contrary, they could start experiencing higher deforestation and associated biodiversity loss.
- If net deforestation rates are reported, these could mask deforestation of old-growth forest, negatively affecting biodiversity.
- Without a clearer classification of forests (e.g., natural, modified, plantations of exotic species) under the UNFCCC or within national REDD-plus strategies, REDD-plus might incentivize the expansion of biofuel production, with negative impacts on biodiversity.

Risk related to overburdening the UNFCCC REDD-plus mechanism with biodiversity requirements:

- There is a risk of overburdening the REDD-plus mechanism if biodiversity issues related to baselines and monitoring processes are seen as an obstacle for implementation.

Biodiversity recommendations

Carbon stock enhancement:

- Afforestation /reforestation activities could help conserve biodiversity if they, for example, convert only degraded land or ecosystems largely composed of exotic species, include native tree species, consider the invasiveness of non-natives, and are strategically located within the landscape to enhance connectivity.
- A MRV system for biodiversity safeguards would help countries in setting up national REDD strategies that consider these threats.
- Countries need to carefully research the potential invasiveness of species (as they are doing now) before introducing them into afforestation activities.

Conflicting policies:

- Policies that integrate and promote the conservation and enhanced sequestration of soil carbon, including in peatlands and other wetlands as well as in grasslands and savannahs, can contribute to climate change mitigation and be beneficial for biodiversity and ecosystem services.
- REDD planning at the national level should consider the harmonisation of relevant policies amongst sectors such as agriculture / energy / environment / infrastructure / wildlife, along with REDD in order to promote synergies and avoid overlap and conflicts that will lead to negative effects for biodiversity.
- There is need for balanced and coordinated policies between local, regional and national level
- Need for clear linkages between the programmes of work under the Convention on Biological Diversity on protected areas and forest biodiversity and REDD at the national level.

Leakage:

- Countries should pay attention to the pressures on other ecosystem types that could result from successfully maintaining forests.
- Inter-ecosystem leakage could be avoided by comprehensive land use planning that does not only consider forest but also non-forest ecosystems and related biodiversity objectives.
- The design of the REDD mechanism should be in such a way that it supports or contributes to the conservation of the whole range of ecosystem types and associated values.

Definitions and scope of REDD-plus:

- Establishing reference emission levels in a way that allows countries with high forest cover but low deforestation rates to participate in REDD-plus would result in enhanced biodiversity benefits.
- REDD-plus needs to incentivize the maintenance of existing forest cover.
- There is a need for countries to establish more precise definitions of forest and different forest types and other ecosystems, e.g., the FAO definitions for primary forest and other forest types, in order to avoid the conversion of natural forests into plantations.
- At the international level, there is the need for minimum criteria to define different forest types.

Monitoring of biodiversity:

- The CBD includes within its new framework of targets and indicators an indicator of the impacts of REDD-plus on biodiversity.

- Achievement of biodiversity objectives needs to be measured and reported with appropriate indicators. Clear criteria, method, etc are required and that should result in a monitoring framework or REDD-plus standards developed to ensure social and environmental benefits
- Countries could create synergies between biodiversity monitoring and ongoing MRV for carbon.

Awareness raising, research needs and capacity building:

- Development of relevant information, economic and trade-off analysis and mapping tools in order to help policy makers take informed decisions regarding REDD-plus and its multiple benefits.

Topic 2: Optimizing multiple benefits: identifying main opportunities for synergies between the implementation of REDD-plus and the CBD programme of work on forest biodiversity; identifying the tools and processes needed to achieve and optimize these synergies; and identifying how these tools and processes could be improved.

Recommendations to optimize multiple benefits:

- With its post-2010 Strategic Plan, the CBD should establish a target on monitoring of the impacts of REDD-plus on forest biodiversity with specific indicators. The CBD should include biodiversity safeguards for REDD-plus under its programme of work on forest biodiversity.
- National plans and policies, such as REDD roadmaps, strategies and NBSAPs, should mainstream climate change (REDD-plus) and biodiversity.
- A process should be promoted between CBD and UNFCCC to raise the need and opportunity to link mechanisms and recommendations. In addition national MEA focal points should have formal means of collaboration.
- Biodiversity hotspots and areas with high carbon values should be identified through land use planning processes. This planning should ensure protection of high biodiversity values, in particular primary forests, reduced fragmentation and/or increases connectivity. In addition, fragile areas should be identified and protected. Tools that can support this planning, includes spatial analysis.
- Capacity-building should be provided on the role of biodiversity and associated benefits within REDD-plus.
- Increase awareness-raising efforts, informing decision-makers about the linkages between biodiversity, climate change and national development aspirations, including that REDD-plus ensures ecological stability and enhances ecosystem services.
- CBD COP10 should recognize the importance of REDD-plus for forest biodiversity conservation.
- The CBD should consider addressing REDD-plus not only through its PoW on forest biodiversity but also through other programmes since some of the drivers of deforestation are outside the forestry sector.
- Consider available environmental and social standards for REDD-plus design and implementation.
- Incorporate the economic values of forests ecosystem services in national REDD-plus communication and strategies (research need at national level).
- Develop guidance for transparent financial mechanisms and benefit sharing arrangements.
- Consider national and sub-national screening criteria for REDD-plus projects/initiatives to include biodiversity and ILC criteria. Biodiversity and ILC selection criteria should be used when identifying priority areas for REDD-plus piloting.

- There should be a robust monitoring and reporting system for multiple benefits and safeguards, as well as methods for the integration of biodiversity concerns in the development of reference levels including in situ methodologies of species inventory and monitoring.
- The CBD through its programme of work on forest biodiversity can support the implementation of REDD-plus, in particular with respect to maximising the benefits for forest biodiversity conservation.
- The CBD could help the UNFCCC in operationalizing the safeguards without prejudging the outcome of the REDD-plus agreement.
- Promote biodiversity as a central pillar of achieving REDD-plus

Topic 3: Indigenous and local community benefits: identifying risks to indigenous and local communities, and developing recommendations how these risks can be avoided or mitigated; identifying the main opportunities for achieving benefits from REDD-plus for indigenous and local communities, and developing recommendations how these benefits can be maximized. Under this point, participants are asked to consider specifically articles 8(j) and 10 (c) of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Risks and recommendations on indigenous and local communities

Potential risks to indigenous and local communities

- This mechanism could lead to a loss of traditional territories and a restriction of land use, ecosystem services rights and sovereignty, including eviction of ILCs from their ancestral land.
- By monetizing forest carbon, this mechanism might increase the financial value of forests and trigger a land grab by governments and private investors, taking forests away from ILCs.
- The mechanism could negatively impact on the traditional livelihoods and endanger access and benefit sharing (ABS).
- May deny access to environmental services like spiritual, traditional knowledge and ancestral medicines, among others.
- The mechanism could affect and interfere their rights to full and effective participation in the development in their lands and territories.
- This mechanism could not achieved its objectives if there is no full support of ILC and the rights of the ILC are not recognized in the whole process, from planning to implementation processes.
- Indigenous cultural values may be threatened by external influences and pressures of livelihood and lifestyles change.

Recommendations

- ILC are likely to benefit more from this mechanism where they own their lands, where there is the principle of free, prior and informed consent and where their identities and cultural practices are recognized and they have space to participate in policy-making processes involving local stakeholders, in particular women.
- The mechanism need to establish a framework for access and benefit-sharing that provides for equitable benefit-sharing between key stakeholders involved in the process and also within the communities receiving the benefits.
- The mechanism should take into account spiritual and traditional values of forest resources for ILCs.
- Full and effective participation of local and indigenous communities in accordance with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, in particular, indigenous peoples rights to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC).
- National Governments could make use of existing institutions of ILC or institutions that ILC recognize and work with in order to equitably distribute benefits among ILC.

Opportunities

- The REDD-plus mechanism should directly compensate indigenous and local communities to prevent a loss of indigenous and local communities' property rights over forests that could result from pressure to sell forest.
- Political will should be strengthened to increase the participation of indigenous and local communities in land-use planning.

Annex II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

A. Government experts

Argentina

Ms. Julieta Bono
Biologist
Secretariat for Environment and Sustainable Development
San Martin 451 3° OF. 339, Buenos Aires
Argentina
Tel: 54 11 43488642
Fax: 54 11 43488486
E-mail: jbono@ambiente.gob.ar

Bolivia

Ms. E. Carla Ledezma Garcia
National Programme on Climate Change
Ministry of Environment and Water
Camacho Av. # 1475La Paz, Bolivia
Tel: +591 (2) 2200206, 22111055
E-Mail: carlaledezma@gmail.com

Brazil

Mr. Eduardo V. Canina
Department of Climate Change
Secretariat of Climate Change and Environmental Quality
Ministry of Environment
Esplanada do Ministerios
Bloco B, Sala 836
Brazilia-DF
Tel: +55 61 2028-1020
E-Mail:Eduardo.canina@mma.gov.br

Cambodia

Mr. Heng Chan Thoeun
Deputy Director & National Team Leader for Vulnerability and Adaptation Assessment TWG
Ministry of Environment
No. 48, Samdech Preah Sihanouk
Tonle Bassac, Chamkarmorn
Phnom Penh
Cambodia
Tel.: (855) 23 218 370
Fax: (855) 23 218 370
E-Mail: hcthoeun@yahoo.com, hcthoeun@gmail.com

Cameroon

Mr. Haman Unusa
Ecological Monitoring Unit
Ministry of Environment and Protection of Nature
P.O BOX 320, Ministerial Building No. 2, Yaoundé,
Cameroon
Tel: +237 99 49 01 10/ +237 79 38 87 47/ +31 659016014/ +31 683027095
E-Mail: hamanunusa@yahoo.fr; unusahaman71@gmail.com

Colombia

Mr. Lucio Andres Santos Acuna
Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial
Grupo de Mitigacion de Cambio Climatico
Calle 37# 8-42
Tel : 3323400 ext 1179-1182
Fax : 3323400 ext 1173
E-Mail : lsantos@minambiente.gov.co

Democratic Republic of the Congo

Mr. Bruno Guay
Conseiller Technique (PNUD)
Coordination Nationale REDD de la RDC
Tel: +243(0)99 702 6504
E-Mail: Bruno.Guay@undp.org

Mr. Mike Ipanga Mwaku
Ministère de l'Environnement
15 Av Papa i Leo, Kinshasa, Gombe
DR Congo
Tel: +243 8436789 et 999060697
E-Mail: mikeipanga@yahoo.fr

Mr. Danely Mitonga Kasulu
Chef de Bureau Bioprospection
Direction de Developpement Durable
Ministère de l'Environnement
15 Av Papa Leo
Kinshasa, Gombe
DR Congo
Tel: +243 898 78 72 79, +243 998474014
E-Mail: danelykasulu@yahoo.fr, mitonga-kasulu@hotmail.com

Ecuador

Ms. Daniela Carrión
Responsable del Desarrollo del Tema REDD
Subsecretaría de Cambio Climático
Ministerio del Ambiente
Madrid y Andalucia
Quito, Ecuador
Tel: 593 023987600
E-Mail: dcarrion@ambiente.gob.ec

Fiji

Mr. Samuela Lagataki
Deputy Conservator of Forests
Forestry Department
Box 2218
Government Buildings
Suva
Fiji Islands
Tel: 3301611
E-Mail: samuela_lagataki@yahoo.com

Germany

Mr. Christian Großheim
Dipl. Forstwirt / M. sc. forest. trop.
Bundesamt für Naturschutz
Fachgebiet II 3.1 "Agrar- und Waldbereich"
Konstantinstr. 110
53179 Bonn
Tel. +49 (0)228-8491-1825
Fax +49 (0)228-8491-1819
E-Mail: Christian.Grossheim@BfN.de
Web: http://www.bfn.de

Japan

Mr. Tatsuo Seino
Deputy Director
Ministry of the Environment
1-2-2, Kasumigaseki,
Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo, Japan
Tel: +81-3-5521-8247
Fax: +81-3-3581-4815
E-Mail: tatsuo_seino@env.go.jp

Kenya

Ms. Alice Kaudia
Environment Secretary
Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources
NHIF Building, Ragati Road
P.O. Box 30126-00100
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: + 254-20-2730808
Fax: +254-20-2727771
E-Mail: alice.kaudia@gmail.com; environmentsecretary@environment.go.ke
Web: http://www.environment.go.ke

Mr. Kefa M. Wamichwe
Senior Assistant Director
Kenya Forest Service
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: +254 722863364
E-Mail: kmwamichwe@yahoo.com

Mr. Meshack Ogora
Superintending Geologist
Mines and Geology Department
Box 30009-00100
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: +254 0728 702410
E-Mail: ogoromeshack@yahoo.com

Mr. Maina Manyeki
Deputy Director
Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife
P.O. Box 41394
Nairobi
Kenya
E-Mail: mainamanyeki@yahoo.com

Liberia

Mr. Nathaniel T. Blama, Sr.
Administrative Assistant/ National Focal Point, Program of Work on Protected Areas
Environmental Protection Agency of Liberia
4th Street Sinkor, Tubman Boulevard
Monrovia, Liberia
Tel: +2316518635
E-Mail: natpolo2000@yahoo.com

Mexico

Ms. Karla Barclay Briseno
Unidad Asuntos Internacionales
Vincente Guerrero K 8-7
Col. Del Carmen, DCL
Coyoacan, CP 04100
Mexico, DF
Mexico, D.F.
Tel: + 52 55 56286400 X 12255
Fax + 52 55 56280694
E-Mail: karla.barclay@semarnat.gob.mx; karla.barclay@gmail.com

Nepal

Mr. Krishna Prasad Acharya
Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation
Singh Durbar Kathmandu
Nepal
Tel: 00977 1 4211892, 4313437
E-Mail: kpacharya1@hotmail.com

Nigeria

Mr. John Auta
Federal Ministry of Environment
Federal Department of Forestry
Plot 393/394
Augustus Aikhomu Way, Utako District
Abuja, Nigeria
Tel: +234 8023751134
E-Mail: jkauta2007@yahoo.com

Mr. Salisu Mohammed Dahiru
Federal Ministry of Environment
Federal Department of Forestry
Plot 393/394
Augustus Aikhomu Way, Utako District
Abuja, Nigeria
Tel: +234 8030570625
E-Mail : sdahiru85@yahoo.com

Norway

Mr. Audun Rosland
Special Director on Climate Change and Forest
Ministry of the Environment
P.O. Box 8013 dep, NO-0030
Oslo, Norway
Tel: +47 22 24 58 34
Fax: +47 22 24 27 56
E-mail: Audun.Rosland@md.dep.no

Philippines

Ms. Nancy Reano-Corpuz
Senior Ecosystems Management Specialist
Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau
Dept of Environment and Natural Resources
Quezon Ave, Diliman
Quezon City
Philippines
Tel:+632 920 44 86/9240109
E-Mail: nancycorpuz@yahoo.com

Ms. Mayumi Quintos-Natividad
Chief, Forest Management Specialist
Forest Management Bureau
Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Visayas Ave, Diliman
Quezon City, Philippines
Tel: (632) 9262141
Fax: (632) 9208650
E-Mail: mayquin@mozcom.com

Saint Lucia

Mr. C. Lyndon John
Assistant Chief Forest Officer
Forestry Department
Union
Castries
Saint Lucia
West Indies
Tel: (758) 468-5635
Mobile: (758) 486-8645
E-Mail: lynjohn1@yahoo.com; lynamazon@gmail.com

United Republic of Tanzania

Ms. Zainabu Shabani Bungwa
Vice President's Office
PO Box 5380
Dar es Salam
United Republic of Tanzania
Tel: +255 22 2118416
Mobile: +255 754759518
Fax: +255 22 2113856
E-Mail: shabani_zainabu@yahoo.com

Mr. George Revocatus Kafumu
Vice President's Office
PO Box 5380
Dar es Salam
United Republic of Tanzania
Tel:+255 22 2118416
Mobile: +255754657330
Fax:+255 22 2125297
Email: grkafumu@yahoo.com

Uganda

Mr. Aggrey Rwetsiba
Uganda Wildlife Authority
Plot 7, Kira Rd Kamwoyka
PO Box 3530
Kampala, Uganda
Uganda
Tel : +256 772 499 735
Fax : +258 414 346291
E-Mail: aggrey.rwetsiba@ugandawildlife.org; aggreyrwetsiba@yahoo.com

United Kingdom

Mr. Martin Brasher
Deputy Director of Wildlife and Countryside Group
Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs
Nobel House
17 Smith Square London
SW1P 3JR
Tel: +44 (0)117 372 8277
Mobile: +44 (0)7785 267931
Fax: +44 (0)117 372 8688
E-Mail: Martin.Brasher@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Mr. Mike Barrett
Policy Lead on International Climate Change
Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs
Area 1B
Nobel House
17 Smith Square London
SW1P 3JR
Tel: +44 20 7238 6934
Tel: +44 7880723672 (mb)
E-Mail: Mike.barrett@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Viet Nam

Ms. Nguyen Ngoc Linh
Head of Division
Biodiversity Conservation Agency
Building N5, 99th Leduan St
Hanoi Vietnam
Tel: +84 4 39212029
Fax: + 84 4 9412027
E-mail: nlinh@nea.gov.vn; nngocl@yahoo.com

B. United Nations and specialized agencies

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

Mr. Tim Christophersen
Programme Officer
Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413 St. Jacques Street, Office 800
Montreal Quebec, H2Y 1N9
Canada
Tel.: +1-514-287-7036
Fax: +1-514-288-6588
E-Mail: Tim.Christophersen@cbd.int
Web: http://www.cbd.int

Mr. Johannes Stahl
Junior Professional Officer
Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413 St. Jacques Street, Office 800
Montreal Quebec, H2Y 1N9
Canada
Tel.: +1-514-287-6683
Fax: +1-514-288-6588
E-Mail: Johannes.Stahl@cbd.int
Web: http://www.cbd.int

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

Ms. María J. Sanz-Sanchéz
Programme Officer/ATS
UNFCCC Secretariat
Bonn, Germany
Tel: + 49 (0) 228 815 1844
Fax: + 49 (0) 228 815 1997
E-Mail: MSanz-Sanchez@unfccc.int
Web: http://www.unfccc.int

United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF)

Ms. Catalina Santamaria
Forest Policy Affairs Officer
United Nations Forum on Forests
UNFF Secretariat, Department of Economic and Social Affairs
One United Nations Plaza, DC 1 Room 1248
New York, NY 10017
United States of America
Tel.: 1-212-963-4703
Fax: 1-917-367-3186
E-Mail: santamaria@un.org
Web: http://www.un.org/esa/forests/

UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre

Mr. Barney Dickson
Head of Programme, Climate Change and Biodiversity
UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre
219 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0DL, UK
Tel: +44 1223 277314
E-Mail: barney.dickson@unep-wcmc.org

UN-REDD Programme

Mr. Ravi Prabhu
Sr. Programme Officer,
Forests and Climate Change
Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI)
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Nairobi, Kenya, P.O. Box 30552 (00100),
Phone: +254 20 762 5723
Fax: +254 20 762 4249
E-Mail: Ravi.Prabhu@unep.org
Web: http://www.un-redd.org

Ms. Julie Greenwalt
Programme Officer
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Tel.+254 20 762 5729
Mobile. +254 (0)725 528 175
E-Mail:Julie.greenwalt@unep.org
Web: http://www.un-redd.org

Mr. Niklas Hagelberg
Programme Officer
Freshwater & Terrestrial Ecosystems Branch/DEPI
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
P.O.Box 47074 Gigiri, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: (+254 20) 762 4840 or (+254) 0733 684 111
E-Mail: Niklas.Hagelberg@unep.org
Web: http://www.un-redd.org

Ms. Linda Rosengren
Natural Resources Officer
UN-REDD Programme Secretariat
International Environment House
11-13 Chemin des Anémones, CH-1219 Châtelaine

Geneva, Switzerland
Tel. (+41) 2291 78397
E-mail: linda.rosengren@un-redd.org
Web: http://www.un-redd.org

C. Intergovernmental organizations

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

Mr. Robert Nasi
Programme Director
Environmental Services and Sustainable Use of Forests
Center for International Forestry Research
PO Box 0113
BOCBD
Bogor Barat 16000, Indonesia
Tel.: +62 251 8622 622
E-Mail: r.nasi@cgiar.org
Web: http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/

Commission des Forêts d'Afrique Centrale (COMIFAC)

Mr. Chouaibou Nchoutpouen
Expert suivi Biodiversité et Désertification
Commission des Forêts d'Afrique Centrale (COMIFAC)
B.P. 20818 Yaoundé, Cameroun
Tél.: (237) 22 21 35 11 (Bureau) /99 52 34 07 (Portable)
Fax: (237) 22 21 35 12
E-mail: cnchoutpouen@yahoo.fr

Global Environment Facility (GEF)

Mr. David Cunningham
Programme Officer
Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF)
United Nations Environment Programme
900 17th Street, NW, Suite 506
Washington, DC 20006, USA
Phone: +1 202 621 5021
E-Mail: david.cunningham@unep.org
Web: http://www.unep.org/stap

Mr. Dirk Gaul
Forestry Specialist, Natural Resources
Global Environment Facility (GEF)
G 6-604, 1818 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20433, USA
Tel: +1 (202) 458-9023
Fax: +1(202) 522-2720
E-Mail: DGAUL@TheGEF.org
Web: http://www.thegef.org

International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)

Mr. Eduardo Mansur
Assistant Director, Reforestation and Forest Management
International Organizations Center - 5F
Pacifico-Yokohama
1-1-1, Minato-Mirai, Nishi-ku
Yokohama, 220-0012 JAPAN
Tel.: +(81-45)223-1110
Fax: +(81-45)223-1111
E-mail: mansur@itto.int
Web: http://www.itto.int

D. Indigenous and local community organizations

Centre d'Accompagnement des Autochtones Pygmées et Minoritaires

Mr. Pacifique Mukumba Isumbisho
Executive Director
Centre d'Accompagnement des Autochtones Pygmées et Minoritaires Vulnérables (CAMV) and African Civil Society Representative on UN REDD Policy Board
Democratic Republic of the Congo
Mobile: +243997706371
E-Mail: camvorg@yahoo.fr

Community Research and Development Services

Mr. Elifuraha Laltaika
Program Officer
Community Research and Development Services (CORDS)
Tanzania,
Tel: +255272505668,
Mobile phone: +255788660301
E-Mail: cords@habari.co.tz; elilaltaika@yahoo.com

Dupoto forest and wildlife association

Mr. Samwel Naikada
Coordinator- Dupoto forest and wildlife association
Box 1 Kilgoris- Kenya
Tel: +254 735432354
E-Mail: naikada2005@yahoo.com

First Peoples Worldwide

Ms. Mary Simat
Board member
Box 711
Narok, Kenya
Tel: +254 722 857 793
E-Mail: maweedm257@gmail.com

Indigenous Information Network

Ms. Edna Kaptoyo
Programme Officer Indigenous Information Network
Box 74908-00200
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 721845096 / +254-020-2499389/8
E-Mail: ednakaptoyo@yahoo.com; iin.kenya@gmail.com

United Organization for Batwa Development in Uganda

Mr. Peninah Zaninka
Director United Batwa Organization in Uganda
Box 169 Kisoro Uganda
Tel: + 256 77660810
E-Mail: zaninkah@yahoo.com; uobdvbatwa@gmail.com

E. Others

Conservation International

Ms. Celia A. Harvey
Vice President
Global Change and Ecosystem Services
Conservation International
2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500
Arlington, VA 22202
USA
Tel: 703 341 2775
Fax: 703 979 2514
E-Mail: charvey@conservation.org
http://www.conservation.org

Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP)

Ms. Sarah Simons
Executive Director
Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP)
United Nations Avenue,
P.O. Box 633-00621
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel : +254-20-7224035/4061
Fax: +254-20-7122150
E-Mail: s.simons@gisp.org
Web: http://www.gisp.org

Global Witness

Ms. Rosalind Reeve
Climate & Forests Campaign Manager
Global Witness
Tel: +254 726 993377 / 733 616869
Tel (UK): +44 791 251 7128
E-Mail: rreeve@globalwitness.org; roz.reeve@gmail.com
Web: http://www.globalwitness.org

Green Belt Movement International

Mr. Peter Ndunda
Green Belt Movement International
Development House
56-64 Leonard Street
London, United Kingdom
EC2A 4LT
E-Mail: pndunda@greenbeltmovement.org

Greenpeace

Dr. Janet Cotter
Greenpeace International Science Unit,
Innovation Centre 2, Rennes Drive
University of Exeter,
Exeter, UK EX4 4RN
Tel: +44 (0)1392 247 925/920
E-Mail: J.Cotter@exeter.ac.uk

State University of New York

Ms. Lauren Eastwood
Center for Earth and Environmental Science
State University of New York at Plattsburgh
101 Broad Street
Plattsburgh, NY 12901
E-Mail: eastwole@plattsburgh.edu

University of Freiburg

Ms. Christine Schmitt
Institute for Landscape Management
Tennenbacher Str. 4
D-79106 Freiburg
Phone: +49-(0)761-203-3630
Fax: +49-(0)761-203-3638
E-Mail: christine.schmitt@landespflege.uni-freiburg.de

Wildlife Works Carbon

Mr. Hassan Sachedina
VP Conservation Enterprise
Wildlife Works Carbon, LLC
Kenya
Tel: +254 752 474709 and +254 771 722523
E-Mail:hassan@wildlifeworks.com
Web: http://www.wildlifeworkscarbon.com
