MINUTES OF FGD on Permenhut about REL

Date : 25-26 June 2009

Venue : IPB Convention Center, Bogor

Participants: Representatives from Ministry of Forestry, National Climate Change Board (DNPI), Climate Change Working Group, National and International NGOs, Donor Agencies, Universities.

Agenda: (Annex 1)

Summary of the FGD:

1. An opening speech was presented by Ir. Dedy Supriadi on behalf of the Director General of Forest Planology. The speech emphasized on the important of REL to be in the REDD mechanism. A REDD strategy has been developed and REL as one of REDDI structure should be developed following national approach and sub-national implementation. The REL Permenhut is needed to follow up the Permenhut 30/2009. The FGD was intended to get inputs from participants for revising a draft of Permenhut and its technical guidance on REL.

2. A speech from Mr. Alex Heikens was emphasizing on the important of multistakeholder approach in developing issues related to REDD mechanism. This is due to REDD is a join learning process. UN have developed a program called 'Quick Start' for UNREDD by supporting 9 countries, including Indonesia, to make the country ready for REDD mechanism. For Indonesia, a UNREDD proposal has been developed and will have three outcomes and 10 outputs. One of the outputs is related to REL.

3. A keynote speech was given by Mr. Wandojo Siswanto. He raise some issues such as how to convince district government, setting REL is not only dealing with technical issues but political issue also, who should implement, guide, monitor any changes, at what levels, how detail should it be, on what landscape, who should authorize, what methodology for different landscape should be applied, management of scale, who should manage leakage, data availability, uncertainty of the mechanism, and policies in REDD implementation including regional autonomy, SFM, participation of people around forests, stakeholder involvement, pro job, pro poor and pro growth.

4. A presentation by Dr. Daniel Murdiyarso on Baseline, REL and RL gave new information after Bonn meeting covering REDD and REDD Plus, Definition of Baseline, REL and RL; Implication of REL/RL setting, options for effective REDD, Cost-efficient of RL and MRV, addressing equity and national circumstances, and

quota system. The presentation concluded that REDD-plus would provide more opportunities to develop different types of REDD projects; setting national RL is more strategic than REL as it will also measure the sequestration in addition to the emission; for effective implementation, it should be encouraged to enhance the benefits.

5. A presentation on methodology to develop REL was presented by Dr. Rizaldi Boer. He presented some issues covering three approaches for determining REL, quantifying REL using the approaches, validity of REL based historical emissions, and adjustment of National REL based on improvement of Activity Data (AD) and Emission Factor (EF) and Removal Factor (RF) of the sub-nationals or projects. He proposed some issues to be done covering: (a) a need of developing default values for error for AD from different resolution of satellite images, and (b) developing national default factors on carbon stock (EF/RF) for various land categories and forest with different level of degradation. The later can be started from NFI data and expand it later on.

6. Discussion on the Dr. Daniel and Dr. Rizaldi presentations resulted the following:
   a. REDD plus provide more benefits in term of carbon emission.
   b. REL vs RL: Government should make a decision which one will be used. Most participants agree to use RL because opportunity for reducing deforestation is higher.
   c. Definitions of Baseline, REL and RL are very important to be disseminated into all stakeholders and decision makers at national and sub national. These are basic for REDD mechanism.
   d. Leakage (emission displacement) and permanence issues are not taken care at project level. It should be at national level, so it is the liability of the government.
   e. Nested is a process. It is to accommodate initiative that are currently on going before national REL is available. By doing this, Demo Activities can start to define REL while waiting national REL. To be efficient, developing REL should be started from national level and at the same time from bottom-up.
   f. REL/RL should be developed cross sectorally. Ministry of Forestry as a lead. It is expected that Minister of Forestry could raise the issue in the Cabinet Meeting.
   g. Quality assurance is important and it will be reflected in Reporting.
   h. The use of REDD should not just to fulfill emission target of Annex 1 countries, but it should be viewed to benefit more for the country.
   i. RL will need much more works and it will implicate on cost. So, to go to RL, it should be approached step-by-step. Example: the first 5 years will use REL, then later will use RL.

j. Conclusion from the discussions were that (a) participants have the same perception on terminology of Baseline, REL, and RL. (b) the terminology should be disseminated to local governments, policy makers, (c) methodology has been presented, and for simplest methodology, a threshold method is an option but it needs to be evaluated.

7. A presentation of a Rapid Carbon Stock Assessment was given by Dr. Sonya from ICRAF covering methodological issues of REDD, framework of AFOLU C-stock Assessment, Assessment Issues, National level accounting and monitoring, sub national level accounting and monitoring, national – subnational linkage, and effective reducing emission from land use in Indonesia issues related to REDD and REDD Plus.

8. A presentation of existing data to support REL was presented by Dr. Wardoyo covering how credible the REL, basic inputs to calculate gas emissions/removals, data available in the MoF, sample plots on the ground, stand volume estimation, high resolution images 2007-2009, data about carbon stock (ton per ha) for each province.

9. Discussion of the above topics resulted the following:
   a. During the discussion, some issues were arousen including issues on peatland and wetland, scattered data at MoF, Lapan, Bakosurtanal, ICRAF, etc; reclassifying forest; classification of forests into its quality (good, fair, bad); data sharing among institutions.
   b. The discussion concluded that (a) it needs a study to simplify land cover classifications, (b) institution arrangement on data management, MRV, (c) Emission carbon data should be revised. Carbon data fraction needs to be studied (local values). This will impact on error level.

10. Discussion on the Draft of Permenhut resulted the following:
   a. Since the REL discussed in the FGD related with the Permenhut 30/2009, the discussed draft format is questioned. Is it the really format needed or other else format? This is because the Permenhut 30/2009 has already provided a mechanism on how to develop REL (Annex 2 and 5). The required format might be a table of REL.
   b. Some definition should be visited (anti leakage, redd activities, etc).
   c. Consistencies of terminology should be visited.
   d. The permenhut should include scope of the regulation, objects to be included in the carbon market (pasal 7).
   e. Time for MRV should be added.
   f. Revisit the objective and goal of the permenhut.
   g. There should be additional regulation related to any changes (Pasal 10).