

REDD Workshop



Cochabamba
19th April 2010

Presented by Sandy Gauntlett

Sandy

The reality of the Pacific

- 27 different nations
- Some colonised by other countries
- Three developed nations (NZ, Aust and Hawaii)
- 15 under serious threat before turn of the century
- At least 5 under serious threat within 20 years.
- Kiribati and Tuvalu already under threats from high tides and fresh water salination
- Solomons. Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu, Tonga and Samoa with large pockets of indigenous forests

MAJOR SOURCE MATERIAL

- All Available on www.globalforestcoalition.org
- “The Hottest Redd Issues.....” (*ref 1*)
- Forests And Climate Change, an introduction to the role of forests in the UN climate change Negotiations (*ref 2*)
- Climate Change, Forest Conservation and Indigenous Peoples Rights (*ref 3*)

DEFORESTATION & CLIMATE CHANGE

- According to the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), eighty per cent of the world's biodiversity is found in rainforests.
- Papua New Guinea, Solomons and Vanuatu are major rainforest nations with huge impacts from plantation agrofuel production
- West Papua colonised by Indonesia and under threat from deforestation (Kwila in particular) and transmigration

CAUSES OF DEFORESTATION

- Unsustainable forest management is the main cause of forest degradation, while the conversion of forests into agricultural land is by far the main cause of deforestation.
- The expansion of large-scale agro-industrial monocultures for food, fibre and, increasingly, energy production is both an important direct cause of deforestation and an important underlying cause of forest loss
- The expansion of monocultures on existing arable land causes cattle ranching and other forms of agriculture to move towards forest areas and other natural ecosystems. [Ref 2](#)

So.... ISN'T FOREST CONSERVATION A GOOD IDEA?

- While some countries, and many Indigenous Peoples and local communities within those countries, have made significant progress in halting deforestation and forest degradation, other countries maintain dramatically high rates of deforestation and forest degradation, so much so that deforestation is today estimated to be responsible for an estimated 17 % of global greenhouse gas emissions. [Ref 1](#)

MARRAKECH

- The Kyoto Protocol and the so-called 'Marrakech Accords' (as the agreements on LULUCF rules and definitions by the Parties of this Protocol are called), allow industrialized countries to discount their greenhouse gas emissions if they implement certain land-use change and forestry activities.
- These activities are limited to strictly defined cases including afforestation, reforestation and deforestation since 1990, sometimes called 'Kyoto forest'.

WHEN IS A FOREST NOT A FOREST?

- *'Kyoto forest' is defined as “a minimum area of land of 0.05-1.0 hectares with tree crown cover (or equivalent stocking level) of more than 10-30 per cent with trees with the potential to reach a minimum height of 2-5 metres at maturity in situ.*
- *A forest may consist either of closed forest formations where trees of various storeys and undergrowth cover a high portion of the ground or open forest.*
- *Young natural stands and all plantations which have yet to reach a crown density of 10-30 per cent or tree height of 2-5 metres are included under forest, as are areas normally forming part of the forest area which are temporarily unstocked as a result of human intervention such as harvesting or natural causes but which are expected to revert to forest.”*

DEFINITIONS OF FORESTS FOR REDD

- Therefore the definition of forest used for REDD become vital as there is the potential for monocultural agrofuel plantations to be included as Forests
- If that is the case it becomes more economically profitable to clear natural forests and plant timber monocultures
- In particular, where nations have a high rate of deforestation, there is a danger of plantations for agrofuel production being classified as forests

Plantations for Agrofuels



WHAT'S THE PROBLEM WITH REPLACING FORESTS?

- Biodiversity i.e Monocultural plantations are usually (not always) exotics therefore replacement (after cutting) creates problems for endemic species
- Sustainable Livelihoods. Indigenous Peoples use their forests for food, shelter, water supply, medicines etc
- Monocultures provide no protection for endemics or livelihoods and the risk from monocultures of indigenous species poses a potential threat to biodiversity

This is a certified “Forest”



WHEN DEFORESTATION IS NOT DEFORESTATION

- As well as including all kinds of unnatural 'forests', the UNFCCC's definition of forests sets the number of trees that need to be present at a very low level. This can also be used to justify deforestation.
- Logging corporations can remove most of the trees in a forest, and it will not count as 'deforestation'.
- However, the damage to the forest itself can be so high that the forest will be unable to recover

IS DEFINITIONS THE ONLY PROBLEM?

- What about issues like land rights, community right to involvement in decision making and profit sharing.
- In the climate convention, only Governments get a right to vote and only Governments will be deciding on the shape of any potential REDD schemes, including who gets to own benefits from REDD

ENGAGEMENT OF RIGHTSHOLDERS AND STAKEHOLDERS

- Genuine and effective engagement of the rightsholders and stakeholders in the development and implementation of policies that affect them is at the heart of both governance and equity.
- It includes genuine engagement by Indigenous Peoples— one of the rights enshrined in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other international human rights instruments, genuine engagement by women, genuine engagement by community representatives, and genuine engagement by the countries whose rights and interests are often overlooked in global regimes.

PARTICIPATION

- Article 7 of the Aarhus Convention sets the standards for public participation in environment related projects.
- Therein, the state is obliged to make appropriate and other provisions for community participation.
- Participation must start in the preparation of plans and programs, transparency and fairness must be evident and the state must have provided all the necessary information regarding the project.
- We have a right to expect to be consulted and involved in decision making on REDD

EQUAL RIGHTS

- The "Contraction and Conversion", and the "Greenhouse Development Rights" proposals are two specific and partly similar policy proposals that attempt to render concrete the concept of "equal per capita emission rights".

EQUITY IN REDD

- It is of utmost importance that policy proposals to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries are being analysed within the framework of this equity dimension of the climate regime in general

INDIGENOUS TERRITORIES, COMMUNITY CONSERVED AREAS

- A main concern related to rights and equity is the risk that the benefits and costs of REDD related initiatives will not be shared equitably with the Indigenous Peoples and local communities that have historically been responsible for the conservation and sustainable use of large tracks of forests and other carbon-rich ecosystems

INDIGENOUS COMMUNITY CONSERVED AREAS

- Territories and lands occupied or used by indigenous peoples and other traditional local communities (ICCAs) encompass a considerable proportion of areas important for biodiversity.
- Although poorly known and acknowledged, these areas are responsible for conserving an enormous part of the Earth's beleaguered biodiversity and ecological functions, supporting the livelihoods of millions of people and helping to maintain their culture and sense of identity.

WHO GETS THE MONIES FROM ICCAS IN REDD?

- Since Communities preserve, protect and maintain these areas, should they not have the right to say no to REDD, and to profit from an REDD project agreed to by their Government without:
 - ❖ Extra taxation
 - ❖ Being shut out
 - ❖ Losing Land Rights

CUSTOMARY INSTITUTIONS, ICCAS AND THE STATE

- More often than not, the interface between state-based institutions and the customary institutions of indigenous peoples and local communities remains a complex arena. Indigenous peoples and local communities have few options to shape policies and direct their own paths to well-being, development and conservation.
- More often, policies are adopted and enforced upon them, at times even squandering precious opportunities for mutual support and synergies.... Those [tensions] surface in initiatives aiming at "recognizing" ICCAs, fitting them within a state legislative frameworks and/or incorporating them as part of national protected areas systems.

ADAPTING THE ICCA TO FIT THE GOVT

- Trying to "adapt" the governance institutions of traditional ICCAs to state requirements has ended up in some cases, undermining their authority and stability, and lead to the demise of long standing successful conservation. Some nations still claim that all of their peoples are indigenous, thus undermining the rights of those peoples indigenous to the areas.
- Often this happens in parallel to the setting up of decentralized government institutions, such as rural municipalities. In other cases, well intentioned financial support has proved socially and morally disruptive.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

- Clarifying the role of ICCAs and ways to provide them with appropriate support has become crucially important in the face of global climate change and emerging adaptation and mitigation strategies.
- There is no doubt that ICCAs and other biodiversity-rich areas are severely threatened by the impacts of climate change, but there is also a growing awareness that they can contribute significantly to mitigation and to adaptation efforts.

THE DANGER

- Policies are being formulated and tested to compensate various actors for their efforts to conserve ecosystems - in particular forests and watersheds.
- Carbon trading mechanisms can have enormous impacts on ICCAs. While financial compensation for ecological services can provide needed recognition and support to ICCAs, they can also give the coup de grace to community based conservation.

POTENTIAL FOR EQUITY?

- Indigenous peoples and local communities have voiced concerns over what they see as a commercialisation of nature. Even where communities are keen to benefit from funding schemes for ecosystem services, it remains to be explored what mechanisms are capable of transferring funds to the local level in equitable ways, without harming the governance structures and values that have preserved ICCAs so far.

SHOULD INDIGENOUS PEOPLES BE INCLUDED?

- The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples has spelled out the right of Indigenous Peoples to participate in decision-making processes directly relevant for their lands and territories.
- So far, however, Indigenous Peoples' organisations have not been allowed to participate effectively in the debate on REDD, or indeed as a voting partner in the UNFCCC itself.
- Indigenous Peoples have felt so excluded from the negotiation process that they staged several large public protests during the 13th Conference of the Parties of the FCCC.

IS THERE A WAY OUT OF THE QUAGMIRE?

- If Indigenous Communities and stakeholders were equitably included in the REDD discussions, could we reach agreement?
- The experience of Informal Expert Group meetings says that there is potential for equitable discussion and decision making.
- Unfortunately, the COP often has undone some of the good work done in these informal meetings.

WHAT ABOUT THE FEEL GOOD EFFECT

- The other danger in REDD is that developed nations are in effect buying the right to pollute unequally.
- There is further danger that if the consumer nations start to regard these emissions as theirs by right it will encourage further wastage and increased emissions, which would be compounded by the adoption of the Kyoto Forests Definition

REDD CAN ONLY WORK IF

- Benefits go to those communities providing the ecosystem protection
- Consumer nations adopt further cuts in their domestic emissions and do not see REDD as a licence for unbridled development, or as a replacement for cutting emissions at source
- The principal of equal rights to development applies
- Communities, women and Indigenous Peoples become part of the process.

How do we achieve equity?

- We must ensure that REDD (or any other market mechanism is not seen as a replacement for emission cuts at home
- We must ensure that communities at risk are at the heart of any funding mechanisms under the climate convention
- Rather than attempting to apply trickle down theory, we should be practicing trickle up