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Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD plus)

Environmental Problem
- Forests store about 638 gigatonnes (Gt) of carbon
- 50% more carbon than in the atmosphere
- Gross deforestation averages 13m ha/year (net loss 7.3 million ha/year)
- Responsible for 20% - 25% of global GHG emissions

Challenges to a Solution
- Scary scale
- Uncertainty: methodological issues, leakage, permanence
- Sovereignty issues and country specific circumstances
- Environmental, social and socio-economic effects
REDD+: Where we are coming from…

- 1997: No incentives to reduce deforestation in the Kyoto Protocol
- 2003: Exclusion of avoided deforestation from the CDM/Limited scope for A/R under the CDM
- 2005: Submission by governments of PNG and Costa Rica (FCCC/CP/2005/MISC.1) to COP11 (Montreal)
- 2007: the first dedicated REDD decision under the UNFCCC (2/CP.13) [Bali Action Plan]
- 2007-2009: intense discussions on (what became) REDD+ resulting in an almost decision at Copenhagen
- 2009: Informal Working Group on Interim REDD+ Finance
- 2008 – : various national proposals for REDD+ finance
AWG-LCA: REDD+

• Need for flexible, practical, balanced and comprehensive policy approaches. Should be voluntary and encourage wide participation, taking into account national circumstances
• General agreement on phased approach
• Agreement on safeguards and involvement of IP and local communities
• Still controversial: Funding sources (market vs non-market), role of subnational activities

**Phase 1:**
- national REDD-plus strategy development and core capacity-building;
- supported on the basis of needs

**Phase 2:**
- implementation of REDD+ actions
- supported on the basis of needs (Component “a”)
- incentivized on the basis of proxies for results (Component “b”)

**Phase 3:**
- implementation of REDD+ actions
- incentivized on the basis of MRV’d GHG emissions/removals against agreed reference
AWG-LCA: REDD+

Countries shall develop

- National reference levels or national reference emissions levels and MRV systems
- National [action plans] [strategies] [or subnational strategies]

Financing through

- A window of the relevant financial mechanism under the Convention funded through Party contributions and/or innovative funding sources
- A flexible combination of market approaches and funds, depending on the countries’ preferences

MRV

- Of action and support
Safeguards: REDD+ has to

- Complement or be consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements;
- Be transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty;
- Respect the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities, by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws, and noting that the General Assembly has adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;
- Include the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, including in particular indigenous peoples and local communities;
- Be consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity.
Copenhagen Accord

- Aspirational 2°C target, with GHG emissions peaking as soon as possible
- A pledge-and-review process of
  - Quantified economy-wide emissions targets for 2020 by developed countries
  - Nationally appropriate mitigation actions of developing country Parties
to be reported every 2 years
Copenhagen Accord (cont’)

Among others, the supporting countries:

Recognize the crucial role of reducing emission from deforestation and forest degradation.

Agree on the need to provide positive incentives to such actions through the immediate establishment of a mechanism including REDD-plus.
US Bills and REDD+

- Both Waxman Markey (ACESA) as well as Kerry Boxer give special consideration to REDD and offer support through a set-aside of allowances (to manage allowance prices) and through the creation of eligible offsets.
- Cantwell-Collins’ CLEAR does not consider REDD
- Kerry-Graham-Lieberman not yet published, but likely to consider REDD
REDD+ in ACESA and Kerry-Boxer

• Both ACESA and Kerry-Boxer allow offsets from REDD, but subject to quantitative and qualitative limits:
  • Max. of 1bn tons in intl offsets. Credits 4 tons for every 5 submitted
  • Limited to countries that adopt national reference levels, except:
    – State or province level projects allowed (phased out after 5 years)
    – Project-level activities in smaller countries (phased out 5-13 years)
• Other requirements
  – Equitable sharing of profits and benefits with local communities
  – Consistent with any applicable UNFCCC requirements
• Activities compared to baseline deforestation levels
  – Reference period generally considers historical deforestation over 5 years
• Kerry-Boxer modifications:
  – EPA has jurisdiction over offsets and establishes DOJ Office of Offsets Integrity
  – No requirement for performance standards on uncapped sources
  – REDD is more stringent with stronger protections for communities and ecosystems and the requirement to monitoring of leakage for project-based RED
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