UN-REDD PROGRAMME

Proceedings of the UN-REDD workshop on identifying and promoting ecosystem co-benefits from REDD+

UN-REDD PROGRAMME

19 May 2010

UNEP WCMC

UNEP

The UN-REDD Programme, a collaborative partnership between FAO, UNDP and UNEP, was created in response to, and in support of, the UNFCCC decision on REDD at COP 13 and the Bali Action Plan. The Programme supports countries to develop capacity to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and to implement a future REDD mechanism in a post-2012 climate regime. It builds on the convening power of its participating UN agencies, their diverse expertise and vast networks, and "delivers as One UN".

The United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) is the biodiversity assessment and policy implementation arm of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the world's foremost intergovernmental environmental organization. The centre has been in operation since 1989, combining scientific research with practical policy advice.

The United Nations has proclaimed 2010 to be the International Year of Biodiversity. People all over the world are working to safeguard this irreplaceable natural wealth and reduce biodiversity loss. This is vital for current and future human wellbeing. We need to do more. Now is the time to act.

Edited by

Dickson, B., Miles, L.

Citation:	Dickson, B., Miles, L. (eds) 2010. *Proceedings of the UN-REDD workshop on identifying and promoting ecosystem co-benefits from REDD+*. 27-29 April 2010, Kaetsu Centre, Cambridge. Prepared on behalf of the UN-REDD Programme. UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge, UK.
Acknowledgements	Many thanks to all workshop participants (see Appendix 2) for a fruitful and lively discussion, and to the climate and biodiversity team at UNEP-WCMC for their assistance in assembling these proceedings.

Table of contents

1 Recommendations to the UN-REDD Programme

During the workshop a document was compiled drawing together the key findings and priority actions, in order to produce a set of recommendations for the UN-REDD Programme to inform its continuing work on co-benefits. This was presented on Day 3 to allow for discussion, comment and feedback. A revised version was then produced and circulated to all workshop participants providing time for comment. The final version is presented here.

1.1 Supporting decision-making on REDD+ co-benefits

As countries develop their strategies for implementing REDD+, such strategies will need to reflect national development priorities and policies on the non-carbon benefits of forests. Countries will need a range of tools and guidance to enable them to do this. These tools and guidance should be jointly developed between the UN-REDD Programme, REDD+ countries and donor countries.

Action

The UN-REDD Programme should support the development and use of tools, methodologies and guidance for:

- *Monitoring of co-benefits from REDD+*
- *Spatial mapping and analysis of co-benefits*
- *Addressing trade-offs*
- *Economic valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services*
- *Comparison of land-use scenarios (including the provision of cost-benefit analyses evaluating the impacts on ecosystem services)*
- *Use of private or public finance to safeguard and enhance co-benefits, for example through Payments for Ecosystem Services*
- *Prioritisation of geographical areas and forest types for inclusion in REDD+*

In supporting the development and use of such tools, the UN-REDD Programme should:

- *Make use of existing tools and methodologies wherever possible*
- *Encourage planners and decision-makers to work closely with CSOs and Indigenous Peoples' organisations and to make use of data and expertise that may be held by them and by universities, NGOs and other institutions*
- *Provide necessary capacity building in the use of such tools*
- *Consider the development of web-based guidance in the use of such tools, guiding decision-makers through a series of choices. This could involve a hierarchical or tiered approach to selecting tools that takes account of the quality of available data and the cost and opportunities for improving those data*
- *Distinguish between tools for national-level planning and project- or site-level planning*
- *Consult with REDD+ practitioners including CSOs and Indigenous Peoples' organisations*
- *Recognise that tools may need to be tailored to the national context*
- *Ensure that positive outcomes on co-benefits are communicated to all REDD+ stakeholders including in developed countries*

1.2 Potential synergies between Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs)

There are many potential synergies between safeguarding and enhancing co-benefits under REDD+ and the goals of other MEAs (e.g. CBD and UNCCD).

Action

Ensure that the UN-REDD Programme actively promotes synergies between climate change, biodiversity and land management in the implementation of REDD+, engaging with the MEA Secretariats where appropriate and developing guidance that promotes such synergies at the national level.

1.3 Enabling conditions and co-benefits

Biodiversity and good governance are not just potential co-benefits from REDD+. They are also enabling conditions that are vital to the success of REDD+. Biodiversity and good forest governance underpin forest resilience and therefore long-term carbon storage.

Alongside the implementation of forestry activities, successful REDD+ also requires action on other parts of the economy to reduce pressures on forest. Progress towards these twin goals can be evaluated using an indicator such as 'green GDP', which estimates the negative impacts of environmental degradation and income inequalities on economic welfare.

Action

Prepare a paper providing a strong message on the evidence that biodiversity and good forest governance underpin ecosystem resilience and therefore permanence of carbon storage.

UN-REDD should strongly recommend that countries calculate a 'green GDP' as one measure of the success of the REDD+ programme, as a step towards the transition to a sustainable economy.

1.4 REDD+ and adaptation to climate change

One of the benefits of REDD+ is the contribution of forests to climate change adaptation.

Action

Ensure the contribution of REDD+ to adaptation is fully acknowledged by UN-REDD Programme in work on co-benefits, including within the papers that were released in draft form at this workshop.

1.5 Minimum standards on co-benefits

Different institutions concerned with the implementation of REDD+ are in the process of developing minimum standards for co-benefits.

Action

Where the UN-REDD Programme develops minimum standards for performance on co-benefits it should seek to ensure such standards are consistent with those being developed elsewhere. Minimum standards and indicators on ecosystem co-benefits should be strengthened.

1.6 Terminology

What is a 'co-benefit' from the perspective of mitigating climate change may be a primary benefit from other perspectives. All co-benefits provide benefits to people and distinguishing between 'social' and 'ecosystem' co-benefits is not helpful in all contexts; there should be recognition that ecosystem co-benefits are, in many cases, also social benefits.

Action

Have more explicit discussion of terminology in the UN-REDD paper on 'What are co-benefits?'. Ensure that the primary importance of some 'co-benefits' is fully recognised and give consideration to using the term 'multiple benefits' instead. Re-consider the use of the distinction between social and ecosystem co-benefits.

1.7 UN-REDD papers on ecosystem co-benefits

Action

Develop a single summary of the ecosystem co-benefit papers. Prepare French and Spanish translations of the summary, and of abstracts for each paper.

2 Workshop objectives

A UN-REDD workshop on 'Identifying and promoting ecosystem co-benefits from REDD+' was held from 27th-29th April 2010 in Cambridge, UK. Fortyfour people participated in the workshop, including representatives from UN-REDD pilot countries, observer countries, agencies and NGOs (see appendices for final list of participants).

The workshop provided an opportunity for discussion focused around the ecosystem and social aspects of REDD+.

The objectives of the workshop were to:

- present draft analyses, tools and guidance for addressing ecosystem co-benefits from REDD+ to pilot countries and other stakeholders; and to receive feedback before these products are finalised.
- discuss the social, institutional and economic aspects of ecosystem co-benefits.
- consider the integration of ecosystem co-benefits into national REDD+ strategies.
- arrive at a set of findings, recommendations, and priority actions for how the UN-REDD Programme tackles ecosystem co-benefits (at national and global levels).
- foster a 'community of practice' on ecosystem co-benefits amongst interested stakeholders.

3 Presentation abstracts

All presentations at the workshop can be found on the UNEP-WCMC website (http://www.unep-wcmc.org/climate/april2010workshop.aspx) and on the UN-REDD workspace (http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=731&Itemid=53). The following abstracts of these presentations (written by the presenter unless otherwise stated) are given in the order in which they were presented.

3.1 Day 1: Key issues

3.1.1 What are the ecosystem co-benefits of REDD+ and why do they matter? – Barney Dickson, UNEP-WCMC

The paper on which this presentation is based provides an analysis of the co-benefits from REDD+.

The terminology around co-benefits is not yet clear cut; the different terms in use are reviewed and suggestions are made about how terms can be used in a consistent way.

The range of different co-benefits is surveyed and the most important ones identified. There is a risk of environmental harms as well as benefits from REDD+. Some of the benefits are closely related to each other, and tend to co-occur. Co-benefits are delivered at different scales; some are primarily local while others may be national or global. Different REDD+ activities may give rise to different co-benefits and risks.

Assessing the magnitude of co-benefits from REDD+ is often not easy; nevertheless, in some cases it may be possible to provide an estimate of the economic value of the co-benefits. In all cases, the monitoring of co-benefits can play an important role.

A number of equity issues arise in connection with ecosystem co-benefits which should be addressed in the implementation of REDD+.

3.1.2 The economics of ecosystems and biodiversity (TEEB) on REDD co-benefits – Pavan Sukhdev, TEEB

The TEEB reports outline for different audiences the economics of ecosystems and biodiversity. They resulted from a decision at the meeting of G8+5 environment ministers in 2007. TEEB has compiled a valuation database from many studies, which can be disaggregated by biome, region or ecosystem service. This makes it potentially useful for valuing REDD co-benefits.

An example of use of the TEEB database to value ecosystem services is an evaluation of resource use by the construction sector in China. Using the market price of timber as an indication of value of resource provision, the impact of different policies could be assessed. However, there are issues in valuation: the value of a service changes depending on the stakeholders. For instance, the value of ecosystem services in India at a national level contributed 7.3% to the gross domestic product (GDP). However, when considering farm livelihoods, the value contributed to 57% of “the GDP of the poor”.

How valuation is used for co-benefits will depend on the demand, the markets and the mechanisms in place to identify the co-benefits and their use. It may be that payments for co-benefits will follow

along the lines of the carbon market and indeed there are already some aspects of biodiversity either on the market themselves (e.g. ecotourism) or part of the voluntary carbon market.

Designing and implementing REDD+ economics will be challenging, as many aspects need to be clarified and decided upon: capacity building, structure and design of the mechanism and financing are a few initial challenges that need to be resolved before valuing ecosystem services.

-- Nathalie Doswald, UNEP-WCMC

3.1.3 Safeguarding and enhancing the ecosystem co-benefits of REDD+ – Lera Miles, UNEP-WCMC

As different forests and forestry approaches produce different ecosystem services, REDD+ implementation decisions will affect the type and quantity of services delivered. The non-carbon services and biodiversity provided by REDD+ forests can be thought of as the 'ecosystem co-benefits' of REDD+. The overall positive and negative effects on these co-benefits will depend upon the sequence of decisions taken.

Here we present a draft issues paper considering options to safeguard and enhance ecosystem co-benefits from the development of the national REDD+ programme to project scale. It assesses the opportunities for and risks to ecosystem co-benefits at the different stages of national REDD+ preparation, design and implementation, measuring, reporting and verification. It focuses on those approaches to REDD+ for which there is scope to safeguard and/or enhance ecosystem co-benefits. It considers the various tools and measures that are available to increase the opportunities and decrease the risks, and suggests some of the likely trade-offs between carbon, ecosystem co-benefits and costs.

3.1.4 Financial incentive mechanisms for ecosystem co-benefits – Katia Karousakis, OECD

The main elements of an international REDD design are scope (REDD or REDD+), financing, measuring success (baselines and reference levels), permanence and community involvement. Whilst REDD+ can lead to substantial co-benefits, each these decision will have impacts on the extent and type of co-benefits delivered. Co-benefits can be promoted though the use of finance mechanisms (e.g. PES) or additional standards or criteria.

Analyses on how to incorporate co-benefits within REDD schemes have been undertaken. For example, UNEP-WCMC created a *Carbon and biodiversity demonstration atlas,* which begins to identify the co-occurrence of biodiversity and carbon. A study by Wendland *et al*. (2009) identified areas with high biodiversity, carbon and water quality in Madagascar along with areas of high deforestation and opportunity cost, to identify where payments could be most cost-effectively targeted.

Ecosystem service payments can be voluntary, regulatory, market-based or fund-based. Voluntary initiatives to bundle carbon and biodiversity are emerging. However, regulatory mechanisms and policy approaches for biodiversity may be needed.

But *over-emphasis* on biodiversity-related criteria imposed on REDD-plus can increase transaction costs, and may consequently be counter-productive for biodiversity. Therefore, an appropriate

balance is needed. REDD is ultimately intended to generate greenhouse gas reductions and it is therefore important not to overload the UNFCCC mechanism.

-- Nathalie Doswald, UNEP-WCMC

3.1.5 Tools for assessing ecosystem co-benefits of REDD+ – Emily McKenzie, Natural Capital Project

A range of tools are available for assessing the co-benefits of REDD+. These tools can help address questions such as: How are ecosystem services and biodiversity currently provided on the landscape? How would they change under a future baseline? How would they change with a REDD+ project? How did they change with a REDD+ project? This presentation outlines the tool characteristics required to answer these questions, and then describes in detail a spatially explicit integrated assessment tool called InVEST (Integrated Valuation of Ecosystem Services and Trade-offs), which can be used to assess the co-benefits of REDD+. InVEST does this by modeling, mapping and valuing multiple ecosystem services under alternative scenarios.

Changes in land-use and land-cover affect the quantity, value and distribution of ecosystem services and biodiversity. This incurs trade-offs over time, space and among stakeholders. Integrated assessment of these impacts and trade-offs can be used to advocate, formulate and implement more effective REDD+ strategies. We outline the opportunities and challenges that have arisen in applying InVEST in Indonesia, Tanzania and Hawaii. Finally, we outline other existing tools, including single service models like SWAT and FIESTA, and another multiple ecosystem service modeling tool called ARIES, contrasting these with InVEST.

3.1.6 Equity and ecosystem co-benefits in REDD+: Lessons from the social co-benefits debate – Leo Peskett, ODI

This presentation explores equity issues that may arise in relation to social co-benefits (SCB) and therefore may be relevant to ecosystem co-benefits (ECB).

Currently there is no formal definition of SCB but in REDD+ we can distinguish between financial (carbon payments; employment; timber/non-timber forest product sales) and non-financial (enhanced resource rights; infrastructure improvements; enhanced voice and choice) benefits. Equity issues surrounding SCB depend upon the:

- geographical scale (international to local): benefit/cost distribution along REDD+ 'value chain'. Mediating factors include rights to land and resources, decision-making and different perspectives on benefits.
- population scale (individual to community): benefit distribution between actors. Mediating factors include individual vs. community vs. 'offsite' targeting and local power relationships.
- temporal scale: duration of benefits/costs. Mediating factors include contract lengths and flexibility, sustainability of activities and MRV systems.

Lessons learned from early REDD+ work and broader forestry and development policy show that trade-offs are common between these potential benefits, that implementation is usually more challenging than the design, that equity issues are narrowly framed and that data on the social impacts of policy are patchy.

Equity issues around ECB are a sub-set of the equity issues for REDD+ more generally but there may be two differences:

1) A narrower set of links between ecosystems and benefits for local communities and
2) Potential conflicts between REDD+ approaches that promote ecosystem co-benefits and those that aim to promote social co-benefits. New issues may therefore arise when trying to align SCB and ECB agendas.

-- Nathalie Doswald, UNEP-WCMC

3.1.7 Community MRV of REDD+ co-benefits – Mandar Trivedi, Global Canopy Programme

REDD+ has the potential to provide multiple benefits, which go beyond the current focus on 'co-benefits'. Healthy populations of forest species are necessary for ecosystem functioning that underpins services like carbon sequestration and storage. In addition to global climate services, large areas of natural tropical forest maintain processes such as rainfall recycling and hydrological control, which will likely provide a buffer to climate change at local and regional scales. These potential benefits could be measured and recorded as part of the overall monitoring of REDD+.

Of equal importance are the potential benefits that could be derived by local communities, which also require monitoring – led by local communities themselves – as part of a robust REDD+ monitoring system. Indigenous lands and protected areas are important stores of carbon and the presence of indigenous people, in particular, reduces deforestation rates. Community-based monitoring based on local knowledge, combined with scientific knowledge (e.g. remote sensing), could feed into national measurement, reporting and verification of REDD+. The Global Canopy Programme and partners at Iwokrama and the North Rupununi in Guyana are starting a demonstration project aimed at creating a methodology for 'Community-MRV' that will aim to support and strengthen the national MRV system.

3.2 Day 2: Co-benefits in national REDD strategies

3.2.1 Ecosystem co-benefits in Panama – Jesus Enrique Salazar, National Environment Authority, Panama

This talk focused on reforestation potential in Panama in the light of REDD+. There is an estimated total of 1 777 750 ha with biophysical potential for reforestation. Current land uses in these areas include sugar cane, agriculture and cattle pasture. There is much overseas interest in buying land for reforestation. REDD+ can offer the potential to support reforestation, provide alternative livelihoods to small farmers that are more ecologically friendly such as agroforestry, and provide a chance to halt deforestation and forest degradation resulting from a number of pressures (e.g. fire).

Potential benefits include reduction in soil erosion, increase in forest cover, improved biodiversity, an increase in local and regional economies, regulation and protection of the water cycle.

The constraints are the efficient management of funds destined for REDD+ activities (ensuring they reach the right people), the value realized from implementation needs to be enough to attract land owners and the accessibility of area for reforestation. Another issue is stakeholder involvement as not enough people understand what REDD+ is.

-- Nathalie Doswald, UNEP-WCMC

3.2.2 Ecuador: Ensuring co-benefits through the implementation of a REDD+ mechanism – Daniela Carrion, Ministry of Environment, Ecuador

Ecuador is one of the countries with the highest biodiversity per unit surface area in the world. It also has approximately 10 million hectares of forest, of many different types. These forests have a great cultural and socioeconomic value and generate important ecosystem services.

However, the forests are seriously threatened. Ecuador has one of the highest deforestation rates in South America. Recognizing the value of forests, it is now a high priority for our country to reduce deforestation. A REDD+ mechanism is considered one way to address this goal.

The Ministry of Environment is working on the development of Ecuador's National REDD+ Strategy. To date, we have identified the elements of the Strategy and some specific activities for each element. Some of those activities are already in implementation. Among the identified elements of the Strategy is the importance of delivering social and ecosystem benefits through REDD+.

One element of the REDD+ Strategy that is already in implementation, is the "Socio Bosque" Programme. This initiative provides an economic incentive to land owners who voluntarily want to conserve their native forests and/or other native ecosystems. Since the Programme started (September 2008), we have signed conservation agreements covering 416 000 hectares, benefiting more than 40 000 people.

Through the "Socio Bosque" Programme, Ecuador is already delivering social and environmental benefits. Two of the key elements of the Programme are the development of a social investment plan and a prioritization of areas scheme. Regarding ecosystem benefits, this prioritization scheme considers three variables: areas with high deforestation pressure, areas with high importance for ecosystem services (carbon storage, biodiversity and water) and areas with high poverty levels.

Another ongoing activity to assure the delivery of social and environmental benefits through the implementation of REDD+ activities is our work with CCBA and Care International on the development and implementation of a REDD+ social and environmental Standard. This Standard provides a benchmark of good practice guidance for delivering co-benefits at a country level.

In order to move forward, some next steps we have identified are: update the information used for the prioritization scheme, integrate social and environmental benefits in other elements of Ecuador's National REDD+ Strategy and develop a system for monitoring REDD+ co-benefits.

3.2.3 Preliminary vision on co-benefits from REDD+ in Democratic Republic of the Congo – Jean Ilunga Muneng, Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation and Tourism, DRC and Roger Muchuba, Civil Society Working Group, REDD, DRC

The REDD+ process in Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) began in January 2009. It is a participatory process involving government, civil society and the private sector with stakeholder consultations held between 2009 and 2010. REDD+ creates a need for new structures within the Ministry of Environment in order for it to perform its tasks effectively and efficiently. Tasks include formulating a national policy for environmental protection, conservation of forests and biodiversity. The Environmental Service Division was therefore created.

DRC indentifies three potential benefits from REDD+: community management of forests, community conservation and the development of a water distribution zoning plan and management plan for forest land use. The main risks are that biofuel plantations increase, logging increases and that the rights of local people are not taken into account.

DRC's Readiness Preparation Proposal includes studies on benefit sharing and legal reforms, a proposal for a law on community management of forests, a proposal for involving indigenous communities in the development for measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) and taking into account other national objectives.

However, there is a need for technical, financial and material support on ecosystem services. In particular, capacity of the staff in the environmental services division needs to be built. For other stakeholders in DRC, capacity needs on ecosystem services relate to the identification, analysis and evaluation of services. It is hoped that the valuation of ecosystem services will lead to the transformation of the forestry economy.

-- Nathalie Doswald, UNEP-WCMC

3.2.4 REDD+ ecosystem co-benefits in Tanzania – Dr Felician Kilahama, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Tanzania

3.2.4.1 Background

According to the FAO 2007 report[1], Tanzania is endowed with forest and woodland resources of about 35.2 million ha. Out of this forest estate, about 13 million hectares are legally gazetted as Forest Reserves of more than 2 million hectares set aside mainly for water catchments, biodiversity and soil conservation. Tanzania's dependence on forest and woodland resources is very high i.e. for livelihoods and socioeconomic growth (domestic energy, food security, water for hydropower and enhanced irrigation). Climate change is increasingly noted to threaten our survival through its negative impacts to the environment, human health, livelihoods and economic development especially in developing countries like Tanzania. However, it is recognized that ecosystems are the major carbon sinks, with forests and woodlands playing critical roles in climate change mitigation through carbon dioxide (CO_2) sequestration and later maintaining it in-situ.

[1] FAO 2007. Annex Table 2: Forest area and area change. In: *State of the World's Forests 2007.* FAO, Rome. http://www.fao.org/docrep/009/a0773e/a0773e00.HTM

Various forest management and conservation practices at local, national and international levels contribute into the efforts towards mitigating and adapting to the global climate change problem. At the 13th Conference of Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) held in Bali, Indonesia in December 2007, member states agreed that Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD) should be considered for inclusion in a post-Kyoto Protocol regime. Tanzania welcomes such a global policy on REDD, as it provides an opportunity for developing countries that are Parties to the UNFCCC to benefit from carbon market and trading through various payments and reward schemes to be adopted.

3.2.4.2 Status of REDD activities in Tanzania

The Government of the United Republic of Tanzania considers REDD policy a viable option that can provide opportunities for the country to meet its obligations of managing her forests and woodlands on a sustainable basis and at the same time respond to poverty reduction initiatives accordingly. In April 2008, Norway and Tanzania signed a letter of Intent on a Climate Change Partnership. The objectives being to support REDD pilot activities in the field including capacity building and national strategy development and implementation. The ultimate impacts would include generation of benefits to the nation and the people as a whole. Anticipated REDD+ co-benefits would be as discussed hereunder:

3.2.4.3 REDD+ and ecosystems co-benefits in Tanzania

- Enhanced conservation of habitats for wildlife and improved biodiversity resources utilization;
- Enhanced conservation of soils, water catchments and other watershed areas leading to generation of electricity through hydropower (52% of national grid) but also enhancing irrigation;
- Enhancing beekeeping and Bee Reserves leading to increased honey and beeswax production hence sustaining income of rural people;
- Meeting household requirements for various forest/woodland products such as firewood, charcoal, fruits, gum, tie-dye materials, mushrooms etc.;
- REDD+ may address, in addition to climate change mitigation, the following co-benefits:
    - Forest conservation: REDD+ initiatives may enhance conservation of forest resources in the entire landscape management schemes. This would lead to provision of other environmental services such as preserving biodiversity and improved livelihoods.
    - REDD+ actions (e.g., financial flows) and forest conservation might have socio-economic benefits, such as reducing poverty. Thus supporting livelihoods and stimulating economic development;
    - REDD+ actions may spark political change toward better governance, less corruption, and more respect for the rights of vulnerable groups;
    - REDD+ actions and forest conservation could boost the capacity of both forests and humans to adapt to climate change;
    - Gaining knowledge on ecosystems services and their values. For instance, forest and woodland resources as important carbon sinks and sequestration of Carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. Through REDD+ initiatives, already Tanzania's carbon potential has been mapped and is now known. The on-going National Forest Resources Monitoring and Assessment (NAFORMA) will generate additional data

3.2.4.4 Co-benefits in the current REDD+ planning in Tanzania

Tanzania developed a National REDD+ Framework to guide the process of formulating the National REDD+ Strategy. Through the process issues like Financial Mechanisms and Incentives, Coordination of REDD+ activities, Governance for REDD+ and Capacity building at all levels are enhanced and well considered in the National REDD+ strategy; Awareness Raising at all levels being undertaken in order to ensure that political support is in place, showing interest in REDD+ and understanding well the Ecosystem co-benefits.

3.2.5 Co-benefits initiative in Zambia – Anna Masinja, Forestry Department, Zambia

Forests cover 49.9 million ha or 66% of Zambia with a range of different natural forest cover types with plantations forming 61000 ha. An integrated land use assessment in 2008 by the FAO with support from the Netherlands, estimated that about 2.8 billion tonnes of carbon are stored in the forests. Forests in Zambia provide timber and non-timber products, employment opportunities in forest enterprises and business opportunities for households as well as providing a number of ecosystem services, such as protection of watersheds, soil erosion control and cultural services.

Deforestation and forest degradation are caused by agricultural expansion, unsustainable fuel wood collection and timber over-exploitation, uncontrolled forest fires, infrastructure development, settlement encroachment and inadequate land use planning and management.

Experience in Zambia shows that decreasing these pressures can be best achieved though participatory forest management. In this process, communities are able to make and influence decisions about forest resources, define the roles and responsibilities of local people, improve user and access rights to forest resources and share the benefit from such stewardship.

The co-benefits, often talked about in REDD+ such as the goods and services provided by forests, are obvious benefits to the local communities. There is a need therefore to promote benefits that add value:

- Local communities being able to make and influence decisions in resource management
- Revenue generated contributing to local development (health centers, schools, etc.)
- Investments in value addition (e.g. small scale forest enterprise development)

On-going actions by Zambia in preparation for REDD+ include another integrated land use assessment, review of current policy related to ensure that participatory forest management is include, and restructuring of the Forestry Department. However, they is a need for more demonstration projects to give insight on best practices to facilitate co-benefit, REDD+ and sustainable forest management.

-- Nathalie Doswald, UNEP-WCMC

3.2.6 Indonesia: Identifying and promoting ecosystem co-benefits from REDD+ – Syaiful Ramadhan and Ima Yudin Rayaningtyas, Ministry of Forestry, Indonesia

Indonesia is one of the countries with the largest tropical forest after Brazil and Democratic Republic of the Congo. The area of Indonesia's forest is approximately about 126.8 million hectares. It does not only contribute to the national development but also plays a significant role in maintaining

ecosystem balance, including in stabilizing global carbon stocks. Around 60% of the country area is forest land/state forest, and ± 37% of these are degraded at various levels. While about 48 million people live in and surrounding Indonesia's forests, around 6 million Indonesians make their living directly from forests. The main regulation references for managing forest are Law No. 41/1999 on Forestry and Law No. 5/1990 on Biodivesity Conservation.

Indonesia's tropical forest has also the second highest biodiversity in the world after Colombia, which consists of 12% of the world's mammals, 7.3% of reptiles, 17% of birds, 270 amphibian species, 2 827 invertebrate species, and 38 000 plant species (1 260 are medicinal plants).

As part of the national programme to reduce emissions, mitigation and adaptation to climate change is already in the mainstream of forestry sector development planning, which is mentioned at the priority policies for the period 2010-2014. At the present, Indonesia is in the second phase (Readiness Phase), preparing methods and policies for REDDI (2009-2012). To support this programme, Indonesia has some ongoing REDD activities under bilateral and multilateral cooperation, such as: UN-REDD Programme (UNDP, UNEP, FAO), Indonesia-Australia Forest Carbon Partnership, Forest and Climate Change Programme (GTZ), Korea-Indonesia Joint Project for Adaptation and Mitigation of Climate Change, Forest Carbon Partnership Facilities (World Bank), ITTO, TNC.

Concerning the biodiversity and communities who live in and surrounding forests, we need to identify and promote the important potential ecosystem co-benefits from REDD+.

3.2.7 Relationships and synergies between monitoring systems for carbon stock change and ecosystem co-benefits in REDD+ – Maurizio Teobaldelli, UNEP-WCMC

In REDD+, measuring, reporting and verification (MRV) of carbon stock change is likely to be based on rules and modalities established under the UNFCCC following guidance and guidelines produced by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) so as to ensure robust and transparent implementation. Co-benefits can be also supported and promoted in REDD+ and monitoring and reporting ecosystem co-benefits might also be required. However, monitoring ecosystem co-benefits requires additional incentives and standardised procedures for assessing different parameters/indicators which so far are not yet defined under the UNFCCC. There exist different ongoing initiatives (e.g. the United Nations Conventions on Biological Diversity and that to Combat Desertification) related to ecosystem services which might inform a national forest monitoring system in REDD+; on the other hand there are relationships and synergies between monitoring carbon stock change and ecosystem co-benefits which might be explored in REDD+ toward the designing of a 'combined monitoring system' both for carbon stock changes and for ecosystem co-benefits, especially when additional monitoring activities are linked with market-based instruments (e.g. utilization of metrics) and payment for ecosystem services.

3.3 Day 3: Next steps

3.3.1 REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards Initiative – Joanna Durbin, CCBA

This initiative aims to define and build support for a higher level of social and environmental performance from REDD+ programmes through the development of standards that can be used by governments, NGOs, financing agencies and other stakeholders to design and implement REDD and

other forest carbon programmes that respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and generate significant social and biodiversity co-benefits. These standards are being designed for government-led programs implemented at national or state/provincial/regional level and for all forms of fund-based or market-based financing. The standards consist of principles, criteria and indicators that define the issues of concern and the required levels of social and environmental performance. A process for monitoring, reporting and verification is being defined to ensure the quality of assessments. The standards have been developed from May 2009 through an inclusive process engaging governments, NGOs and other civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples organizations, international policy and research institutions and the private sector. A Standards Committee representing a balance of interested parties is overseeing the standards development that is facilitated by the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) and CARE International. A revised draft is under preparation following two 60 and 90-day public comment periods which will be applied in pilot countries (Ecuador, Tanzania, Acre-Brazil, Central Kalimantan-Indonesia, Nepal, Liberia) from July 2010.

3.3.2 Risk-based approach to readiness social standards – Estelle Fach, UNDP

UNDP on behalf of the UN-REDD Programme has developed a draft "do no harm " approach to minimum social standards and an accompanying risk assessment tool. This rights-based approach seeks to guide and improve programme design, secure stakeholder support and thus increase programme sustainability. It is primarily based on the guidance provided by the safeguards section of the draft AWG-LCA text on REDD+ and has drawn on contributions of a number of efforts and initiatives, such as those of the FCPF and CCBA/CARE standards, policies and guidance in the UN system, conventions and treaties and many others. Three inter-related principles of 1) good governance 2) stakeholder livelihoods and 3) policy coherence each contain a set of criteria and questions to guide users through assessing potential risks and identifying risk mitigation strategies. This tool is expected to be used iteratively at first in the design and implementation of national UN-REDD programmes, but seeks to be flexible enough to be potentially taken up by a diverse group of stakeholders and throughout different phases of REDD readiness and REDD mechanisms. The UN-REDD Programme is currently finalizing a zero draft of the social principles risk assessment tool and will initiate a formal process to gather feedback from REDD countries, partners and a broader range of stakeholders.

3.3.3 GEF financing to achieve multiple benefits from forest ecosystems: Sustainable Forest Management and REDD+ – Mohamed I Bakarr, GEF

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is the largest financier of forest conservation and management, with an investment to-date of $1.5 billion supplemented by more than $4.5 billion in co-financing for over 300 projects. These investments are directed toward measures to control and prevent deforestation and forest degradation as essential and cost-effective means to deliver multiple global environmental benefits, including the protection of forest habitats, forest ecosystem services, mitigation of climate change and protection of international waters. The GEF's comparative advantage is reinforced through the Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) program established during the fourth replenishment phase (GEF-4). The SFM program created a financing option that incentivized countries to design biodiversity, land degradation, and climate change projects for achieving multiple benefits from forest ecosystems. Responding to the Copenhagen Accord call for

funding mechanisms to provide incentives for REDD+, and drawing on guidance from the CBD and UNCCD, the GEF will expand the incentive mechanism geographically and financially in GEF-5. The new SFM/REDD+ program will cover all types of forests, and include a wide spectrum of tools such as protected area creation and management, integrated watershed management, certification of timber and non-timber forest products or payments for ecosystem services (PES) schemes.

3.3.4 REDD+ and the CBD Forest Programme of Work: Synergies and further research needs – Anne-Marie Wilson, CBD Secretariat

Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) have acknowledged both the need to facilitate biodiversity adaptation and the contribution of biodiversity to broader adaptation and mitigation activities, particularly for the most vulnerable regions and ecosystems. On actions for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), Parties are interested in ensuring that they do not run counter to the objectives of the CBD, support the implementation of the forest biodiversity programme of work, provide benefits for forest biodiversity and to indigenous and local communities, involve biodiversity experts including holders of traditional forest-related knowledge, and respect the rights of indigenous and local communities.

Opportunities for implementing forest-related climate change mitigation options will vary across different landscape contexts, depending on the land-use history, current land-use activities and socioeconomic conditions. Actions for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation allow for a broad set of activities with different potential biodiversity benefits. They should draw on available information and guidance developed under the CBD, including for example, relevant biodiversity targets and indicators and use national ecological gap analysis of protected and non-protected areas to help identify national REDD priorities. In addition to collaborative work with the United Nations Forum on Forests, there is also the Lifeweb Initiative, a partnership platform that strengthens financing for protected areas, secures livelihoods and addresses climate change through implementation of the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas. In 2010, the CBD Conference of the Parties will likely consider a number of forest related recommendations, including on aspects relevant to REDD, the CBD Post-2010 Strategic Plan targets and a proposal to develop a joint work programme of the Rio Conventions to enhance synergies between biodiversity, land degradation and climate change.

To enhance the synergies between forest biodiversity and climate change, further research needs include:

- Further improving monitoring of forest biodiversity, including the development of tools for monitoring the impacts of REDD activities on biodiversity.
- Assessing potential risks of REDD activities on biodiversity
- Refining and/or operationalising the definitions of certain terms, including forest degradation, classification of forest types
- Analysing patterns of success or failure at the national and local level in reducing or halting the trend of forest biodiversity loss
- Providing early indications of the feasibility of medium or long-term targets, such as the potential for large-scale forest landscape restoration

- Development of spatial tools that overlay, at different scales, range of ecosystem services and livelihood dimensions, incl. carbon storage and biodiversity
- Assess the contribution of sustainable forest management to REDD.
- Assess the potential of REDD for enhancing protected area networks and the biodiversity benefits of the surrounding landscapes.
- Explore the implications of additionality and other criteria developed for climate change and how this may affect achievement of co-benefits relating to ecosystems and livelihoods
- Identifying lessons learned from payments for ecosystem services activities and establishment of protected areas in relation to local livelihood and other benefits

Further discussion about CBD and REDD perspectives is available in "Recent CBD scientific findings on biodiversity and climate change - Information Note 1 for the UNFCCC COP15" (http://www.cbd.int/climate/copenhagen).

-- Tim Christophersen, Anne-Marie Wilson and Johannes Stahl, SCBD

3.3.5 Developed country perspective on co-benefits - Andreas Tveteraas, Norway

The summary of this talk to be added later.

4 Break out group discussions: summaries

Eight break-out groups were held during the workshop. Their main conclusions, as reported back to plenary, are presented below.

4.1 What are ecosystem co-benefits?

Whilst there is divergence on the terminology used (co-benefits vs. multiple/additional benefits), there is a common understanding that carbon is not necessarily more valuable than the additional benefits of REDD+ for biodiversity, ecosystem services and other social benefits arising from REDD+ implementation itself. The term 'co-benefits' emphasises that carbon emissions reduction is the primary aim of REDD+: ecosystem services and biodiversity are co-benefits of REDD+ when their continued existence is owed to REDD+ action. However, the alternative term 'multiple benefits' avoids implying a greater value for carbon emissions.

The success of certain co-benefits is also necessary to ensure the success of mitigation. Biodiversity underpins resilience and therefore long-term carbon storage, whilst getting social issues right is essential to creating an enabling environment for REDD+. There is a need for greater recognition that co-benefits are linked to emissions reductions in this way, and for integration of co-benefits into REDD+ planning.

It could be useful to capture these ecosystem functions, and their potential to enhance adaptation to climate change, within the co-benefits definition.

The paper presented makes a distinction between ecosystem co-benefits and social co-benefits, but many people found this difficult because ecosystem co-benefits are by definition benefits for people. Whilst a valid technical distinction, it was recommended that this avoided in communicating REDD+.

The benefits of REDD+ accrue at different scales: global, national, regional, and local. There is a need to communicate at each of these scales, but especially: what will be different on the ground? What is so special about REDD, why should a villager be involved?

The potential for synergies between the different Conventions (UNFCCC, CBD, UNCCD) needs to be acted upon, both within the international and national elements of the UN-REDD Programme. Bridges need to be made between government agencies dealing with these different topic areas. This will help decision-makers to take a holistic view of REDD+ design and architecture.

4.2 Approaches to safeguard and enhance co-benefits

What is a safeguard: does it imply minimum standards for avoiding harm to co-benefits at international or national level? Whilst the Convention will provide certain minimum standards, both implementing and donor countries may wish to go further than this. Safeguards could be specified individually for all five activities listed in the UNFCCC LCA draft.

Safeguards and other aspects of REDD+ design should not inadvertently incentivise countries with low deforestation to increase their deforestation rates (i.e. for eligibility reasons), or encourage leakage between countries. Avoiding penalties for existing good practice, for example through additionality constraints on protected area inclusion or local communities already practising sustainable management of forest, is also critical.

The following recommendations for improvement of the draft paper presented were given:

- Produce an executive summary for national policy paper on options for actions - bullet points summarising likely impacts of chosen actions, and /or a single summary for all three documents presented.
- Translate at least this summary into at least French and Spanish
- Integrate resilience, permanence and adaptation issues throughout the text, e.g. drawing on the recent CBD AHTEG report[2]. Discuss the role of intact versus fragmented forests – potential trade-offs between resilience and conservation of threatened ecosystems. Consider describing adaptation as a co-benefit in itself.
- Emphasise that the approaches to REDD+ in the paper are based on national plans (NJPs)
- Make more linkages with the CBD Programmes of Work: e.g. identify where CBD-inspired activities could be built upon, or where REDD+ activities contribute to CBD achievements
- Consider the addition of a section on financing: tools for planning and mapping co-financing opportunities/needs; include Figure 2 from Miles & Kapos 2008[3]
- Tables of tools should indicate at which scales each are relevant
- Consider including further examples and analysis of existing tools and their relevance for REDD+

A logical next step would be to produce practical guidance for national decision-/policy-makers. The structure of the paper forms a skeleton for a decision-making flowchart that could be made useful in consultation with national REDD practitioners. A version of this tool could be produced on a web-based system to guide the user through a set of choices on achieving and assessing co-benefits, providing access to background material, science, maps and contact points for assistance.

4.3 Monetary incentives for co-benefits

Carbon and other ecosystem benefits are not necessarily delivered at the same level. For example, carbon and biodiversity conservation are global services, whereas water and landscape services are delivered at the sub-national or local scale. As such, where they are marketed will be different e.g. local water benefits cannot really be bundled into international markets. In other words, different services result in different products which can be sold in different markets (e.g. for timber, hunting, water, carbon and so on). Much knowledge exists on the marketing of environmental services through the PES agenda, therefore we can learn a lot from existing PES schemes and marketing activities.

It is questionable whether carbon alone can cover the high opportunity costs from deforestation (e.g. lost revenues from agriculture, soya, palm oil). It may be possible to over-compensate these opportunity costs through a whole set of services that include carbon which, in sum, can

[2] Thompson, I., Mackey, B., McNulty, S., Mosseler, A. 2009. Forest Resilience, Biodiversity, and Climate Change. A synthesis of the biodiversity/resilience/stability relationship in forest ecosystems. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal. *Technical Series* 43. 67 pp.

[3] Miles, L., Kapos, V. 2008. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and forest degradation: Global land-use implications. *Science* 320(5882):1454-1455.

overcompensate these lost revenues. This is particularly important if carbon credit prices decline over the lifetime of the carbon market as more co-benefits marketing can then overcome the opportunity costs.

With regard to additionality, it is hard to say to what extent funding the carbon part would make a difference if there is interest from other parties for implementing a project i.e. is it true to say that a REDD project delivering several benefits which are marketed separately would not deliver if one of the interested parties did not provide funding? No conclusion was reached: either it is additional because without the carbon payment the project would not be implemented, or it is only additional if the carbon deal is the first one made and the others act as 'co-finance'.

Marketing different products may raise transaction costs (e.g. through attracting different sellers, gaining information about different markets, negotiating and concluding different contracts) but may also lower them in the medium to long term (by creating synergies e.g. MRV for REDD may be adjusted slightly to also implement MRV for biodiversity simultaneously).

Marketing different services which are created from a REDD-project besides carbon has benefits: more buyers, with different interests to be satisfied, means there is more pressure on the seller to be successful, resulting in a lower risk of failure, thus helping to ensure the permanence of REDD-efforts. Ex-post-payments (i.e. performance-based payments) also spread risk in the same way. The participation of local beneficiaries is another way to reduce risk by engaging local "guards" and incentivising them to ensure the integrity and success of the project (which is important anyway to ensure the project is in line with the interests of local stakeholders). Finally, risk can also be reduced through better controls and more regulation.

It is important to incorporate the private sector as well as the public sector in marketing carbon and co-benefits, in order to generate funds. This could be through: offsets, especially for extractive industries, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), fiscal measures (e.g. eco-taxes, tax exemptions, tariffs) - although it might be difficult to earmark them for forest protection and sustainable management – and innovative products such as insurance and forest-backed bonds with an investment return of 20-25 years with paybacks along the way.

4.4 Equity and governance

The key equity issues for indigenous peoples and local communities around ecosystem co-benefits include:

- A need for safeguards
- Consideration of the diversity within and between communities
- Relation with poverty issues and livelihoods
- Key tools:
  - International – UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
  - National – clarification of land tenure
  - Local – community-based forest management; community MRV; consultations and free prior and informed consent

- It is important to distinguish between rights and interests, and between procedural rights and substantive rights. It is also important to consider how to reconcile the rights of local communities with the international REDD process.
- It is necessary to distinguish between access to natural resources and payments for these natural resources
- On governance and decision-making, the following issues are key:
    - Who controls the allocation of rights? What conflict resolution mechanism is in place?
    - Decentralization
    - Transparency and access to information

Ecosystem and social co-benefits should be considered in an integrated way, as the distinction between social and ecosystem benefits is not useful. All ecosystem benefits are social benefits. A better denomination should be found, for example, “additional benefits”, comprising of ecosystem benefits, economic benefits and governance benefits. Market investors may want to disaggregate these concepts so under the economic and governance benefits it will be important to define what is measured (e.g. income, poverty, rights etc).

To ensure that co-benefits are included in the planning of REDD+ governance, there is a need for:

- Tools and guidance: spatial analysis and maps, both qualitative (e.g. relative value of a topic gathered through a participatory approach) and quantitative. A bottom-up approach will identify and prioritise the benefits valued by local people.
- Economic valuation tools
- Broad cross-sectoral communication – for example, in the DRC an inter-ministerial committee was created under the REDD Decree, and the national REDD Committee has representatives from 6 different ministries (and non-governmental representatives). In Indonesia, the Council on Climate Change is also inter-ministerial. In Tanzania, a permanent forum on land-based decisions is being established, with the Prime Minister as chair.
- Have additional benefits addressed in legislative systems and use consultations to ensure implementation on the ground
- Increase government capacity on ecosystem benefits (e.g. there is a new division under the Ministry of Environment in the DRC)
- Build capacity on non-carbon MRV
- Develop international incentives
- Regional approaches to planning for ecosystem benefits (ex: COMIFAC) could help, as well as sub-national considerations

Who benefits and who pays or loses out depends on the services and their scales. For example, a farmer may have less access to water as a result of a watershed conservation measure.

To ensure equity, it is necessary to distinguish between the costs of securing long-term access to a resource (e.g. reducing harvest of bushmeat to ensure sustainable use), and the cost of removing access to the resource. Compensation should be considered in the latter case.

4.5 Regional discussion: Latin America

1. **Are ecosystem co-benefits being addressed in national REDD+ strategies?**
   Yes, to varying degrees among participating countries.

2. **What are the most important ecosystem co-benefits in this region?**

In Ecuador, Socio Bosque is principally addressing biodiversity, as well as water and wellbeing. In Panama, water is a high priority. In Peru, water has high importance, especially for downstream rice cultivation. For Bolivia, non-timber forest products are important. Paraguay has a holistic approach. Having better information for these important services is viewed as more useful than adding information for additional ecosystem services.

3. **What are the three tools and methodologies on co-benefits that are most needed in this region?**

Five areas were identified

1. **Information and guidance** targeted to national contexts (maybe using regional examples)
2. **Facilitating communications within country**

   Issues included awareness, information through dialogue, political will, and ensuring free and informed prior consent.

3. **Updated information on co-benefits**

   → data collection
   → training on methodologies
   → financial support
   → could result in maps

4. **Cost-benefit analysis**

The UN-REDD Programme was requested to work on valuation and develop cost-benefit analyses, to support land-use choices and design of national strategies. What is the value of REDD+ compared to other land use options?

5. **Tools for monitoring**

Capacity challenges were identified.

4. **What are the three biggest challenges using them?**
   "Challenges" were read as needs: what is needed in order to achieve some of these benefits, especially water. Needs identified were:

   1) Improved integration and interactions amongst involved stakeholders.
   2) Integrating co-benefits considerations within REDD (challenge is to get it integrated)
   3) scaling up local efforts (understanding both ends of the scale).
   4) MRV for co-benefits.
   5) Updated information on co-benefits.

4.6 Regional discussion: Africa

6. Are ecosystem co-benefits being addressed in national REDD+ strategies?

Yes. Countries already have sustainable forest management plans acknowledging ecosystem benefits. REDD reinforces these and enables scaling up.

Co-benefits are included in Readiness Preparation Proposals prepared under the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility. There is a need for legal reform and institutional change to ensure effective stakeholder participation, including through community management of forest. This will lead to the integration of ecosystem benefits valued by local communities in REDD implementation.

Devolution to community management is a benefit in itself, and communities with appropriate support are also expected to balance their management to integrate their own interests and ecosystem benefits.

7. What are the most important ecosystem co-benefits in this region?

Different kinds of co-benefits:

- governance benefits (both the benefits and an awareness of them is crucial to REDD+ success)

Enabling conditions:
- Institutional change
- Devolution → communities
- Legal reform
- Participation of stakeholders
- Secure land tenure

- national to local level benefits

  - water for hydropower (national scale)
  - cooking fuel – charcoal (local scale)
  - food, NTFPs: basic survival and livelihood security (local scale)
  - timber for construction (both)

- biodiversity?

  - history of lack of local involvement with protected areas
  - new approaches include ecotourism
  - REDD + does not solve all problems! But can contribute

8. **What are the three tools and methodologies on co-benefits that are most needed in this region?**

Features of a REDD planning team

-multisectoral
- includes civil society

Pilot demonstration activities

…showing how improved livelihood security and governance benefits accrue. Support for activities and needs for guidance in these areas:

Sustainable use of forest resources
Land-use planning
Agricultural practices
Monitoring of livelihood impacts

4.7 Regional discussion: Asia-Pacific (focus on Indonesia)

1. **Are ecosystem co-benefits being addressed in national REDD+ strategies?**

Co-benefits addressed in the Indonesian strategy include water, watershed management (including soils), fuelwood (wood chips), biodiversity, jobs, non-timber forest products, training, ecotourism. These co-benefits are addressed in planning and also used as success indicators for REDD+

2. **What are the most important ecosystem co-benefits in Indonesia?**

Local values may not be the same as global values: for example, flood protection is valued at local level whilst biodiversity conservation is valued at global level/

The co-benefits delivered by forest depend on the officially designated functions of the forest areas (e.g. production, conservation forest & protection forest). For example, in production and protection forest, people have access to forest resources, but not in conservation forest.

3. **What are the three tools and methodologies on co-benefits that are most needed in Indonesia?**

More guidance is needed on how to consider co-benefits and to generate the incentives needed to properly take them into account. REDD+ cannot currently compete in financial terms with conversion for oil palm (except, if soil carbon is accounted for, on peat soils). If co-benefits were monetized, then REDD+ could compete. Guidance on valuation and payments for ecosystem services could assist in implementing REDD+ in these areas with high opportunity costs.

4. **Are there any equity and governance issues related to ecosystem co-benefits in Indonesia?**

Some benefits are valued by local stakeholders but not by the most powerful actors who make decisions on land use.

Trees are grown in agroforestry systems outside forest areas (using national and FAO forest definitions) deliver benefits to people and have a carbon storage function, but it is not yet clear whether they will be accounted for under REDD+.

There are some inconsistencies in the classification of oil palm plantations, which may carry through to REDD+ implementation. Forest land is governed by the Forestry Department and agricultural land by the Agriculture Department. Oil palm growing in “forest” land is therefore categorised differently from oil palm growing on “agricultural” land. This could generate a governance issue related to co-benefits, as oil palm plantations yield minimal co-benefits in comparison to natural forests.

5 Appendices

5.1 Workshop agenda

Tuesday 27th April, Day 1: Key Issues

08:30-09:00 Registration

SESSION 1 – Chair: Ravi Prabhu, UNEP

09:30-09:50 Welcome and introduction
Ravi Prabhu, UNEP
Tim Johnson, UNEP-WCMC

09:50-10:00 Aims of the workshop
Barney Dickson, UNEP-WCMC

10:00-10:50 What are the ecosystem co-benefits of REDD+ and why do they matter?
Barney Dickson, UNEP-WCMC

10:50-11:40 Key-note address: The economics of ecosystems and biodiversity (TEEB) on REDD co-benefits
Pavan Sukhdev, TEEB

11:40-11:50 Tea and coffee

11:50-12:30 Safeguarding and enhancing the ecosystem co-benefits of REDD+
Lera Miles, UNEP-WCMC

12:30-13:00 Financial incentive mechanisms for ecosystem co-benefits
Katia Karousakis, OECD

13:00-14:00 Lunch

SESSION 2 – Chair: Felician Kilahama, Forestry and Beekeeping Divison, Tanzania

14:00-14:30 Tools for assessing ecosystem co-benefits of REDD+
Emily McKenzie, Natural Capital Project

14:30-15:00 Equity and ecosystem co-benefits in REDD+: lessons from the social co-benefits debate
Leo Peskett, ODI

15:00-15:30 Community MRV of REDD+ co-benefits
Mandar Trivedi, Global Canopy Programme

15:30-16:00 Break out groups:
1. What are ecosystem co-benefits?
2. Approaches to safeguard and enhance co-benefits
3. Monetary incentives for co-benefits
4. Equity and governance

16:00-16:30 Tea and coffee

16:30-17:00 Break out groups (continued)

17:00-17:30 Plenary: Report back from working groups and discussion

Wednesday 28th April, Day 2: Co-benefits in national REDD strategies

SESSION 3 – Chair: Estelle Fach, UNDP

09:00-09:30 Plenary: Report back from working groups and discussion (continued)

09:30-10:30 ***National presentations on ecosystem co-benefits in Latin America & the Caribbean***

Panama

Jesus Enrique Salazar, National Environment Authority, Panama

Ecuador: Ensuring co-benefits through the implementation of a REDD+ mechanism

Daniela Carrion, Ministry of Environment, Ecuador

10:30-11:00 Tea and coffee

11:00-12:30 ***National presentations on ecosystem co-benefits in Africa***

Preliminary vision on co-benefits from REDD+ in DRC

Jean Ilunga Muneng, Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation and Tourism, DRC and Roger Muchuba, Civil Society Working Group, REDD, DRC

REDD+ ecosystem co-benefits in Tanzania

Dr Felician Kilahama, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Tanzania

Co-benefits initiative in Zambia

Anna Masinja, Forestry Department, Zambia

12:30-13:00 ***National presentations on ecosystem co-benefits in Asia & the Pacific***

Indonesia: Identifying and promoting ecosystem co-benefits from REDD+

Ima Yudin Rayaningtyas and Syaiful Ramadhan, Ministry of Forestry, Indonesia

13:00-14:00 Lunch

SESSION 4 – Chair: Anna Chileshe Masinja, Forestry Department, Zambia

14:00-14:30 Relationships and synergies between monitoring systems for carbon stock change and ecosystem co-benefits in REDD+

Maurizio Teobaldelli, UNEP-WCMC

14:30-15:30 Break out groups:

1. Latin America
2. Africa
3. Asia-Pacific

15:30-16:00 Tea and coffee

16:00-17:00 Plenary: Report back from working groups and discussion

19:30 Evening meal (Main Dining Room, Murray Edwards College)

Thursday 29th April, Day 3: Next steps

SESSION 5 – Chair: Lera Miles, UNEP-WCMC

09:00-10:45 ***Building a broader collaboration on co-benefits***

REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards Initiative
Joanna Durbin, CCBA

Risk-based approach to readiness social standards
Estelle Fach, UNDP

GEF financing to achieve multiple benefits from forest ecosystems: Sustainable Forest Management and REDD+
Mohamed Bakarr, GEF

REDD+ and the CBD Forest Programme of Work: Synergies and further research needs
Anne-Marie Wilson, CBD Secretariat

10:45-11:15 Tea and coffee

11:15-11:45 Developed country perspectives on co-benefits
Andreas Tveteraas, Norwegian Ministry of the Environment
Anke Höltermann, BfN and Stefanie von Scheliha, GTZ

SESSION 6 – Chair: Barney Dickson, UNEP-WCMC

11:45-13:00 Plenary: Workshop findings, recommendations and priority actions

13:00-14:00 Lunch

14:00-14:50 Plenary: Discussion and evaluation

14:50-15:00 Summary

15:00-15:30 Tea and coffee

Close

5.2 Workshop participants

Participant	Organisation	Email address
Andreas Tveteraas	Norwegian Ministry of the Environment	Andreas.Tveteraas@md.dep.no
Anke Höltermann	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)	Anke.Hoeltermann@BfN.de
Anna Chileshe Masinja	Forestry Department, Zambia	annamasinja@yahoo.com
Anne-Marie Wilson	Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Secretariat	anne-marie.wilson@cbd.int
Barney Dickson	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)	Barney.Dickson@unep-wcmc.org
Bhaskar Vira	University of Cambridge	bv101@cam.ac.uk
Cordula Epple	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)	Cordula.Epple@unep-wcmc.org
Daniela Carrion	Ministry of the Environment, Ecuador	dcarrion@ambiente.gov.ec
Emily Dunning	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)	Emily.Dunning@unep-wcmc.org
Emily McKenzie	Natural Capital Project	Emily.McKenzie@WWFUS.ORG
Estelle Fach	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	estelle.fach@undp.org
Felician Kilahama	Forestry and Beekeeping Division, Government of Tanzania	fkilahama@gmail.com
Ima Yudin Rayaningtyas	Ministry of Forestry, Indonesia	rayaningtyas@gmail.com
Inger G. Naess	Norwegian Ministry of the Environment	Inger-Gerd.Nass@md.dep.no
Janet Cotter	Greenpeace	j.cotter@exeter.ac.uk
Jean Ilunga Muneng	Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation and Tourism, Democratic Republic of the Congo	jean_muneng57@yahoo.fr
Jesus Enrique Salazar	National Environment Authority, Panama	ntm_jesus3@yahoo.com
Joanna Durbin	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA)	jdurbin@climate-standards.org
Joey Talbot	University of Leeds	gyjt@leeds.ac.uk
John Lanchbery	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	john.lanchbery@rspb.org.uk
Katia Karousakis	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	katia.karousakis@oecd.org
Leo Peskett	Overseas Development Institute (ODI)	l.peskett@odi.org.uk
Lera Miles	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)	Lera.Miles@unep-wcmc.org
Linda Dalen	Directorate for Nature Management, Norway	Linda.Dalen@DIRNAT.NO

Participant	Organisation	Email address
Linda Rosengren	UN-REDD Programme Secretariat	Linda.ROSENGREN@un-redd.org
Mandar Trivedi	Global Canopy Programme (GCP)	m.trivedi@globalcanopy.org
Matea Osti	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)	Matea.Osti@unep-wcmc.org
Maurizio Teobaldelli	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)	Maurizio.Teobaldelli@unep-wcmc.org
Melanie Heath	Birdlife International	Melanie.Heath@birdlife.org
Mohamed I. Bakarr	Global Environment Facility (GEF)	mbakarr@thegef.org
Mohamed Sessay	UNEP Division of GEF Coordination	Mohamed.sessay@unep.org
Monika Bertzky	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)	Monika.Bertzky@unep-wcmc.org
Nathalie Doswald	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)	Nathalie.Doswald@unep-wcmc.org
Olaf Zerbock	Conservation International (CI)	o.zerbock@conservation.org
Pavan Sukhdev	The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB)	pavan@unep-wcmc.org
Phil Franks	Care International	pfranks@careclimatechange.org
Ravi Prabhu	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Division of Environmental Policy Implementation	Ravi.Prabhu@unep.org
Roger Muchuba	Civil Society Working Group, REDD, Democratic Republic of the Congo	rogermuchuba@yahoo.fr
Rooslyndiani	Ministry of Forestry, Indonesia	rooslyn@gmail.com
Stefanie von Scheliha	German Technical Co-operation (GTZ)	stefanie.scheliha@gtz.de
Syaiful Ramadhan	Ministry of Forestry, Indonesia	ramadhan_syaiful@yahoo.com
Tim Johnson	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)	Tim.Johnson@unep-wcmc.org
Val Kapos	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)	val.kapos@unep-wcmc.org
Wahida Shah	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Division of Environmental Policy Implementation	Wahida.Shah@unep.org