

# Streamlining biodiversity and climate policies for REDD+

## Safeguards & co-benefits after Copenhagen

Dinah Benick

International Expert Workshop  
Freiburg  
April 14, 2010

This Project is supported by the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) with funds from the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)



INSTITUTE OF FOREST AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

UNI  
FREIBURG



introduction

risks&synergies

definitions

national level

questions

## introduction

- **negotiations since 2005:**
  - focus on mitigation of emissions
  - increasingly widening of scope: RED → REDD → REDD+ (→ REDD++?)
  - increasing complexity (MRV, financing, environmental impacts ...)
- **until COP13 (Bali, 2007): REDD often believed to be automatically beneficial for biodiversity (“co-benefits”)**
- **co-benefits for biodiversity do not “simply happen”**
  - depend on the design of the mechanism
  - implementation
- **since 2009 increasing recognition in negotiation text of need**
  - to promote co-benefits
  - to establish safeguards in REDD+ negotiations

## AWG-LCA (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/L.7/Add.6)

### no conversion of natural forests

*“Further affirms that when undertaking activities referred to in paragraph 3 below, the following safeguards should be [promoted] [and] [supported]:*

*(a) That actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements*

*(e) Actions that are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that actions referred to in paragraph 3 below are not used for the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits”*

## potential risks & synergies

- main concerns and synergies highlighted in scientific and NGO publications
- CBD AHTEG-BDCC
  - three meetings
  - report as output (CBD Technical Series No. 41)
  - presented at UNFCCC COP 15 side event
  - parts of the report for discussion at CBD SBSTTA 14 (as suggested recommendations)

→ input into UNFCCC negotiations?

introduction	risks&synergies	definitions	national level	questions
<b>advice of the AHTEG-BDCC (I)</b>				
mitigation activity	potential benefits	potential risks	possible actions	
<b>reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•reduced forest loss and forest degradation</li> <li>•reduced fragmentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•leakage into (low carbon) areas of high biodiversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•prioritizing high biodiversity REDD actions (national level)</li> <li>•develop premiums for co-benefits</li> <li>•improving forest governance</li> <li>•promote broad participation</li> </ul>	
<b>forest conservation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•conservation of intact forest habitat</li> <li>•reduced fragmentation</li> <li>•enhanced integrity of landscape</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•prioritize high biodiversity forests</li> <li>•maintain landscape connectivity</li> <li>•conserve a high diversity of forest types</li> </ul>	

UNI FREIBURG  
ifp  
INSTITUTE OF FOREST AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

5

INSTITUTE OF FOREST AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

introduction	risks&synergies	definitions	national level	questions
<b>advice of the AHTEG-BDCC (II)</b>				
mitigation activity	potential benefits	potential risks	possible actions	
<b>sustainable management of forests</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•reduced degradation of forests (relat. to conventional logging)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•encroachment in intact forest, resulting in biodiversity loss</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•SMF in areas with already intensive land-use (not in primary and intact forests)</li> </ul> <p>→ <b>apply best practice guidelines</b></p>	
<b>afforestation and reforestation (A/R)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•habitat restoration</li> <li>•enhancement of landscape connectivity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•introduction of invasive and alien species</li> <li>•replacement of native grass lands, wetlands and other non-forest habitats</li> </ul>	<p>→ <b>apply best practices</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•prevent replacement of intact forests, grasslands and other non-forest native ecosystems</li> <li>•locate reforestation → enhance landscape connectivity</li> <li>•develop premiums for biodiversity co-benefits</li> </ul>	

UNI FREIBURG  
ifp  
INSTITUTE OF FOREST AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

6

INSTITUTE OF FOREST AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

## definitions

- **Marrakesh forest definition (CP7.11) does not distinguish between natural, semi-natural and plantation forests**
- **no conversion of natural forests**
  - ➔ **what constitutes a natural forest?**
  - agroforestry systems = forest? (excluded for FRA 2000, 2005, 2010)
  - palm oil plantations = forest? (excluded for FRA 2010)
- **enhancement of forest carbon stocks?**
  - CDM A/R refers mainly to plantations, and not to forest restoration ➔ focus on quantity of biomass instead of “quality”



**definitions will play a crucial role in further REDD+ discussions**

## what's the problem with SFM?

- **reference to “sustainable management of forest” and to SFM in negotiations before Copenhagen**
- **UNFF: agreed language on SFM exists already**
- **NGOs claim SFM to be**
  - poorly defined
  - kept deliberately vague
  - no common understanding on criteria & indicators / best practice guidelines
  - ➔ „industrial-scale logging“ not excluded
- **current wording “sustainable management of forests”**
  - ➔ **reference to agreed SFM language of other processes?**
  - ➔ **need for clarification of concept, e.g. criteria and indicators?**

## **national strategies**

- **develop in context of readiness programmes (e.g. FCPF & UN-REDD)**
- **adressed biodiversity to a minor degree (in initial stage)**
- **according to increasing relevance of safeguards in international discussions**
  - ➔ **need to consider social and biodiversity safeguards within national strategies as well**
- **FCPF requires SESA within R-PPs (applying to World Banks safeguard policies)**
- **UN-REDD ➔ see upcoming presentation**



**implications for REDD+ negotiations?**

## **social & environmental standards**

- **plethora of new forestry project certification for voluntary markets, e.g. CCBS, CarbonFix, Plan Vivo, VCS ...**
- **REDD+ social & environmental standards currently in developing phase (CCBA & Care International)**
  - several stakeholder workshops and internet survey
  - latest version from January 2010 (includes recommendations)
- **incorporation of biodiversity aspects in principle 5:**
  - ➔ Principle 5: the REDD+ program maintains and enhances biodiversity and ecosystem services
- **complementary to FSC as well established and widely recognized certification standard?**
  - example CCBA: standard for national strategies



**how can they complement the REDD+ discussion and support implementaion at different levels?**

## workshop questions

- **what are the needs and challenges for establishing strong and effective biodiversity safeguards**
  - at the international level?
  - within national REDD+ strategies?

Session 1
- **how can the concept of SFM be specified in order to**
  - serve as a biodiversity safeguard within REDD+ governance?
  - promote co-benefits, e.g. by facilitating forest restoration / rehabilitation of former forest areas?

Session 2
- **Which options exist for complementing governance of REDD+ (e.g. work carried out by the CBD, CPF and other policy processes)?**

Session 3
- **how can comprehensive governance structures support MRV?**

**Thank you for your attention!**