

**FANRPAN Annual Regional Policy Dialogue**  
**Maputo; Mozambique**  
**Paper Presented by Moshe Tsehlo**  
**Country Director**  
**Pelum Lesotho**  
**Contact details;**  
[pelumlesotho@leo.co.ls](mailto:pelumlesotho@leo.co.ls)/[tsehlot@yahoo.com](mailto:tsehlot@yahoo.com)  
**31-04 September 2009**

**REDD;** Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation.

### **Background Information**

Scientific understanding and public awareness of the enormity of the threat that climate change poses to humanity and to the world's ecosystems have grown rapidly during the past few years, accompanying the rate at which global changes now appear to be approaching their tipping points. The time available to address this global crisis is rapidly dwindling, and deep cuts in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are urgently needed now, if we are to avoid the danger zone of a global temperature increase greater than two degrees celsius (2°C). Climate change mitigation will be neither cheap nor easy, but its cost and difficulty pale in comparison with the risks and costs that are likely to accompany failure to take decisive action.

Constraining global temperature increase to less than 2°C will depend upon keeping atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> Concentrations below 450 parts per million (ppm). Achieving that target will require rapid deployment of all major climate change mitigation strategies. Because deforestation accounts for about 18 percent of global GHG emissions-larger than the entire global transportation sector-reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) has become a prominent potential mitigation strategy.

### **REDD, the Concept;**

The REDD concept is predicated on the assumption that forests will contribute to climate change mitigation only if their value increases to a level that makes protecting forests consistent with viable development strategies.

### **The Scope of REDD within the UNFCCC**

At the end of 2007, the parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) confirmed their commitment to address the global climate challenge through the *Bali Action Plan* and the *Bali Road Map* for an agreement to be completed at the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the UNFCCC in Copenhagen at the end of 2009.

Their agreement includes reference to REDD, specifically calling for: *Policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation*, at the same time, REDD countries should be supported to move toward larger-scale, more precise GHG-based approaches that compensate emission reductions and enhancements of removals and that are upwardly compatible with broader accounting of Africa, Forestry, Sustainable land Use Initiative,[AFOLU]

Therefore the call for the adoption of **Africa Climate Solution** which wishes to push for an Africa led – Agriculture, Forestry Sustainable Land Use initiative and aims to generate resources and mobilize funds from global carbon markets, and donors to promote sustainable agriculture in Africa.

Among other things, AFOLU initiative proposes that; The Global deal on Climate change will require the participation of the entire developing world. Their participation and the benefits which accrue to them are contingent on full bio- carbon being included in the global framework.

Like other major mitigation options, realizing the potential of REDD-AFOLU to contribute to climate change mitigation will require the development and implementation of national development strategies to transform the relevant sectors, building on past experience. Such strategies need to be developed by and for each individual country, and will necessarily vary according to national circumstances. Considerable knowledge and flexibility will be required to enable effective implementation within complex national circumstances and to avoid creating perverse incentives that could either;

- (i) promote increased emissions and/or decreased removals at national or sub national levels in the lead-up to implementation of policies intended to compensate emission reductions and/ or removal enhancements, or
- (ii) Accelerate displacement of deforestation and forest degradation activities from countries that are early entrants into a voluntary REDD mechanism to those that are not.

REDD represents an opportunity for partnership between developing and industrialized countries for the benefit of the global climate system. Developing countries participate by undertaking REDD actions. Industrialized countries participate by sharing the costs associated with those actions. REDD has been touted as a cost-efficient mitigation strategy with numerous analyses of REDD opportunity costs and the benefits and risks of linking REDD to international carbon markets.

### **The Debate;**

The current debate has, however, inadequately captured the following critical aspects:

- The opportunity costs of forest conservation, while an essential consideration for most individual landowners, are not precisely related to the actual financial and non-financial requirements to achieve forest-based emission reductions and/or removals.
- Actual costs can be realistically estimated only by careful, country-by-country analyses, and by taking a more holistic approach to the assessment of REDD, costs and benefits.
- The prevailing market- vs. fund-based REDD debate perpetuates a false dichotomy that ignores the genuine necessity of
  - (iii) achieving substantial near-term emission reductions under conditions that, for the most part, are not amenable to compliance market entry; and

- (iv) providing long-term financial incentives to reduce emissions and enhance removals, including the option for developing countries to access compliance regimes.

### **Delivery of international finance**

Engaging in REDD requires a careful planning and preparation process, during which countries create the conditions for successful REDD actions. Financial and technical assistance may be needed to assess the impact of REDD on a country and to support training, data collection, strengthening of institutional capacities, and demonstration activities. Phase 1 would support a range of national and sub national REDD demonstration activities to test various REDD approaches designed to generate compliance-grade REDD units on sub national implementation of REDD).

Eligibility for participation in a Phase 2 financial instrument would follow demonstration of sufficient evidence presented to the global facility supporting: and enhance national forest resources and a shared understanding of the current state of forests and causes of deforestation/degradation within and beyond the forest sector.

A strong commitment to participate in REDD evidenced by a transparent participatory process including the highest levels of REDD country governments, allowing relevant ministries, national and local government agencies, and non government stakeholders such as NGOs, indigenous peoples organizations, and private sector representatives to express their views, which ought to be taken into account.

A nationally agreed REDD strategy to conserve should be elaborated by the governing body of the mechanism, based on principles agreed to by the Conference of the Parties (COP). An institutional framework in place to lead change, including the nomination of a REDD authority or function that serves as a REDD focal point for the participation in the Phase 2 financial instrument.

The allocation of the maximum international funding assigned to a country for Phase 2 finance would be best determined using a simple and unbiased criterion,

### **Institutional arrangements for Phase 2**

Institutional arrangements should enable the tracking of funding commitments and their impacts. Tracking can be achieved either by channeling all monies through one global account that collects and distributes resources (*Option 1* below), or by a clearinghouse that records and sorts bilateral and multilateral transactions (*Option 2* below).

#### **Option 1: One global fund**

The Phase 2 financial instrument could consist of one global fund linked to a robust international finance raising mechanism for climate action. This fund would be governed by a board including Representation of REDD countries, countries that contribute to REDD financing, and representatives of civil society, such as indigenous peoples organizations and environmental NGOs. The Global Fund to Fight AIDS or the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility could serve as a model. The fund's board would hold the authority to upgrade and downgrade participants making them eligible for more or less.

## **Option 2: A clearinghouse for decentralized REDD financing**

The Phase 2 financing instrument could also rely on multiple funding channels including bilateral and multilateral. A REDD clearinghouse would be established under the authority of the UNFCCC COP for the purpose of: (i) coordinating REDD participating countries and the administrators of various international funding sources to ensure appropriate and equitable delivery of international support; (ii) reporting to the UNFCCC on the progress of REDD actions in participating countries; and (iii) reporting to the UNFCCC on support provided by industrialized countries to REDD action, whether through bilateral or multilateral channels.

The advantage of such a decentralized mechanism is that it may harmonize better with existing systems and avoid perverse governance effects that have been associated with some vertical funds. A decentralized mechanism would, however, not be appropriate to administer a mechanism that relies on UNFCCC-controlled international fundraising mechanisms such as international levies and fees.

## **3 Institutional arrangements for Phase 3**

The Phase 3 instrument will require a new and separate authority that certifies the environmental integrity of REDD units that are made available. This authority ought to be independent of national policies and international financing. This authority may be assigned to a dedicated committee under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) or the Conference of the Parties (COP), assisted by the UNFCCC Secretariat.

### **Adaptation in the context of Africa**

Africa is the most Vulnerable region with the least adaptive capacity, adaptation is the most immediate priority. There is need, however, for global mitigation of greenhouse gases as primary mechanism to prevent long term climate change impacts on this region. . In addition, effective implementation of mitigation measures offers opportunities for Africa to increase its economic competitiveness along a sustainable low carbon development.

The following indicative outline covers the two implementation area of adaptation and mitigation supported and enabled by finance, capacity building and technology. The successful implementation of the adaptation and mitigation areas will require the full participation of all stakeholders, including the full involvement and empowerment of civil society organizations; farmer organizations, private sector and government, and this can be effective in true in a partnership.

### **Scenario within Adaptation;**

There are broad areas of work that needs to be considered when dealing with Adaptation;

- a. Disaster Reduction and Risk Management; including early warning, preparedness, emergency response and post disaster recovery;
- b. Sectoral planning and implementation; adaptation in key sectors including water, agriculture, coastal zones, health infrastructure, biodiversity and ecosystems, forests,

energy, urban management and tourism, taking into account the cross sectoral implications;

- c. Building economic and social resilience through the diversification of economies to reduce dependence on climate sensitive sectors, including through the use of knowledge and practices and strengthening of community organizations.
- d. Steps for effectively implementing work in the above areas include;
  - Understanding the economics of adaptation
  - Understanding the social and cultural dimensions of adaptation
  - Policy setting, planning, including climate proofing of future development
  - Piloting and demonstrating;
  - Full – scale implementation

### **Adaptation and Copenhagen**

Copenhagen agreement must articulate the following in Adaptation text;

1. Focus on the most vulnerable countries, communities and people in all developing countries
2. Rights- based approach to adaptation;
3. Transparent, participatory, sustainable, gendered, community- based and drawing on local and indigenous knowledge.

### **In conclusion;**

#### **The following priorities are also critical ;**

- Adaptation should be defined in communities and countries, not globally
- Communities empowered to take local action and decide what is needed for their adaptation
- Urgent implementation of the NAPAs in an accountable manner.
- Establish an international climate risk insurance mechanism, which in particular delivers rapid payouts for countries struck by very severe weather events.
- Ensure activities related to national and international migration.

For further reading;

[info@deniva.or.ug](mailto:info@deniva.or.ug)

UNEP/AMCEN/12/9

Assembly/AU/decl4

[www.meri.org](http://www.meri.org)

Thank you for Listening