30 nov. 11

REDD+ SBSTA CONTACT GROUP

CO-chairs intend to move to draft text as soon as possible, and have text ready by Friday. Focus on priority issues in safeguards, RL and RELs and MRV. Co-chairs intend adhere strictly to mandate. Finance issues to be discussed under the LCA.

Daily meetings from today until Friday. Closed informal consultations this afternoon at 3 pm.

Afternoon: Present the Co-chair view of elements that could be included on the draft text, based on workshops and submissions by parties. Discuss draft text on safeguards, and other methodological issues. Draft text to be distributed Thursday morning.

Reactions on the co-chair’s plan and reports from expert meetings:

Indonesia: Welcomes proposal, would like emphasis on importance of transparency, inclusiveness and a party-driven process on producing the draft text. Report are very useful. Willing to work constructively.

Guyana: Support following mandate based on decision 1 CP.16. Support the proposed organization of work. Full support to achieve the outcome in Durban.

Australia: Pleased with progress made on expert meetings. Would have preferred for informals to be opened. Besides the issues on the agenda there might be some space to discuss methodological issues on drivers of deforestation.

EU: EU has a submission with text proposals that can help. Historical information and drivers of deforestation and forests degradation are important for consideration in the methodological discussion. Some text on transparency of information in relation to RELs and RLs and safeguards would be needed. Workshops very useful, and will help draft a decision.

India: Fully supports the work-plan. Timeline will be tight. If draft text would be only circulated Thursday there won’t be enough time to discuss it. Need more discussion on MRV, if we transport things from outside.

China: Methodological guidance is very important. Workshops under the Secretariat and REDD+ partnership, are showing a collective view and agreement. Confident that will have conclusions and even a decision in Durban. Due consideration must be given to socio-economic situation and limited capacity in development countries, consider synergies with Nat communications and other conventions. Finance although not discussed here, is very important to the application of the guidelines. Consider what kind a conclusion or decision should be made in Durban general or detailed? Welcomes the approach taken by co-chairs to proceed with the agenda items.

Philippines: What would be the sequence for developing the text? Would it be 2 texts: one on guidance and other in modalities?

Co-chairs: Is up to the parties, co-chairs will facilitate reaching a balanced text that considers all parties views in one package. One co-chairs text based on what was provided in the discussion.

Bolivia: Disappointed with the results. REDD+ has a very narrow approach. It does not included the integral aspects of the forest. Very narrow definition of forests guided the work of this group. Forests have multiple functions, talking about methodological issues. Confirm the fact that there is not room in the REDD+ discussions to include integral aspects of forests, only forest integrality will give concrete solutions. That is why they have sent a submission alternative to REDD+, on the “sustainable live for forests”

Switzerland: Would like to have sufficient space to add elements to the co-chairs text and negotiate more elements.

PNG: Important to focus on the issues on the table, based on the work done to date and have a decision on REL, RLs and MRV and safeguards. Reach some decision that will feed on the LCA process. CfRN is finishing its draft text proposal for the 3 elements and will send it today.

New Zealand: Intend to consider national forest monitoring systems?

Co-chairs: Yes is in appendix 2 c which refers to monitor itself but focuss on issues where we made more progress.

Suriname: Any outcome should reflect high levels of ambition and consider a balance approach considering countries with low deforestation rates.

Malaysia: Happy with the outcomes of the reports. On issues raised on safeguards, relation with CBD outcomes should be expanded. Include issues important for countries with low deforestation in REL and RLs.

Brazil: Comprehensive and balance in Durban must include the progress made this year in REDD+ on technical aspects and financial matters, the later to be addressed in other subsidiary bodies. Agree with the Co-chairs plan. On the agenda, supports the proposal, focus on the mandate. Three main issues on the table are at different level of maturity. Expert meetings only for some issues, others need more discussions. Outcomes from SBSTA must reflect this. Bolivia presented interesting ideas on addressing forest as a whole and will support to tackle this issues on the LCA. National approach for REDD+ activities, main role of SBSTA is to provide guidance that will support national efforts of developing countries.

Co-chair: Prepare for night sessions. Aware of the fact that we did not have an expert meeting on MRV

Ghana (on behalf of Africa group): On RLs, national efforts can be scaled up to regional levels, while the Cancun issues refer to national we could also

USA: Pleased to see commitment on action and building upon on the substantive work made this year. Good degree on commonality on parties’ views. Conclusion on RELs and RLs and safeguards, is possible to reach. Understanding drivers is extremely important, and will support the establishment of a work program on this.

Sudan: Fully supports the Co-chairs proposal. Reports very useful.

Thailand: More time may be needed. Coordinate with LCA.

Liberia: REDD+ exchange meeting in Oslo concluded some elements related to safeguards that could be used.

Norway: Echoes Suriname’s excitement. Ready to work to finalize before Sat and have decisions on safeguards, MRV, REL, RLs.