



BASQUE CENTRE
FOR CLIMATE CHANGE
Klima Aldaketa Ikergai

REDD+ & Climate Change

Past and Future

M.J. Sanz

Climate Change Challenges after Paris agreement, BC3 Summer School 2016

EUSKO JAURLARITZA



GOBIERNO VASCO

HEZKUNTZA, UNIBERTSITATE
ETA IKERKETA SAILA
INGURUMEN, LURRALDE
PLANGINTZA, NEKAZARITZA
ETA APRANTZA SAILA

DEPARTAMENTO DE EDUCACIÓN,
UNIBERSIDADES E INVESTIGACIÓN
DEPARTAMENTO DE MEDIO AMBIENTE,
PLANIFICACIÓN TERRITORIAL,
AGRICULTURA Y PESCA

Unibertsitatea
del País Vasco



Euskal Herriko
Unibertsitatea

ikerbasque
Basque Foundation for Science

ihobe

Outline

- The Convention
- The Past – *The First CP of the Kyoto Protocol*
- The Present – *Modalities for the Second CP of the Kyoto Protocol and REDD+*
- The Future – *Paris Agreement – INDCs / Sustainable Development Goals*
- The Way Forward – ?






The Past

..... up to Paris

FOREST.... One of the fragments of the Land Use Sector



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

COP6bis Bonn Agreement

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

COP6 The Hague

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

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)

COP16, Cancun

REDD+ as part of the Cas, 5 activities

COP17, Durban

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


COP19

REDD+ modalities concluded (WFW)

COP15 Copenhagen

COP21 Paris

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



The Present

..... Status by 2016

Broad Context

LULUCF activities as reflected today

Annex I

Non Annex I

Both

		UNFCCC reporting (All Parties)	Kyoto Protocol 2 nd commitment period (CP) QELRC ³ (Annex I KP Parties)	Kyoto Protocol CDM (non-Annex I)	REDD+ (developing countries)	NAMAS (non-Annex I)
INDCs	Purpose	Reporting only	Legally-binding economy wide targets; liabilities if commitment unmet	Incentives provided for non-Annex I	To contribute to mitigation action in the forest sector and to seek results-based finance ⁴	To enhance mitigation action
	Scale	National	National	Project	National, or subnational ⁵ as an interim step	Not specified
	Scope	<p>Comprehensive coverage of LULUCF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest land • Cropland • Grassland • Wetlands • Settlements • Other land <p>Non CO₂ emissions from agricultural practices⁶</p>	<p>Mandatory activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LULUCF • Afforestation • Reforestation • Deforestation • Forest management <p>Comprehensive coverage of agricultural practices</p> <p>Voluntary (unless elected in the 1st CP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cropland management • Grazing land management • Revegetation • Wetland drainage and rewetting 	<p>Allowed activities:</p> <p>LULUCF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Afforestation • Reforestation <p>Non CO₂ emissions from agricultural practices</p>	<p>Activities involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deforestation • Forest degradation • Forest conservation • Sustainable management of forests • Enhancement of forest carbon stocks 	<p>Not specified.</p> <p>A wide range of activities in the land use sector have been submitted.</p>

REDD+ building blocks and Guidance

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

Related processes

Nat Com

GHGs Inv

Iversen 2014

Basis for implementation

..... credible results ?

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...



FUTURE **REDD+**

How countries approach...

RELS/RLS

Diversity of approaches (FRLs)..... (submissions assessed)

Country	Scale	Scope	Adjustment
Brazil	Amazon biome	Def.	N
Colombia	Amazon biome	Def.	Y
Ecuador	National (excl. small islands, e.g. Galapagos and others)	Def.	N
Guyana	National	Def./Deg.	Y
Malaysia	National, but only permanent forested reserves	SMF	N
Mexico	National	Def.	N

Two main activities selected, methods.....

Mainly through RS for deforestation

No common approach yet for degradation, several countries experimenting

Deforestation:



- Medium-resolution imagery (Landsat)
- High-resolution imagery
- Land registry (cadaster)

Degradation:



- High-resolution imagery
- Testing Landsat-NDVI combination
- Timber records or management plans (volume harvested, species, collateral damage, skid trails, ...)
- Fuelwood extraction statistics

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 or 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 or two ready for the GCF payments (i.e. Brazil, reporting 2.9 Billion tones 1st BUR, REDD+ Annex)
- Two to three 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+

(<http://blog.cifor.org/37888/>)

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*





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, which countries develop a variety of public policies, measures and actions to address deforestation, the current REDD+ mechanism is not enough. *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 produced, **we will see the emergence of a new market for 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*



Are the views that far apart?



10 views on the future of REDD+

(<http://blog.cifor.org/37888/>)

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 Verchoi*

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 Halmgren*

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 strategy for the **management of large landscapes**—including agricultural activities that are crucial to rural livelihoods—then forested countries develop a variety of public policies, measures and actions to address deforestation and forest degradation. *Luiz Antonio Rez De Freitas Calzadilla*

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 need to **achieve long term mitigation goals** and gain full access to carbon markets. *Dan Njoroge*

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**. *Anid Angelsen*



Probably not!

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

September 2015



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 NDCs, 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




How do governments make land available for development?

Governments make land available for human settlements through various land management tools.



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**

Present towards future of REDD+


Immediate challenges to achieve the 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+ finance...


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



Is it enough pledges for the absorption capacity?

-> Disbursement stabilized at *USD 0.4* Billions per year while pledges on average are above.

Figure 9: Disbursement Rates by Country, 2009-2014




Is finance flowing?
-> Disbursement is slow

Note: For full disbursements to all countries, see Annex II.
Source: Forest Trends' REDDX Initiative. REDD+ Finance Flows 2009-2014.



Not a single standard solution, need to adapt to country situations....




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.**

INDCs




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)

INDCs – LULUCF sector

A more refined analysis of the LULUCF sector by JRC indicates :

- The INDC submissions reflects 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 Repot

- Technical potential in developing countries between 6.7 to 11.9 GtCO₂eq (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 (GtCO₂ in 2030, median (range)).

	Reduced deforestation	Reduced degradation and forest management	Afforestation and reforestation	Totals
Regions	Technical (tropics) ^{a,b}	Technical (degradation, tropics) ^{c,d}	Technical (non-Annex I countries) ^{e,f}	Technical
Africa	0.6 (0.2-0.8)	0.5 (0.2-0.9)	1.6	2.7 (1.9-3.3)
Latin America and Caribbean	1.9 (1.2-2.5)	0.1 (0-0.2)	1	3 (2.3-3.7)
Asia-Pacific	1 (0.4-1.4)	0.3 (0.1-0.6)	1.2	2.5 (1.7-3.1)
Peatland degradation	-	0.8	-	0.8
Totals	3.5 (1.8-4.7)	1.7 (0.3-1.7)	3.8	9 (6.7-11.9)

What Paris brings to REDD+... and beyond

- ✓ Article 5 on REDD+ signals political support for the existing internationally agreed REDD+ framework
- ✓ Need of reporting and principles for accounting for emissions reductions ensure transparency and improvement over time for forests and other sectors (Article 4 and 13)
- ✓ The agreement overall strengthens efforts on mitigation (Article 4), finance (Article 9), and provide room for considering markets (Article 6), three important elements for REDD+
- ✓ Developing countries tendency to include REDD+ and LULUCF in the INDCs, although no clarity how can be integrated, and broader land use approaches to address REDD+
- ✓ There is potential to contribute to the 2C goal. Most potential in topical DCs is in REDD+.
- ✓ Appropriated and tailored to the needs finance will be crucial (mix of sources and instruments)

Forest are still an important part of the solution!

If developing countries act....

Thank You

