

Background To The Pacific Regional Policy Framework On REDD+ V2

This document provides some specific background information, and answers to frequently asked questions for the Pacific Regional Policy Framework for REDD+.

Contents

Part I: Background Information	2
Global Framework.....	2
Regional REDD+ Issues.....	2
Regional Drivers of Deforestation and Forest Degradation.....	2
Relevance to Each Member State.....	3
Non-Carbon Benefits.....	3
Policy Framework	4
Scope Of Activity Types	4
Scale Of Activities.....	5
REDD+ Readiness.....	6
REDD+ Implementation	7
UNFCCC and NON-UNFCCC Options	7
No Regrets REDD+ Financing.....	8
The Carbon Market	8
REDD+ Implementation In National GHG Accounting	9
Validation And Verification.....	9
Preferred Approaches to MRV.....	9
Safeguards	10
Positive Ancillary Impacts	10
Leakage	11
Distribution Of Benefits	11
Transparency And Governance	12
Information, Training and Education	12
Information.....	12
Training	13
Learning-By-Doing	13
Tertiary Education.....	13
Community Education.....	14
Regional Support.....	14
International Engagement.....	14
International Engagement With Stakeholders Within The Region.....	14
International Engagement With Stakeholders Outside The Region.....	15
Part II: Frequently Asked Questions	17
Scope, Scale, Readiness	17
Implementation.....	20
MRV	21
Safeguards	24
Information, Training, Education.....	24
International Engagement.....	25

Part I: Background Information

The information provided in this background paper is designed to support the equivalent sections of the Pacific Regional Policy Framework For REDD+.

Global Framework

REDD arose as a global policy issue at the United Nations in 2005 as a response to the lack of a UNFCCC instrument for developing countries to gain access to incentive payments for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the forest sector.

‘REDD’ stands for ‘Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation.’ Deforestation refers to the permanent conversion of forest land to non-forest land. Forest degradation refers to the reduction of tree cover and forest carbon stocks but where the forest remains as forest (e.g. through high intensity selective logging). The ‘+’ in REDD+ was added later and refers to the conservation of forest, the enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and sustainable management of forest. For practical purposes a broader definition of REDD+ could also include growing new forest on non-forest lands (afforestation/reforestation), enabling REDD+ to mean “forest carbon management.”

Deforestation and forest degradation are a major source of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere. At this stage in history most of this is occurring in developing countries in tropical regions. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) emissions from tropical deforestation during the 1990s amounted to 1.6 billion tonnes of carbon per year equating to 17% of global carbon emissions. Reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation is, therefore, an important component of global climate change mitigation.

Regional REDD+ Issues

Rainforest nations throughout the world are engaging with the technical, policy and financing dimensions of REDD+. The Pacific Island region has a diversity of countries with different scales of forest cover, and different needs and interests in relation to REDD+. But there are also common themes within this region, particularly relating to the value of ecosystem services derived from forests and trees. Another prominent feature of Pacific Island forest resources is that they are predominantly owned and occupied by indigenous peoples, who share a need for economic development and poverty alleviation.

Regional Drivers of Deforestation and Forest Degradation

‘Drivers’ refers to the human causes of carbon stock change. Drivers of emissions (e.g. deforestation and forest degradation) need to be understood if they are to be altered or removed. Drivers of carbon sink activity also need to be understood so that they can be encouraged and supported in national policy and programmes. A key feature of REDD+ is the need to curtail drivers of forest sector emissions, and encourage drivers of forest enhancement.

Relevance to Each Member State

The REDD+ sector potentially provides a potentially significant source of technical and financial support for forest sector developments that have been a priority in the region for many years. For example, the highest priority for climate change policy for many Pacific Island countries is climate change adaptation and resilience. Many REDD+ activities such as forest protection and enhancement will also deliver a range of non-carbon beneficial outcomes including climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, sustainable land management, water security, flood and drought mitigation, and biodiversity conservation. REDD+ financing options present a means to help fulfil some of these national goals and priorities.

There is a common need throughout the region for accurate and up-to-date mapping and monitoring of forest and tree resources for land use and resource management planning purposes. The benefits of participating in REDD+ activities and programmes include the opportunity to build local capacity and data sets in forest and tree mapping and monitoring.

The smallest Pacific Island countries have very small land areas and very small areas of forest cover (including mangroves). Even though small in scale, the relative importance of forests and trees to the well-being of local communities in these countries remains significant. One of the potential benefits of a regional approach to REDD+ is to support small-scale activities that are compatible with the needs of these smaller countries.

REDD+ is a public policy as well as a commercial tool for gaining access to finance for forest management. When utilised as a commercial tool for financing forest management, REDD+ activities will commonly need to demonstrate commercial returns on investment as with other commercial activities. When utilised as a public policy tool, REDD+ may not need to demonstrate commercial returns on investment, but instead can be regarded as a useful co-financing instrument for a range of sustainable land management priorities.

Non-Carbon Benefits

For a long time now foresters, ecologists and environmentalists have helped us understand the way that forested landscapes provide a broad range of ecosystem services that are beneficial to our communities.

For example, forests provide the following:

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Watershed Management: | Forests provide protection from flood and cyclone damage through root systems that bind the soil, protect riverbanks, together with a canopy that intercepts rainfall. This reduces the risk of surface, gully, stream bank, and rill erosion thereby reducing sediment loads in rivers and coastal marine areas. Forest soils tend to have higher water holding capacity compared with non-forested soils, which helps to moderate the discharge of water into stream systems and salinization of groundwater near coastlines, riverbanks and shores. This can lower the risk (and cost) of flash flooding and associated flood damage in high rainfall events. A forest buffer will also mitigate the pollution of water sources from human activity (e.g. cattle grazing, pesticides, and water seepage from human settlements). |
| Coastal Protection: | Coastal forests provide protection from seaward winds and tides and also help to filter out sediment that would otherwise flow to the sea and cover coral reefs. Mangrove forests also provide important buffering from cyclone |

damage and storm surges.

Latent Heat Production:

Forests keep the land surface cool through latent heat production. Forests do this by converting the sun's energy into sugar (and wood) and water vapour – each are forms of latent heat. Latent heat is not hot to the touch (that is 'sensible heat') but still stores heat energy. When we remove forests we remove the system that produces latent heat, and the land surface heats up even without any additional heat from the sun. A hotter land surface will have lower soil moisture (because of faster evaporation rates), and be less productive than a cooler land surface – especially in tropical and sub-tropical climates.

Water cycle:

Forest systems help to maintain the cycling of water locally through evapotranspiration. This can help to maintain local water supplies, particularly in seasonally dry climates.

Provisioning Services:¹

Forests clearly provide many forest products that are beneficial to our communities including wood, foods, fibre, and cultural resources.

Biodiversity:

Being three dimensional, forest ecosystems are storehouses of biological diversity and tropical rainforests are among the most bio-diverse systems on Earth. Protecting biodiversity is already an important component of environmental policy and management in many Pacific Island countries through their biodiversity strategies.

Reducing GHG Emissions:

Harvesting timber from forests and forest clearance produces CO₂ emissions. This is because approximately half the dry weight of wood is carbon that was taken from the atmosphere (in the form of CO₂) through photosynthesis. When trees die and decompose or are burnt this CO₂ is released back into the atmosphere. Reducing deforestation and/or forest degradation therefore, reduces GHG emissions from these activities, and is beneficial to the climate system.

GHG Removals:

Growing new forests on non-forest land or restoring forests on deforestation and degraded land increases the current amount of CO₂ that is taken from the atmosphere and stored as wood. This helps to lower atmospheric CO₂ concentrations and is beneficial to the climate system.

Policy Framework

Scope Of Activity Types

REDD+ activities involve:

- Baseline/reference or 'without payment' scenarios, and
- Project or 'with-payment' scenarios

Baseline/reference scenarios can include situations where:

¹ The terminology here follows the UN Millennium Ecosystem Assessment that defines the provision of goods (such as forest products) as 'provisioning services.'

- Deforestation is occurring
- Deforestation is not yet occurring but where drivers of deforestation exist
- Forest degradation is occurring
- Forest degradation is not yet occurring but where drivers of forest degradation exist
- A forest is degraded and not regenerating
- A non-forest land use is occurring but there is potential for a forest land use to occur on the same land

Project or ‘with-payment’ scenarios can involve:

- Conversion of active deforestation to forest protection
- Conversion of active deforestation to low impact logging
- Avoidance of future deforestation by protecting a forest
- Avoidance of future deforestation by implementing low impact logging
- Conversion of a low carbon (degraded) forest to a high carbon forest
- Conversion of non-forest land to forest land

Scale Of Activities

The financing instruments available to REDD+ readiness and implementation will commonly determine the scale at which the activities are able to occur. There are a number of international REDD+ financing options currently or potentially available including carbon markets, multilateral banks (such as the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility of the World Bank), bilateral agreements, philanthropic entities, and the private sector.

Project-scale REDD+ activities can range from relatively small areas (e.g. tens of hectares) to tens or hundreds of thousands of hectares of forest land. Very small-scale projects need to overcome project development and transaction cost barriers, which in practice, is likely to require a minimum area (e.g. 50ha) that is larger than some projects. In these situations, small projects can be aggregated with other projects to gain the scale needed (called grouped projects). Another factor to consider in very small-scale projects, is the potential to develop purpose-built financing instruments to suit them. Ultimately, small projects seeking payments for ecosystem services are attempting to find a supplier of money for these payments. Small-scale projects may be appropriately aligned with small scale source of finance such as local financial institutions, businesses, or donors.

Larger scale projects can include projects large enough to cover all forests of a particular type in a small or medium sized country. For example, a country could aggregate all priority areas into a single grouped project covering the national resource.

Countries considering national vs project-scale financing options need to consider the reason for opting for national scale approaches and evaluate the costs and the benefits of doing so. Because the UNFCCC has not yet developed a REDD+ financing instrument, it remains unknown whether it will offer this at a national scale only, or with options for other scales of engagement (e.g. jurisdictional, nested, project and grouped project scales).

Starting with project and grouped project approaches, learning how the entire cycle works, and then, through time, scaling up to a national scale approach is a lower risk option for many Pacific Island countries than starting with a full national-scale approach. This is particularly true when there is (as yet) no national-scale UNFCCC instrument. Once the UNFCCC have finalised a REDD+ financing instrument it will become much clearer whether it will be of any benefit to Pacific Island countries (particularly those other than Papua New Guinea that are small on a global scale).

REDD+ Readiness

REDD+ Readiness involves capacity building to enable countries to participate in REDD+ implementation activities. A global UNFCCC REDD+ instrument (if completed) may require completion of a full set of national REDD+ readiness performance indicators as a condition of eligibility for participation in UNFCCC REDD+ implementation activities. The World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) already requires the completion of a full set of national REDD+ Readiness performance indicators as a condition of eligibility for participation in the FCPF REDD+ implementation activities.

Sub-national approaches to REDD+ engagement may be an option with a future UNFCCC REDD+ instrument (if completed), either with:

- Full completion of a set of national REDD+ Readiness performance indicators, or
- Partial completion of a set of national REDD+ Readiness performance indicators, or
- Electing not to undertake national REDD+ Readiness

These options are offered in forest-based project-scale modalities under the Kyoto Protocol with the Joint Implementation (JI) and Clean Development Mechanism (CDM).

If a future UNFCCC REDD+ instrument requires countries to complete a full set of national REDD+ readiness performance indicators prior to gaining access to REDD+ implementation financing, then Pacific Island countries which lack the capacity or resources to complete a full national REDD+ readiness programme may elect to not participate in a future UNFCCC REDD+ instrument, opting instead to utilise other more flexible instruments if available.

Sub-national engagement with REDD+ implementation will require the full set of sub-national REDD+ readiness elements. For example, project-scale REDD+ readiness includes:

- Selecting and/or developing the financing instrument and financing arrangements, including the fulfilment of eligibility criteria, and the clarification of modality and conditions for payments for ecosystem services.
- Development/refinement of project governance structures.
- Legal capacity and capability to clarify carbon rights including rules for the transfer of carbon rights (if applicable), legal contracts between project owners, project developers, programme operators, and payers of performance-based payments for ecosystem services.
- Technical capacity and capability to undertake project mapping, calculate baseline/reference and project scenario GHG emissions, and forest carbon modelling.
- Economic capacity and capability to undertake the economic analysis associated with project cost-benefit analysis, additionality testing, and market leakage testing.

- Design and development of specifically tailored legal instruments to protect forests for carbon benefits.
- Logistical capacity and capability to undertake project management and monitoring of carbon stocks, project safeguards, ancillary impacts, benefit distribution, project risk assessment and risk management.

Project-scale engagement with REDD+ will commonly involve/require the out-sourcing of certain technical expert services in a similar way as national REDD+ engagement and other resource management activities.

To participate even in small-scale REDD+ activities forest owners will need the support of other stakeholders including government programmes and technical support to ensure their effective participation.

REDD+ readiness activities can be financed through grants by multilateral agreements and programmes, multilateral development banks, bilateral agreements, domestic financing instruments within the countries, philanthropic entities, and the private sector.

REDD+ Implementation

The ultimate purpose of REDD+ programmes is the receipt of performance-based payments for the delivery of quality-assured ecosystem services, financed from a range of possible non-market and market modalities.

UNFCCC and NON-UNFCCC Options

The UNFCCC as yet has not developed a global financing instrument for REDD+. If the UNFCCC does provide a global REDD+ implementation financing instrument, it may not be available for many years, and may have conditions that pose barriers to participation by small island countries. This may come in the form of a fund-based instrument, a market-based instrument, a market-linked instrument or a combination of all of these.

If the UNFCCC fails to provide a global REDD+ implementation financing instrument, then it is possible that global REDD+ implementation financing may shift to other policy settings such as regional climate change agreements, domestic policies in Annex 1 countries, and/or a global REDD+ agreement outside the UNFCCC. Such instruments may come in the form of fund-based instruments, market-based instruments, market-linked instruments or a combination of all of these.

Non-UNFCCC REDD+ implementation financing instruments are currently available in the global voluntary carbon market, and fund-based instruments through bilateral agreements, and/or multilateral financing institutions.

Non-UNFCCC REDD+ implementation financing can involve payments for carbon benefits already delivered (*ex post* payments), or payments (now) for carbon benefits to be delivered in the future (*ex ante* payments). *Ex post* payments for ecosystem services tend to be delivered in batches (e.g. every 5 years) following the delivery of a batch (e.g. 5 years) of ecosystem services. Countries and/or sub-national entities engaging in *ex post* REDD+ implementation financing will have the option to transition to a future UNFCCC (or other global) REDD+ implementation financing instrument should one be provided. In contrast, countries and/or sub-national entities engaging in long-term *ex ante* REDD+ implementation financing (e.g. selling credits in a long range futures market) will not have the option to transition their

financing to a future UNFCCC REDD+ implementation financing instrument, at least not until the expiry of any *ex ante* contracts.

No Regrets REDD+ Financing

A ‘no-regrets’ approach to REDD+ implementation financing is one that would take advantage of currently available REDD+ financing instruments, whilst keeping the option open to engage with future UNFCCC or other global REDD+ implementation financing instrument/s. The value of engaging with REDD+ implementation financing instruments currently available includes the ability to:

- Build REDD+ capacity through ‘learning-by-doing’.
- Begin or continue with REDD+ readiness activities with the confidence that this will lead to some form of REDD+ implementation and associated payments.
- Not delay their transition from REDD+ readiness to REDD+ implementation.

The Carbon Market

The carbon market involves buyers and sellers of carbon credits. Carbon credits are produced from comprehensive quality assurance through carbon market standards. These standards independently verify that the climate-related ecosystem services represented by the credits have actually been produced. The independent audit procedures of carbon market standards verify that the carbon credits have resulted from measurable GHG emission reductions and/or removals that would not otherwise have occurred (i.e. they are additional to business-as-usual). Carbon market standards normally require compliance with equivalent methodological frameworks and standards as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol.

Buyers use carbon credits for:

- Social/environmental responsibility claims.
- “Green” marketing of goods and services that are linked to environmental and social responsibility.
- Maintaining access to markets for manufactured goods by showing emission reduction and offsetting certificates.

Carbon credits validated and verified by carbon market standards are required to:

- Pass an additionality test (i.e. would not have occurred anyway).
- Account for and address leakage/displacement of emissions.
- Come from projects that self-insure the carbon benefits.
- Legally enforce project activities for the duration of the project.

Countries could elect to support carbon market financing for REDD+ activities, and regulate this by requiring projects to be validated and verified to a selection of voluntary carbon market standards that guarantee that the quality of activities will be in line with world’s best practice. Regulating the voluntary carbon market in this way would ensure high quality projects without requiring any additional capability or resources in government regulatory agencies.

Carbon market standards that enable projects to meet world's best practice in REDD+ implementation activities include:

- Verified Carbon Standard (VCS)
- ISO14064-2 (especially when combined with methodological elements from other standards such as the VCS)
- Plan Vivo
- Carbon Fix
- Climate Community and Biodiversity Standard (CCB) (non-carbon co-benefits only)
- Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)
- Social Carbon

REDD+ Implementation In National GHG Accounting

The monitoring associated with REDD+ activities can be used in national GHG accounting. Emission reductions and/or enhanced removals from REDD+ activities could also potentially be used as part of a national low emission development strategy.

Validation And Verification

‘Validation’ refers to the quality assurance auditing of methodologies and proposed activities, whereas ‘verification’ refers to the quality assurance auditing of actual performance as a consequence of monitoring. Validation and verification standards are core feature of REDD+ financing instruments including carbon markets.

Preferred Approaches to MRV

‘MRV’ stands for ‘measurement, reporting and verification’. Any future UNFCCC REDD+ implementation financing instrument will require compliance with UNFCCC guidelines and guidance for MRV. REDD+ implementation financing instruments outside the UNFCCC also require compliance with the equivalent UNFCCC guidelines and guidance for MRV.

UNFCCC Decision 4/CP.15, requests developing country Parties to take the following guidance into account for activities relating to measurement and reporting:

1(c) “To use the most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change guidance and guidelines, as adopted or encouraged by the Conference of the Parties, as appropriate, as a basis for estimating anthropogenic forest-related greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks, forest carbon stocks and forest area changes”

1(d) “To establish, according to national circumstances and capabilities, robust and transparent national forest monitoring systems and, if appropriate, sub-national systems as part of national monitoring systems that:

- (i) Use a combination of remote sensing and ground-based forest carbon inventory approaches for estimating, as appropriate, anthropogenic forest-related greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks, forest carbon stocks and forest area changes;

(ii) Provide estimates that are transparent, consistent, as far as possible accurate, and that reduce uncertainties, taking into account national capabilities and capacities;

(iii) Are transparent and their results are available and suitable for review as agreed by the Conference of the Parties;”

Safeguards

REDD+ safeguards are designed to maximise the positive and minimise the negative ancillary impacts of REDD+ implementation activities. Appendix 1 of the UNFCCC Cancun Agreement in December 2010 cover REDD+ safeguards and state that REDD+ activities should:

- Complement or be consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements;
- Involve transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty;
- Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities, by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws, and noting that the United Nations General Assembly has adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;
- Include the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities,
- Ensure that actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, and are not used for the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits;
- Address the risks of reversals (e.g. forest fires and illegal logging);
- Reduce the displacement of emissions (also called leakage).

Agencies other than the UNFCCC have developed or are developing guidelines and guidance on REDD+ Safeguards, including but not restricted to the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards Initiative.

Positive Ancillary Impacts

REDD+ implementation activities can cause positive ancillary impacts if such activities are designed, planned and executed in ways that incorporate social and environmental good practice methods, in line with social and environmental safeguards.

Non-carbon positive ancillary impacts of REDD+ implementation activities can include (but are not restricted to) poverty alleviation, climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, sustainable land management, sustainable forest management, watershed protection, bioenergy, and biodiversity conservation.

Some non-carbon positive ancillary impacts of REDD+ implementation activities are addressed in non-REDD+ resource management programmes in the countries. Such programmes will benefit from REDD+ implementation activities that take sufficient account of these programmes and the domestic and international reporting requirements and obligations of such programmes.

Non-carbon positive ancillary impacts arising from REDD+ implementation activities can be independently quality assured through good practice guidance, standards, third party validation, verification and certification, and registration procedures.

Leakage

Performance-based payments for REDD+ ecosystem services are usually conditional on the assessment of leakage (the displacement of emissions) arising as a consequence of the particular REDD+ implementation activities. Leakage refers to emissions occurring outside the boundary of the REDD+ implementation activities but which are caused by those same REDD+ implementation activities. An example of leakage is when a forest is protected from logging (and the owners sell carbon credits generated by that protection), but the logging operation simply shifts to another forest that would not otherwise have been logged.

Leakage is closely linked to, and caused by, the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and if these drivers are not addressed in REDD+ implementation activities, they will cause leakage.

Addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation is an integral component of “leakage avoidance” activity. Leakage avoidance activities can be incorporated into the management plans of REDD+ implementation and can include:

- Additional employment opportunities for local people.
- The development of plantation forests to help meet local demand for timber production and forest-related employment.
- Assisting logging companies create and sell carbon credits instead of or along side timber as a means of generating an income from their concession areas.

Under national-scale REDD+ implementation programmes, leakage within a country is eliminated because the forest sector of a whole country is caught in national forest carbon accounting, and it is the nation that receives performance-based payments for ecosystem services. To use a metaphor: national-scale REDD+ implementation and carbon accounting is akin to a person (representing a nation) standing on the scales and measuring her weight (representing forest carbon stocks) in year one. This person then weighs herself again 5 years later. If she is heavier in year 5 compared with year 1, she gets a performance-based payment for increasing her weight (carbon stocks). The volume of payment is based on the difference in weight between year 1 and year 5. Here it does not matter if weight gain on her left leg is cancelled out by weight loss on her right leg because her whole body is being weighed. In project-scale REDD+ implementation, the project boundary might be restricted to her left leg. Weight gain on her left leg that is cancelled out by weight loss on her right leg needs to be accounted for and is subtracted from the performance-based payment to her left leg.

Using our metaphor, international leakage can be understood as weight gain on one person being cancelled out by weight loss on another person. International leakage cannot be addressed by individual country alone, but instead requires regional cooperation, and also potentially cooperation with other countries beyond the region.

Distribution Of Benefits

Land Tenure arrangements

REDD+ implementation will take place on a variety of land tenure types including government-owned land, freehold land, and lands owned communally by indigenous peoples.

The distribution of benefits arising from REDD+ implementation will need to reflect rights associated with that land tenure. REDD+ benefit distribution will need to take into account existing customary land tenure systems in each of the countries.

Disputes over land tenure (particularly between communal landowners) pose a significant potential barrier to REDD+ implementation. The resolution of land tenure disputes and/or benefit distribution disputes is a pre-condition to REDD+ implementation.

Rights Of Indigenous Peoples

UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Appendix 1 of the UNFCCC Cancun Agreements in December 2010 referring to REDD+ safeguards, are both relevant to the role and rights of indigenous peoples in relation to REDD+ activities.

The vast majority of lands in the Pacific Island Region that are relevant to REDD+ Implementation activities are owned by indigenous peoples.

Transparency And Governance

Illegal Logging

Illegal logging activities will undermine and seriously diminish the value of any REDD+ Implementation activities. According to the FLEGT definition, illegal logging includes logging of timber species protected by law, logging outside licensed areas (including overcutting), buying of logs harvested from outside licensed areas, logging in protected areas (including reserves and/or protected forest carbon project areas), logging in prohibited areas (including steep slopes, buffers), cutting and removal of undersized trees, cutting over the authorised limit, logging without proper authorisation, shortcutting the proper licensing process.

The negative impacts of illegal logging on REDD+ activities can be reduced or eliminated through active pursuit of forest law enforcement, governance and trade (FLEGT) programmes.

Governing Private Contributions To Public Ecosystem Services

Government taxation, rate revenues, and levy instruments are often used to harvest private funds to offset any social and/or environmental external costs of economic development activities. When private actors undertake activities that reduce external costs of economic development, or produce positive externalities, it is logical and consistent with natural justice to not penalise those private actors by taxing, rating or levying them in the same manner as private actors who generate negative externalities.

Information, Training and Education

Information

Forest data requirements of REDD+ Readiness and Implementation will necessitate new research activities to support Member States in their engagement with REDD+ activities.

Forest data gathered in one country may be applicable to REDD+ activities in another country.

Social, economic, and cultural data gathered in one country may be applicable to REDD+ activities in another country.

Regional cooperation and coordination of REDD+ research activities will benefit the region by reducing costs and increasing efficiencies, especially if such research activity is designed and executed to support specific components of REDD+ activities.

A regional information platform for REDD+ will benefit the region by facilitating information sharing.

Training

REDD+ activities require skill-sets that are not always fully available among implementing agencies in the Member States.

Improving capabilities among incumbent staff in agencies involved in REDD+ activities will require targeted training.

Increasing the skill level among incumbent staff in agencies involved or potentially involved in REDD+ activities will benefit the region by lowering the reliance on external expertise.

One option for targeted training for REDD+ activities is to organise this on a regional basis that brings relevant staff from the different Member States to coordinated training programmes.

Targeted training for REDD+ could be incorporated into professional development programmes for staff employed in agencies relevant to REDD+ activities.

Professional development training can include modular courses offered by tertiary institutions using REDD+ experts as trainers.

Modular REDD+ courses can be combined to form a postgraduate tertiary degree and thereby be available to staff of relevant agencies involved in REDD+ activities and/or available to postgraduate students seeking to engage in REDD+ activities as a new entrant.

National and regional training for REDD+ will be more efficiently undertaken if such training programmes were first carefully planned and incorporated into a regional REDD+ training strategy.

Learning-By-Doing

REDD+ activities include new activities for which there are few opportunities for prior training.

Similar activities to REDD+ activities have been conducted in other fields that provide experience sufficient to enable the successful implementation of REDD+ activities.

Undertaking new activities helps to build capability among those individuals and agencies involved in undertaking those activities.

REDD+ activities that require external technical assistance and support can be designed so that they involve capability transfer and on-the-job training for local counterparts if designed for this purpose.

Tertiary Education

For REDD+ to become mainstreamed in the Pacific Islands region, new entrants to the sector will need to become available from the pool of those educated in (particularly tertiary) educational institutions in the region.

The skills relevant to REDD+ activities include but are not restricted to: Forestry, biology, ecology, environmental science, economics, human and physical geography, sociology, finance, law, and public policy.

Many of the skills relevant to REDD+ activities are already available from educational disciplines already available at tertiary educational institutions of the region.

The mainstreaming of REDD+ will benefit from the inclusion of REDD+ themes in existing tertiary educational institutions in the region, with particular reference to forestry education.

REDD+ educational resources developed for use by tertiary educational institutions in the region can also benefit REDD+ tertiary education.

Community Education

Local communities and other relevant REDD+ stakeholders will benefit from understanding the purpose of REDD+ activities as well as the opportunities and responsibilities associated with their participation.

Users of resource management innovations do not need to know all of the technical details of how the innovation works in order to use it or benefit from it.

The educational needs of local communities and relevant REDD+ stakeholders are focused on their particular role in REDD+ activities.

Community and stakeholder education in REDD+ will achieve greater uptake if delivered using languages and contexts that are relevant to that particular group or stakeholder.

Community education in REDD+ will be most beneficial to local communities and relevant stakeholders if it is designed and delivered to:

- Simplify the issues as much as possible
- Enable an understanding of REDD+ activities in a way that is relevant to that particular group or stakeholder
- Be understood in languages and contexts that are relevant to that particular group or stakeholder.

Regional Support

Pacific Island countries planning and undertaking REDD+ activities would benefit from regional REDD+ support supplied by regional organisations such as SPC. Such support could include advisory services, coordination of activities, providing external expertise, training and education support, information sharing, international leakage monitoring and control, and technical services such as remote sensing and mapping.

International Engagement

International Engagement With Stakeholders Within The Region

Member States have existing processes for international engagement with each other through the Pacific Islands Forum and through a range of other channels.

Different Member States are likely to have different priorities and preferences for REDD+ and how REDD+ aligns with national policies and programmes.

A Regional approach to REDD+ needs to support regional cooperation through open dialogue between Member States and key regional REDD+ stakeholders. Regional engagement will most effectively represent the interests of different Member States and different relevant stakeholder groups within each Member State if the relevant stakeholders are party to dialogue concerning regional REDD+ issues.

International Engagement With Stakeholders Outside The Region

REDD+ is being developed as part of a global policy, technical, and financing process through the UNFCCC, multilateral development banks, multilateral programmes, and bilateral agreements.

Different Member States are engaged in these global initiatives at different levels and with different priorities.

The Pacific Island region will be more strongly represented in global REDD+ policy, technical and financing processes if it is able to articulate a coherent regional message that emphasises the common needs and interests of the region, whilst recognising intra-regional differences where appropriate.

Different Member States will have different preferences with respect to global REDD+ policy, technical, and financing programmes.

International REDD+ policy guidance developed for the Member States by the CROP agencies will accurately reflect the needs, interests and priorities of the Member States as a whole, if such guidance is the product of a process of dialogue with each of the Member States and the relevant sectors and stakeholders within Member States.

Global REDD+ policy, technical, and financing process through the UNFCCC, multilateral development banks, multilateral programmes, and bilateral agreements commonly provide for the representation of forestry interests from the region and from Member States.

The participation of forestry representatives at global REDD+ policy, technical, and financing process through the UNFCCC, multilateral development banks, multilateral programmes, and bilateral agreements will benefit the advancement of REDD+ programmes and activities in the region.

Multilateral environmental agreements each impose national reporting requirements on ratifying Member States, and that these reporting requirements impose a significant resourcing challenge to the ratifying Member States, particularly due to:

- The cross-over between different agreements and the different reporting frameworks and templates,
- The low capacity of many government agencies of Member States, and
- The need to undertake this reporting over and above the normal functioning of government agencies,

There is considerable value in the development of REDD+ reporting systems that:

- Avoid duplication of REDD+ reporting with existing national MEA reporting requirements,
- Harmonise REDD+ reporting requirements with other MEA obligations to streamline these functions of government.

Part II: Frequently Asked Questions

The regional consultation for the Pacific Regional Policy Framework for REDD+, held in Suva in April 2012 involved participants asking several questions for clarification.

Scope, Scale, Readiness

Question	Response
<i>Do smaller island states qualify to sell their carbon?</i>	UNFCCC: no instrument yet Non-UNFCCC: yes. In practice it depends on the details of the particular activity, the rules financing instrument used, and prudent balancing of costs and benefits. Key point: the core of this sector is performance-based payments for ecosystem services. These payments can come from different sources
<i>Do coconut plantations qualify for carbon credit?</i>	It will depend on the definition of ‘forest land’, which can differ from one country to the next. Coconut plantations do contain carbon because this is what the wood is made from. If the baseline is grass, and the project involves planting new coconut plantations then in principle there is no reason why carbon credits cannot be produced on such land in a non-UNFCCC financing instrument. The challenge is that the volume of carbon sequestered per hectare per year may be quite low and the credit volumes correspondingly low. So in this situation the project development and transaction costs would need to be relatively low – otherwise too much money would be spent on project development and not enough actual payments going to land owners. The best way to answer this question is to undertake a cost-benefit analysis as part of a pre-feasibility study of a potential carbon project.
<i>What kind of data needed to be submitted to qualify for carbon credit?</i>	Each financing instrument will specify the data requirements for a national, jurisdictional, programmatic or project activity. This will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defining (mapping) the forest area and clarifying associated land tenure and carbon rights, • Identifying the GHG sources and sinks to be measured and the carbon pools to be considered, • Determining the baseline activity and proving (through economic analysis) that the baseline is viable and likely to occur without the project activity, • Determining the project activity and the carbon strategy, • Calculating baseline emissions using a carbon accounting procedure involving mapping data and forest inventory data, • Calculating project scenario emissions, • Calculating net carbon benefits • Undertaking a risk analysis • Using the risk analysis to determine a risk management strategy including project self-insurance • Assessing leakage • Calculating carbon credit volumes using all of the above • Assessing non-carbon ancillary impacts • Defining roles and responsibilities • Designing a monitoring plan • Determining the project data management system • Assessment of uncertainty and data quality
<i>What is the definition of forests at regional and national level?</i>	This will potentially differ from country to country, but can also use FAO definitions for what constitutes ‘forest-land’. There are different definitions of what constitutes a forest. The most significant differences concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The legal classifications of land uses in a country (forest / agriculture / urban)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The kind of vegetation that constitutes a forest. <p>Some legal definitions of ‘forest’ are based on the actual vegetation on the ground, whereas other definitions are based on a defined land area which may have no vegetation on it at all but is legally under the jurisdiction of the national agency which manages forests and natural resources.</p> <p>In the 1990 FAO report, forests in developed countries were defined as areas of land with 20% tree cover. In the 2000 report, this definition was changed in order to harmonize it with the definition for developing countries which is 10% tree cover.</p> <p>It would be useful to define ‘forest land’ at a regional level for the Pacific Island region. This regional definition could potentially include coconut plantations.</p>
<i>What are the reporting mechanisms?</i>	Reporting mechanisms are rigidly defined and determined by each financing instrument. Different reporting requirements are imposed by different financing instruments. Such reporting will cover the data requirements indicated in c. above.
<i>What REDD+ standards comply with international (IPCC) requirements?</i>	<p>Forest carbon standards relevant to the broader definition of REDD+ and which comply with IPCC LULUCF guidelines and guidance include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan Vivo • Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) • ISO14064-2 Standard • Carbon Fix • Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) • Climate Community and Biodiversity Standard • Social Carbon
<i>Scope: What are the options for the very small island countries?</i>	<p>It is helpful to think of REDD+ as performance-based ‘payments for ecosystem services’. The Pacific Regional Policy Framework For REDD+ explains the different activity types possible in the REDD+ sector. Even for small island states with little forest, the same scope principles can apply as those of the larger countries, so long as the financial instrument recognizes them. Different financing instruments focus on different scopes.</p> <p>For example, Carbon Fix and the Clean Development Mechanism both only support afforestation/ reforestation activities. The verified Carbon Standard supports all scopes. Plan Vivo and the ISO14064-2 standards supports all scopes.</p>
<i>Is there a risk in developing a national REDD+ programme for a UNFCCC instrument, when we do not know if that instrument will be finalized and what it will look like?</i>	We do not know what the UNFCCC REDD+ financing instrument will look like until it is finalized. Until then we can only prepare in a way that does not shut down future options. For example, imagine that a country undertakes project-scale activities now but the UNFCCC only offers a national scale instrument. Under this situation the country can continue with its project scale activity and the payments for ecosystem services from that activity can continue to be received. But the national scale carbon accounting would need to be managed to avoid any double counting. The project-scale activities can help the country to understand how to engage at a national scale in the future.
<i>IPCC vs UNFCCC: Can they be combined?</i>	The UNFCCC is a climate <u>policy</u> convention, whereas the IPCC is a <u>scientific advisory body</u> . The IPCC is the scientific advisory body to the UNFCCC.
<i>What is the relevance of the Pacific Regional Policy Framework for REDD+ countries that already have REDD+ policies?</i>	The Pacific Regional Policy Framework for REDD+ can help to strengthen and reinforce national policies where they already exist.
<i>How is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change governed, and what is its purpose?</i>	The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change was established in 1988 through a collaboration between the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) and the UN Environment Programme. It is composed of scientists and policy experts and its role is to provide policy relevant but not policy prescriptive advice to the parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (i.e. national governments world wide).

	<p>The world's best climate scientists are selected for roles as authors and reviewers of climate science assessment reports that are released every 6 to 7 years. The first Assessment Report of the IPCC was released in 1990. The fourth Assessment Report was released in 2007.</p> <p>The preparation of the assessment reports is conducted by panels of world leading scientists covering each different component of climate science. These panels review all of the available climate science publications in the world's scientific journals. The IPCC working groups then summarise the findings of the most up-to-date climate science. These summaries are then subject to peer review and also line by line negotiation by scientific panels to arrive at a consensus position on each theme.</p> <p>Third Assessment Report (2001) as a 3,061- page synthesis by over 1,000 authors and expert reviewers of over 11,000 peer-reviewed scientific studies. The Assessment Reports are broken into three volumes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Scientific Basis2. Impacts Adaptation Vulnerability3. Mitigation <p>The IPCC also recruits world-leading specialists to form expert teams to prepare special reports on specific topics such as global warming potentials of different greenhouse gases, aviation emissions measurement, and methodologies for carbon measurement in the Land Use Land Use Change And forestry (LULUCF) sector. This methodological guidance is designed to guide governments in their own national GHG inventories and reporting.</p> <p>The IPCC is perhaps the most robust and comprehensive process of scientific consensus building ever conducted on a global scale.</p> <p>Thousands of scientists from all over the world contribute to the work of the IPCC on a voluntary basis. Review is an essential part of the IPCC process, to ensure an objective and complete assessment of current information. IPCC aims to reflect a range of views and expertise. The Secretariat coordinates all the IPCC work and liaises with Governments. It is supported by WMO and UNEP and hosted at WMO headquarters in Geneva.</p> <p>The IPCC is an intergovernmental body. It is open to all member countries of the United Nations (UN) and WMO. Currently 195 countries are members of the IPCC. Governments participate in the review process and the plenary Sessions, where main decisions about the IPCC work programme are taken and reports are accepted, adopted and approved. The IPCC Bureau Members, including the Chair, are also elected during the plenary Sessions.</p>
--	--

Implementation

Question	Response
<i>What do the national activities involve?</i>	<p>The implementation of national scale activities are contingent upon the availability of a UNFCCC REDD+ financing instrument.</p> <p>A national approach will involve the establishment of national Reference Levels (RLs) to determine the baseline against which any national performance in carbon stock management will be measured.</p> <p>The management of the national forest carbon estate in a manner that increases forest carbon stocks and reduces forest sector carbon emissions. These activities can be incentivised by the government in any way that a government wishes. One way to incentivise certain activities is for governments to decentralize the distribution of carbon credits directly to the landowners, or to retain the ownership of carbon credits nationally but distributing direct payments for forest management performance to landowners.</p>
<i>Do we have enough financial and technical resources to start or we have to look for external funding?</i>	It is likely that external funding support will be required to support new activities until such time as they can be supported entirely without that support.
<i>Is there a regional process to follow for soliciting technical and financial support from outside sources?</i>	At this stage there is no regional process specifically designed to cater for the soliciting of technical and financial support.
<i>Is there a ready-made regional REDD+ guidelines for implementation?</i>	No. The Pacific Regional Policy Framework for REDD+ will be a first step in this direction.
<i>Are group projects possible in the VCS?</i>	Yes. The Verified Carbon Standard supports grouped project approaches.
<i>Plan Vivo standards – can different REDD+ activity types be undertaken in one project?</i>	Yes – This is also true for the VCS, but in the VCS it is probably more expensive to do this.
<i>Are there funding sources for implementation?</i>	Yes. This can involve donor support through grants and also private sector investment funds to support activities where the private sector will buy credits generated from those activities.
<i>What are the costs of implementation?</i>	These costs vary considerably depending on scale, scope and activity type.
<i>Are there methodologies and project designs for Plan Vivo?</i>	Yes. But Plan Vivo also allows project proponents to develop their own technical specifications (methodologies), which are then subject to quality controls in Plan Vivo.
<i>When is REDD+ operational?</i>	REDD+ is operational outside the UNFCCC as soon as a country or a sub-national entity decides to undertake a REDD+ activity using existing carbon market standards. No one knows if and/or when the UNFCCC REDD+ instrument will be operational.
<i>What's the difference between REDD+ and Payment for Ecosystem Services?</i>	There is no difference. REDD+ involves payments for ecosystem services. It is one of the more advanced versions of payments for ecosystem services.

MRV

Question	Responses
<i>Who is doing the remote sensing?</i>	Many different entities generate the aerial imagery. Then this imagery needs to be processed by organisations seeking to use it for REDD+ planning purposes.
<i>Is there sufficient software, satellite images and maps available in the region for doing REDD+?</i>	Yes.
<i>Can aerial photos be used?</i>	Yes.
<i>Do we have enough capacity to do the national forest carbon inventory?</i>	This will vary from one country to the next.
<i>Are we using uniform standards and criteria (methodology)?</i>	Sometimes. It is very useful to ensure that standards and methodologies are integrated across the region so that each country engaging in REDD+ is compatible with other countries in the region. It is particularly important to ensure that each country is basing their MRV systems on a common set of international best practice for the REDD+ sector. This international best practice guidance comes from the IPCC and other scientific advisory bodies that are informing the UNFCCC.
<i>How often can or should countries update their forest inventory?</i>	It is up to the country, and it depends on the way a national inventory is designed. The two basic approaches are periodic and continuous inventory. Periodic inventories occur at one time (e.g. during 2015/16) and then occur again at a later time (e.g. 2025/6). This provides decadal data that can be compared with each other. Periodic inventory requires a major investment in staff and training and inventory implementation every inventory cycle. Continuous inventory is where an on-going inventory process is established, where a smaller group of inventory staff begin in one part of the country and then undertake the inventory systematically from one location to the next, and times so that they get back to the starting point 5 or 10 years after they started. And then the process simply continues through time.
<i>What is the correct terminology: 'Baseline' or 'reference' level?</i>	The word 'baseline' and the term 'reference level' mean much the same thing. In many ways they can be used interchangeably. The baseline is the reference upon which forest carbon management performance is measured, and on this basis the difference between the 'without-payment' and the 'with-payment' scenario can be determined. The quantitative difference between 'without-payment' (baseline) and the 'with-payment' (project) forest carbon scenarios is the basis for determining the volume of payments to be delivered to the REDD+ activity. The reason why this can get confusing is that the terms need to accommodate national level and project scale activities. In project scale activities the term 'baseline' seems to be more common, whereas in national approaches the term 'reference level' or 'reference emissions level' is the norm. In both cases and at any scale, the baseline/reference is the product of a negotiation between a REDD+ activity proponent (e.g. a community or a country) and a financing instrument. The financing instrument wants to minimize the amount paid, whereas the REDD+ activity proponent wants to maximize the amount paid. The financing instrument and its quality control mechanisms require the REDD+ activity proponent to present carbon accounting evidence (audited by an independent third party) to justify and defend the reference/baseline. For national Reference Levels, this negotiation will likely occur at the UNFCCC with developing country Parties presenting their RL/REs and developed country Parties scrutinizing them very closely and challenging them with their own

	<p>experts. The reason why developed country parties are likely to pay close attention to RL/RELS is because they will be the carbon buyers of REDD+ activities and will want to make sure that what they are buying is real, conservative, and not inflated.</p>
<p><i>What is the relationship between sustainable management timber harvesting and the reference level?</i></p>	<p>Most reference levels are developed by gathering historical data to determine the normal rate of emissions from the forest sector over an historical period (e.g. 1990 – 2009), and projecting this rate into the future. These historical reference levels can, in some situations, be adjusted allow countries to increase their emissions reference level above historical levels. Because reference level carbon accounting happens as a national scale, it really does not matter how those emissions were caused. What matters is the volume of the emissions. So sustainable forest management (SFM) activities may have occurred historically and this would contribute to the reference level. If we get a UNFCCC REDD+ instrument, then SFM can also occur in the carbon management period. The key is the aggregated total level of annual emissions for the carbon management period and the difference between this level and the reference level. It will be on this basis that any national level incentive payments will be allocated (as is the case for developed countries in the Kyoto Protocol).</p> <p>At a project scale SFM timber harvesting can also be in the baseline and the project scenario. As with national carbon accounting, the key is the total emissions during the carbon management period.</p> <p>Imagine a natural forest with relatively high commercial timber volumes, but not quite enough to make SFM timber harvesting commercially viable (this is common throughout the world). Because SFM harvesting is not commercially viable in its own right, then the business-as-usual (the baseline) scenario could justifiably involve unsustainable timber harvesting (or deforestation) – because that would be commercially viable in it sown right. In this situation, there is potential to establish a carbon project involving SFM timber harvesting and carbon crediting, where both of these asset-producing activities produce enough assets (timber and carbon credits) to make the project commercially viable. Here carbon credits have helped to cause the SFM forest management regime to become commercially viable, and this is the kind of thing that carbon credit finance is designed to do: make the more sustainable option commercially viable.</p>
<p><i>Could a baseline or reference level be influence by policies?</i></p>	<p>The baseline or reference level of emissions will be the product of all of the activities and policies of a country during the reference period. Policies that change the rate of timber harvesting (e.g. log export rules) will influence the reference emissions level. If a policy can cause emissions to increase in the reference period, clearly a policy can be changed to cause emissions to decrease in the carbon management period. A national scale approach enables countries to use policies (rather than just projects) to influence the level of emissions. And if the emissions level is lower in the carbon management period compared with the reference period then the country will be eligible for performance-based incentive payments for ecosystem services (aka carbon finance) if a national scale financing instrument is offered internationally.</p> <p>Incidentally, if for some reason the UNFCCC fails to deliver a global REDD+ instrument, then it is quite possible that an international (intergovernmental) REDD+ financing mechanism will develop anyway, through the modification of the existing non-UNFCCC instruments, and/or the establishment of another mechanism such as a global agreement on forests.</p>
<p><i>Are forests defined differently between larger and smaller countries?</i></p>	<p>Countries have the option to define forests how they please. They are well advised to use the definitions provided by organisations like the FAO as a starting point, but then can modify the definition to suite national circumstances. From a forest carbon point of view, the definition of forest land will influence what kind of forest carbon project can occur on that land but is unlikely to influence the potential carbon revenues able to be produced on that land. This is because the volume of carbon revenues able to be generated on any given piece of land will be determined by carbon accounting and not definitions of forest.</p> <p>For example, if a country defines forest to include coconut plantations, then</p>

	<p>establishing new coconut plantations will qualify for carbon financing. But the amount of money able to be generated per hectare on that land will depend on how much carbon is sequestered each year on that land. Different forest definitions would only influence the amount of carbon-related payments if the definition affected the eligibility of land for participation in a particular financing instrument.</p> <p>This is relevant to developed countries under the Kyoto Protocol (for reasons too complex to explain here), but developing countries have the option to choose from a number of different non-UNFCCC financing instruments, whereby the activity types (scope) of these instruments covers most if not all legitimate REDD+ activities.</p>
<p><i>Would National greenhouse gas inventories be sufficient to start MRV?</i></p>	<p>Yes. National forest carbon monitoring starts with the relevant national data sets that already exist. From this starting point gaps are highlighted and plans and strategies developed and implemented to fill those gaps. Through time a country builds its national forest carbon monitoring programme in tandem with the building of its own capacity.</p>
<p><i>Why are there UNFCCC and non-UNFCCC standards, instead of one universal standard?</i></p>	<p>The UNFCCC REDD+ programme has certain quality assurance requirements to ensure that data used in UNFCCC GHG accounting mechanisms are real, measureable and verifiable and consistent with world's best practice. The forest carbon accounting standard used by the UNFCCC is the IPCC carbon accounting standards that have been developed for this purpose.</p> <p>The non-UNFCCC REDD+ financing instruments (e.g. carbon standards) use the same IPCC quality assurance standards at their core. The Non-UNFCCC financing instruments differ from the UNFCCC in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are operational now • Sometimes they offer a more detailed range of activity types (i.e. more detailed than the UNFCCC activity types) • Some have been developed to a higher standard than the IPCC (i.e. more detailed carbon accounting) but based on the IPCC at their core <p>In this way the IPCC forest carbon measurement guidelines and guidance can be seen as a template upon which all forest carbon financing instruments and standards are based.</p> <p>One of the reasons why some non-UNFCCC financing instruments (and their forest carbon accounting methods) are more developed and more detailed than the UNFCCC is because the non-UNFCCC instruments have been operational now for some years and during this time have attracted the worlds best forest carbon experts who have refined many different methodological components of forest carbon accounting, monitoring, reporting and verification systems.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that global forest carbon accounting has also progressed considerably in the Kyoto Annex B (industrialized) countries because these countries have been engaging with the forestry scope of the Kyoto Protocol since the Protocol came into force in 2005</p> <p>If the UNFCCC does eventually develop an operational REDD+ financing instrument, it will very likely borrow from the expertise gained by the non-UNFCCC instruments that have gained considerable experience over their years of operation. Furthermore, many of the non-UNFCCC REDD+ financing instruments have been developed with the assumption that a UNFCCC REDD+ mechanism will eventually become operational, and non-UNFCCC instruments that meet worlds best practice will therefore increase their chances of being accepted into the UNFCCC mechanism.</p>
<p><i>Can there be a regional REL/RL?</i></p>	<p>In principle yes, but in practice this is unlikely.</p>

Safeguards

Question	Responses
<i>Where do the payment for ecosystem services come in?</i>	<p>Safeguards are all about ensuring that carbon-related payments for ecosystem services in the REDD+ sector do not cause undesirable side effects such as increasing poverty, breaching indigenous peoples rights, causing conflict, reducing biodiversity, reducing water supply. Furthermore, if REDD+ activities are undertaken in ways that do cause many other problems, these activities are unlikely to be enduring. Safeguards therefore help to lower non-permanence risk. Another purpose of safeguards is to ensure that deforestation and degradation drivers are actually addressed, and this in turn takes pressure off the forest resource.</p>
<i>How do you determine/measure the value of forest ecosystem services?</i>	<p>For many years economists have wrestled with the issue of how to put an economic value on non-market goods and services. Non-market valuation is a big sub-discipline in economics. As such, there are many different ways to measure the value of forest ecosystem services.</p> <p>One way is to develop an understanding of the ecosystem services produced by forests, see how useful they are to society, and see what it would cost to get these same services if we had to buy them or engineer them.</p> <p>For example, unsustainable forest practices can make water catchments more susceptible to flood damage to downstream communities, and this flood damage comes at a real cost to society and the economy. By managing that catchment more sustainably (e.g. protecting and growing forests) we can lower the impact of flood events, and thereby lower the cost of flood events.</p> <p>When seen in this way we can begin to view forests as ecological infrastructures, and recognize that the sustainable management of forests comprises an ecological infrastructure investment.</p> <p>Like any infrastructure investment, we weigh up costs and benefits associated with construction and maintenance. The difference between ecological and engineered infrastructures though, is that nature a) built the infrastructure, and b) did this for free. So with many ecological infrastructures we do not need to supply the initial capital cost of construction. We only need to pay for the maintenance of this infrastructure.</p>

Information, Training, Education

Information

Question	Responses
<i>Is there enough information available to do REDD+ activities?</i>	<p>All REDD+ implementation activities will require the defining of a specific methodology and then populating that methodology with all the necessary data. In most cases some of the necessary data will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already be available in the appropriate format • Available but will need to be collated and formatted to suit the formatting requirements of the methodology • Not available but requiring some minor resourcing to gather • Not available and requiring outsourcing expertise to gather or produce • Impossible to gain <p>During the development of a concept note (e.g. Project Idea Note or PIN) and/or a project description documentation (PDD or equivalent) REDD+ implementation activities are well advised to use the selected methodology to generate a draft PIN or PDD (or equivalent) by undertaking a data assessment for each data component in the form of a gap analysis. This can enable the production of a First Draft PIN or PDD (or equivalent), which also serves as a data gap analysis. A data-harvesting plan can then be developed and resourced in order to prepare the second or final draft of the documentation.</p>

<i>Is there a database of existing information (national and regional) relevant to REDD+ in the Pacific Islands?</i>	SPC/GIZ are already developing a Regional REDD+ Information Platform that can serve this purpose.
<i>Are any academic institutions involved in REDD+?</i>	USP is already involved in REDD+ data gathering with the Fiji REDD+ Programme and can also be involved in a regional information platform.

Education and Training

Question	Responses
<i>Are current training programmes and existing syllabus applicable to REDD+?</i>	Much of existing forestry training will be relevant to REDD+, but some modifications can bring such training up to speed.
<i>How can academic institutions get involved in REDD+?</i>	It would be useful to consider the development of modular training programmes to use for professional development and postgraduate degree programmes.
<i>How can REDD+ be made attractive to training institutions?</i>	Several options including showing such institutions the importance of forest carbon management and performance-based payments for ecosystem services.
<i>How do we identify and engage academic institutions in REDD+?</i>	This could be facilitated by the development of a REDD+ education strategy in such institutions (such as USP) that identifies relevant education institutions in the region, relevant skill-sets and disciplines for REDD+ education, and the relevant educational and training needs of REDD+ stakeholders.

International Engagement

Question	Responses
<i>Who participates in international negotiations: Forestry or Environment?</i>	<p>The UNFCCC negotiations are hosted by either policy/finance working groups (e.g. the Ad Hoc Working Group (AHWG), and the Long Term Cooperative Action (LCA)</p> <p>Technical/scientific working groups (e.g. Subsidiary Bodies for Scientific and technological Advice – SBSTA)</p> <p>Country Parties send delegates selected by the country. These can include Forestry and/or Environment delegates. The UNFCCC fund 2 delegates per country. Any additional delegates need to be funded by other means. Each country can also have several policy or technical advisors at the negotiations. These advisors can be external experts who can assist and advise the negotiators and/or contribute to negotiations on behalf of country negotiators (e.g. commonly several issues are being negotiated at any one time and small delegations find it difficult to be in several different places at once.</p> <p>One way around this is to define a Regional REDD+/Forestry team that includes selected country representatives and external policy/technical advisors. This team could attend the international negotiations to represent the REDD+ interests of the region, mandated each year at the September Forestry Technical Meeting.</p>