

The International Climate Debate - Historical Context and Structure

REDD+ Training Workshop
Port Moresby, PNG
11th September 2013



Presentation Outline

- Structure of the UNFCCC related to REDD+
- History of REDD+ negotiations
- Implications for national actions

UNFCCC article 2: Objective

- ..stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. Such a level should be achieved within a time-frame sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change, to ensure that food production is not threatened and to enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner.



Conference of the Parties (COP): Decision making body of the UNFCCC

- Meets annually, in November or December

Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technical Advice (SBSTA):

Under the COP, provides scientific and technical advice

- Meets several times a year to address an agenda set by the COP

Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI): Under the COP, provides advice on implementation

- Originally only the Kyoto Protocol, but now addressing MRV for NAMAs, so relevant to REDD+

Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action

under the Convention (AWG-LCA): Subsidiary body to identify long-term cooperative action to be presented to the COP. Main REDD+ negotiating body

Ad Hoc Working Group on the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP):

Subsidiary body to discuss future commitments for industrialized countries under the Kyoto Protocol. LULUCF included – analogous to REDD+

Inter-governmental panel on climate change (IPCC):

International body for the assessment of climate change. It was established by UNEP and WMO in 1988 to provide a clear scientific view on the state of knowledge of CC and its potential environmental and socio-economic impacts

REDD History

- Dec. 2005 REDD Proposal to COP11 (Montreal)
- Presented by PNG & Costa Rica on behalf of CfRN
 - Agreed to 2-year SBSTA agenda item
- Dec. 2007 COP 13: Bali Action Plan
- Dec. 2009 COP 15 (Copenhagen): Fast start finance pledge
- 30 billion US\$ 2010-2012, 100 billion in 2020
 - Important methodological decision on REDD(+)

REDD History

Dec. 2010

COP 16 (Cancun): Major progress on:

- Phasing of REDD+ (3 phases)
- REDD+ activities (5 “eligible activities”)
- Safeguards (7 “Cancun safeguards”)
- Scope of REDD+ (national, with sub-national on an interim basis)

Dec. 2011

COP 17 (Durban): The “Durban Platform”

- Some clarity on MRV (reporting as CO_{2eq}; peer review)
- Guidance on safeguards and RELs/RLs
- REDD+ window in GCF

Dec. 2012

COP 18 (Doha): Not much new



Phasing

Phase 1: Development of national strategies or action plans, policies and measures, and capacity-building

Phase 2: Implementation of national policies and measures and national strategies or action plans that could involve further capacity-building, technology development and transfer and results-based demonstration activities

Phase 3: Results-based actions that should be fully measured, reported and verified



Project-based versus Planning-based approaches

Why do many think in terms of a Project-based Approach?

- Familiar to everybody – “comfort zone” for government and non-governmental stakeholders
- Easy to conceptualize and compartmentalize – limited need to involve multiple stakeholders
- Discreet and direct funding arrangements
- Easy reporting to superiors/donors





Some of the Problems with a Project-based Approach:

- Scale
- Addressing underlying causes
- Leakage and permanence
- MRV
- Carbon rights
- Management of the process



Problems with a Project-based Approach: Scale

Cambodia

FRA 2010 estimates 55M tonnes of C lost from forest ecosystems in the period 2005-2010: 11M tonnes/year

Only VCS-registered project with verified emission reductions is Oddar Meanchey. Estimate 7.1M tonnes of C emissions avoided over 30 years = 0.24M tonnes/year (so, to make Cambodian forests C-neutral would require 46 similar projects)

Total cost of OM project: \$2M = \$29/ha. Revenues @ \$2/tonne = \$14M over 30 years (\$460,000/yr, or \$6.76/ha/yr)

- **Scale**
- Addressing underlying causes
- Leakage and permanence
- MRV
- Carbon rights
- Management of the project

Problems with a Project-based Approach: Underlying Causes

GEF

In GEF-2, Biodiversity funding supported site-based projects, especially protected area projects

Overall performance assessment of GEF-2: “... *great projects ... with limited impact in terms of conserving biodiversity ... because site-based projects cannot deal with systemic barriers*”

For example, in REDD+ terms: integration of planning processes; strengthening of forest law enforcement; mitigation of corruption risks

- Scale
- **Addressing underlying causes**
- Leakage and permanence
- MRV
- Carbon rights
- Management of the project

Problems with a Project-based Approach: Leakage and permanence

Leakage: Addressing a driver in one geographical area simply shifts the driver to another area previously unaffected. The result is no net benefit. A national (planning-based) approach eliminates domestic leakage (not international leakage)

Permanence: REDD+ interventions should carry a reasonable expectation of permanence – this is much less likely in a project-based approach that, by its nature, is temporary

- Scale
- Addressing underlying causes
- **Leakage and permanence**
- MRV
- Carbon rights
- Management of the area

Problems with a Project-based Approach: MRV

In a project based approach the actual carbon stocks in the site area must be measured. In a national (planning-based) approach, total carbon stocks across the country are estimated

Oddar Meanchey (Cambodia): 150 biomass estimation plots for 68,000ha = 1 plot/450ha (cost estimate @\$1,000/plot = \$2.21/ha)

National REDD+ programme: 4000 plots for 10,700,000 ha = 1 plot/2,700 ha (cost estimate @\$700/plot = \$0.26/ha)

- Scale
- Addressing underlying causes
- Leakage and permanence
- **MRV**
- Carbon rights
- Management of the project

Problems with a Project-based Approach: Carbon Rights

In a project based approach the benefits provided are based on actual carbon stocks in the site area. Therefore it is critical to know who owns the carbon, and therefore emission reduction credits. This can be a difficult legal process in which traditionally marginalized groups might lose out; risk of loss of benefits if carbon lost

In a national programme, benefits accrue to the nation (“Viet Nam owns the carbon”). Sharing of the benefits cannot be on the basis of local carbon stocks, as they are unknown. Therefore it must be on the basis of some other measure (e.g., inputs), can carbon rights be irrelevant.

- Scale
- Addressing underlying causes
- Leakage and permanence
- MRV
- **Carbon rights**

Problems with a Project-based Approach: Management of the process

In a project based approach you need a project proponent. The motivation of project proponents may be financial (maximizing their individual profits), or biodiversity (for a conservation NGO), or other factors. They are not to maximize the benefits, including social benefits such as poverty reduction, to the nation.

Only in a National REDD planning-based approach can social and development goals be planned and realized. Priority sites for interventions, benefit distribution and other issues can be set to optimize total environmental and social benefits, so the system is nationally owned.

- **Scale**
- **Addressing underlying causes**
- **Leakage and permanence**
- **MRV**
- **Carbon rights**

Eligible Activities

1: Reducing emissions from Deforestation

2: Reducing emissions from Forest Degradation

3: Conservation

4: Sustainable management of forests

5: Enhancement of forest carbon stocks (restoration and reforestation)



Safeguards

- Complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements;
- Transparent and effective national forest governance structures;
- Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities (noting the UNDRIP);
- The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders;
- Actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring [no] conversion of natural forests, but protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and enhancing other social and environmental benefits;
- Actions to address the risks of reversals;
- Actions to reduce displacement of emissions.



Countries must design a national programme; any sub-national approach, including projects, is only on an interim basis

National REDD+ Strategy in first phase – must discuss the 5 eligible activities, although a country may decide to include fewer, with justification

Almost all countries are still in 1st phase. Brazil, and arguably Viet Nam, Indonesia and D.R. Congo are in phase 2

Slow progress in UNFCCC negotiations has resulted in an ever-more-complex landscape of multilateral and bilateral financial possibilities



Thank you for your attention!

Timothy.boyle@undp.org

<http://www.un-redd.org>

