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The Past

................ up to Paris
FOREST.... One of the fragments of the Land Use Sector

LULUCF

MITIGATION ACTIVITIES

• KP 3.3, 3.4
  • FM
  • CM
  • GM
  • Re-vegetation

• WL activities

• CDM AR

• REDD+ 5 activities
Forest in the context of Climate Change

Always were part of the UNFCCC

Kyoto Protocol

.... But started unbalance
Fear that avoiding deforestation cheap credits will flood the emerging offsetting carbon markets.

COP6 The Hague
One of the elements that contributed to failure: Art. 3.3, 3.4 (and 12 LULUCF)

COP6bis Bonn Agreement
- Avoiding Deforestation not included in CDM (only A/R)
- LULUCF modalities agreed

COP11/MOP1, Montreal
- KP LULUCF applied (A1)
- Reducing emissions from deforestation back to the COP Agenda (Non-A1)

COP13
REDD included in BAP
New round of negotiations (LCA and KP AW)

COP17, Durban
2 CP KP LULUCF Modalities concluded
New round of negotiations continued under LCA

COP15
Copenhagen

COP19
REDD+ modalities concluded (WFW)

COP21 Paris

Deforestation represents approx. 20% Global Emissions, 4AR
The Present

.......... Status by 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INDCs</strong></th>
<th><strong>LULUCF activities as reflected today</strong></th>
<th><strong>Annex I</strong></th>
<th><strong>Non Annex I</strong></th>
<th><strong>Both</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Reporting only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Comprehensive coverage of LULUCF:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Forestry: land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cropland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Grassland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Settlements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non CO₂ emissions from agricultural practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive coverage of agricultural practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Voluntary (unless elected in the 1st CP):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cropland management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Grazing land management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Revegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wetland drainage and rewilding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LULUCF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Afforestation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reforestation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deforestation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Forest management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Activities: LULUCF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Afforestation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reforestation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allowed activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non CO₂ emissions from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agricultural practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kyoto Protocol 2nd commitment period

- QELRC (Annex I KP Parties)
- Legally-binding economy wide targets; liabilities if commitment unmet
- Incentives provided for non-Annex I

### Kyoto Protocol CDM

- (non-Annex I)
- To contribute to mitigation action in the forest sector and to seek results-based finance

### REDD+

- (developing countries)
- National, or subnational as an interim step
- To enhance mitigation action

### NAMAS

- (non-Annex I)
- Not specified

A wide range of activities in the land use sector have been submitted.
## REDD+ building blocks and Guidance

### Basis for implementation

---

Iversen 2014

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>UNFCCC Channel</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Information Hub</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Strategy (NS) or Action Plan (AP)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>When seeking RBP</td>
<td>As appropriate, link to NS or AP</td>
<td>9/CP.19 para 3 &amp; 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National FREL / FRL</td>
<td>FREL / FRL submission</td>
<td>Technical assessment in context of RBP</td>
<td>When ready (especially when seeking RBP)</td>
<td>FREL/RL Submission &amp; final assessment report</td>
<td>9/CP.19 para 3 &amp; 11 (b) 13/CP.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFMS including MRV</td>
<td>Technical Annex BUR</td>
<td>Technical assessment in context of RBP</td>
<td>Every two years</td>
<td>Final technical report</td>
<td>9/CP.19 para 3 &amp; 11 (a) &amp; (e) 14/CP.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguard (SG) Information</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>Approximately every four years</td>
<td>Summary of information on addressing &amp; respecting SG</td>
<td>9/CP.19 para 3 &amp; 11 (c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Related processes

Nat Com

GHGs Inv

---

www.bc3research.org
**REDD+**  MRV an example where to we easily can go beyond....

- Consistency between the REDD+ Annex and GHG inventory is a must!
  - REDD+ activities and Land Use categories conversions in the GHGs inventories if developed simultaneously are more likely to be consistent

- To address drivers of deforestation land use information is needed beyond forest lands!
  - Conversions to croplands and grasslands are relevant (need to match agriculture statistics and spatially explicit data with forest conversions)
  - Natural regeneration of natural forest happens in abandoned lands
  - Grey area for agroforestry and plantations (rubber, palm oil etc) between FL and croplands (depends on country decisions)

- Overall information on Forest and LU is necessary to design REDD+ strategies to be nested in broad land use management plans
REDD+ Long road from Bali to Paris...

- Full set of decisions guiding countries from readiness towards piloting.
- Many actors supporting readiness, from NGOs, bilateral cooperation, multilateral initiatives - Coordination challenge still exist.
- Longer processes than expected, overlapping phases. Managing expectations.
- Many realizing solutions are broader than forest.

Yet financing to come for implementation...
How countries approach...

REDD+ / RELs/RLs
Present of REDD+ - Emerging Challenge

- Consistency across different potential scales of implementation is becoming a challenge (national, sub-national, project levels).
- Consistency and credibility of estimates for RELs/RLs (historic data vs present and future data, GHGs inv)
- Assessment of adjustments, national circumstances understanding and substantiation

…. Challenges observed while countries are constructing their RELs/RLs, and during the TAs.

Next to come the TAs of their BURs and new GHGs inventories in parallel to the improvements of their RELs/RLs
Where developing countries are...

- Most countries undergoing readiness activities (up to 60 countries progressing at different speed) supported bilaterally and by multilaterals (i.e FCPF RF and UNEDD Prog.)
  - Many countries developing National REDD+ strategies
  - Some countries with more define strategies and moving towards demonstration activities or implement and RBPs (e.g Brazil, Mexico, Ecuador, Viet Nam, Guyana)
- Many counties engaged in RBP bilateral (Norway, UK, Germany) and multilateral initiatives (FCPF CF)
Where developing countries are on NMFS and RELs/RLs (UNFCCC)

- Many countries developed NFMS or have partially developed the essential elements

- 6 Countries with the 1st REL/RL reviewed (Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Guyana, Malaysia)

- 9 new RELs/RLs submissions sent of expected by end Jan 2016 (Vietnam, Peru, Chile, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Paraguay, Rep. Congo, Zambia, Costa Rica)
Where countries are on reporting to access RBPs (UNFCCC)

- One ready for the GCF payments (Brazil, reporting 2.9 Billion tones 1st BUR, REDD+ Annex)

- 2 to 3 expecting to send the 1st BUR REDD+ Annex in 2016

- Few countries with other visions, such broader sustainable development (Gabon) and joint adaptation and mitigation approach (Bolivia)

All struggling with the investment gap...
But .... More participation, planning and integration

Realities still today...

...We hope so
Other issues pending

- Stronger verification provisions if markets are used for RBPs?
- Issues referred to methodological issues related to non-carbon benefits resulting from the implementation of REDD-plus?
- Methodological guidance for JAM…?
- New issues from Paris mitigation articles?
The Future
10 views on the future of REDD+
So what’s next for REDD+? Ten experts from across the globe give their take

REDD+ is just one tool in the toolbox for tackling climate change. We’re in the real **building phase now**, we’re past the hype—we need to get past the disillusionment and start doing the hard work. **Louis Verchot**

We have **everything we need now** to make REDD+ work. **Nur Masripatin**

Now we have a combined challenge of uncertain returns on the carbon investments, complicated engineering of REDD+ actions, and a **complex policy context with multiple priorities**. **Peter Holmgren**

A $5 carbon price is nothing compared with other traditional development opportunities in forest areas. So we are trying to **combine approaches for generating resources**—domestic funding, development assistance, as well as results-based REDD+ payments. **Yitebitu Moges Abebe**

If we understand REDD+ as a national mechanism that **can be inserted into the broader management of large landscapes**—including agricultural activities that are usually the main drivers of deforestation—and in which countries develop a variety of public policies, measures and actions to address deforestation, the future of REDD+ is very interesting. **Gustavo Suarez De Freitas Calmet**

The evidence that protecting forests is actually a good idea from a green growth, “enlightened self-interest” perspective is also far stronger today than it was in 2008. **A number of tropical forest countries** are realizing that and **acting on it**. **Pharo Per Fredrik Ilsaas**

If there is payment for the results presented, I **expect that more countries will engage** in REDD+. **Thelma Krug**

REDD+ will have **to evolve toward broader land use and agriculture issues**, and link in with issues of adaptation and food security while enhancing forests as a storehouse of carbon and ecosystem services. **Martin Herold**

We will see a “race to the top” **among states, provinces and nations, each seeking to attract investment** and gain full access to markets. **Dan Nepstad**

The way forward is for forested countries to assume a stronger role and ownership in the implementation of REDD+, and to **incorporate it into their INDCs and in their domestic emission targets**. **Arild Angelsen**

**BC3**
BASQUE CENTRE FOR CLIMATE CHANGE
Klima Aldaketa Ikergai

www.bc3research.org
10 views on the future of REDD+

So what's next for REDD+? Ten experts from across the globe give their take.

REDD+ is just one tool in the toolbox for tackling climate change. We’re in the real building phase now, we’re past the hype—we need to get past the disillusionment and start doing the hard work. Louis Verchot

We have everything we need now to make REDD+ work. Nur Masripatin

Now we have a combined challenge of uncertain returns on the carbon investments, complicated engineering of REDD+ actions, and a complex policy context with multiple priorities. Peter Holmgren

A $5 carbon price is nothing compared with other traditional development opportunities in forest areas. So we are trying to combine approaches for generating resources—domestic funding, development assistance, as well as results-based REDD+ payments. Yitebitu Moges Abebe

If we understand REDD+ as a national mechanism that can be inserted into the broader management of large landscapes—including agricultural activities that are usually the drivers of deforestation—by which countries develop a variety of public policies, measures and actions to address deforestation within the REDD+ framework. Gustavo Suarez De Freitas Calmet

The evidence that protecting forests is actually a good idea from a green growth, “enlightened self-interest” perspective is also far stronger today than it was in 2008. A number of tropical forest countries are realizing that and acting on it. Pharo Per Fredrik Ilsaas

If there is payment for the results presented, I expect that more countries will engage in REDD+. Thelma Krug

REDD+ will have to evolve toward broader land use and agriculture issues, and link in with issues of adaptation and food security while enhancing forests as a storehouse of carbon and ecosystem services. Martin Herold

We will see a “race to the top” among states, provinces and nations, each seeking to attract investment and gain full access to markets. Dan Nepstad

The way forward is for forested countries to assume a stronger role and ownership in the implementation of REDD+, and to incorporate it into their INDCs and in their domestic emission targets. Arild Angelsen
10 views on the future of REDD+

So what's next for REDD+? Ten experts from across the globe give their take

REDD+ is just one tool in the toolbox for tackling climate change. We're in the real building phase now—past the hype—past the disillusionment.

We have everything we need now. We need REDD+ to strengthen governance and reduce deforestation.

And challenges remain. It all rests on the complex policy context with multiple priorities.

Combining REDD+ with other tropical development approaches for generating resources—domestic funding, development assistance, as well as results-based REDD+ payments.

Yitebitu Moges Abebe

We have everything we need now to make REDD+ work.

Nur Masripatin

Now we have a combined challenge of uncertain returns on the carbon investments, complicated engineering of REDD+ actions, and a complex policy context with multiple priorities.

Peter Holmgren

A $5 carbon price is nothing compared with other traditional development opportunities in forest areas. So we are trying to combine approaches for generating resources—domestic funding, development assistance, as well as results-based REDD+ payments.

Yitebitu Moges Abebe

A $5 carbon price is nothing compared with other traditional development opportunities in forest areas. So we are trying to combine approaches for generating resources—domestic funding, development assistance, as well as results-based REDD+ payments.

If we understand REDD+ as a national mechanism that can be inserted into the broader management of large landscapes—including agricultural activities that are usually the main drivers of deforestation—and in which countries develop a variety of public policies, measures and actions to address deforestation, the future of REDD+ is very interesting.

Gustavo Suarez De Freitas Calmet

The evidence that protecting forests is actually a good idea from a green growth, "enlightened self-interest" perspective is also far stronger today than it was in 2008. A number of tropical forest countries are realizing that and acting on it.

Pharo Per Fredrik Ilsaas

If there is payment for the results presented, I expect that more countries will engage in REDD+.

Thelma Krug

REDD+ will have to evolve toward broader land use and agriculture issues, and link in with issues of adaptation and food security while enhancing forests as a storehouse of carbon and ecosystem services.

Martin Herold

We will see a "race to the top" among states, provinces and nations, each seeking to attract investment and gain full access to markets.

Dan Nepstad

The way forward is for forested countries to assume a stronger role and ownership in the implementation of REDD+, and to incorporate it into their INDCs and in their domestic emission targets.

Arild Angelsen

But how to achieve long term mitigation goals.........
Context

The Global Goals provide the broad context for Climate Action. Multilateral Climate Change Agreements provide objectives, means and guidance to achieve the ultimate goal of the UNFCCC. *Same actors will play this game.*
Opportunity towards the future...

Developing Countries are seriously considering at this stage their potential to contribute to mitigation of Climate Change in the context of their INDCs, and the Paris Agreement endorsed this process.

Emerging question

How REDD+ is going to be used to increase the global level of ambition in this context?
The way forward
When dealing with lands, governments look for best options...

The tools are not so different of what is promoted thanks to REDD+:

- Inventories (NFI)
- Land cover and use maps

.... layers of useful information

to attribute in the overall planning the most suitable use for the land according to their priorities:

protection, forestry, agriculture, urban, etc.
Diversity of approaches...... (different priorities)

........Similar goal
REDD+ is moving towards piloting and implementation in many countries.....

- **Consistency across different potential scales of implementation is becoming a challenge**, needs to be considered at early stages of design (national, sub-national, project levels).

- **REDD+ not linear**, more a cycle, step wise approach (i.e MRV). **Timing and scale of finance matters** to country processes and differences.

- Paris provided a broader context, domestically there is a need to **ensure REDD+ this will contribute to sustainable land use** if long term mitigations is aimed.
Few figures on REDD+ on finance...

Does finance target all? ->
Most of the finance goes to governments, and few countries

Is finance flowing?
-> Disbursement is slow

It is enough pledges for the absorption capacity?
-> Disbursement stabilized at USD 0.4 Billions per year while pledges on average are above.
Not a single standard solution, need to adapt to country situations....

Source: FCPF

Cumulative emission reductions

- Result based climate finance
- Climate finance (investment)
- General finance for sustainable land use
- General finance for activities leading to deforestation/degradation
- TA

Amount of Finance

to match demand of finance to achieve sustainable results....
REDD+ in Paris

Article 5

1. Parties should take action to conserve and enhance, as appropriate, sinks and reservoirs of greenhouse gases as referred to in Article 4, paragraph 1(d), of the Convention, including forests.

2. Parties are encouraged to take action to implement and support, including through results-based payments, the existing framework as set out in related guidance and decisions already agreed under the Convention for: policy approaches and positive incentives for activities relating 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; and alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests, while reaffirming the importance of incentivizing, as appropriate, non-carbon benefits associated with such approaches.
147 Parties corresponding to 146 countries submitted 119 INDCs by 1 October 2015. The INDC of the European Union (1 INDC representing 29 Parties / 28 countries)
A more refined analysis of the LULUCF sector by JRC indicates:

- The INDC submissions reflect the widely different countries circumstances and perspectives, unavoidable in a country-driven process.

- Assuming full implementation of INDCs, it is expected by 3030 to provide a quarter of planned countries emission reductions.

74 Parties included LULUCF
LULUCF sector – Technical potential DCs

UNEP 2015 Gap Report

- Technical potential in developing counties between 6.7 to 11.9 GtCO$_2$eq (mostly based in scientific papers and IPCC AR), excluded enhancement in forest remaining forest.

- No INDCs constrain.

### Table 6.1: Technical potential for forest related mitigation activities for developing countries (GtCO$_2$ in 2030, median (range)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Reduced deforestation</th>
<th>Reduced degradation and forest management</th>
<th>Afforestation and reforestation</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.6 (0.2-0.8)</td>
<td>0.5 (0.2-0.9)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7 (1.9-3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean</td>
<td>1.9 (1.2-2.5)</td>
<td>0.1 (0.0-0.2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (2.3-3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia-Pacific</td>
<td>1 (0.4-1.4)</td>
<td>0.3 (0.1-0.6)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.5 (1.7-3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peatland degradation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3.5 (1.8-4.7)</td>
<td>1.7 (0.3-1.7)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9 (6.7-11.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forest are still an important part of the solution!

If developing countries act....

Thank You