**REDD at the Copenhagen Climate Talks and Beyond: Bridging the Gap between Negotiation and Action**

**Nairobi, 16-18 November, 2009**

**Main Messages from the Workshop**

The first capacity building workshop for negotiators and stakeholders on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD) aimed to:

- Increase the forestry sector’s negotiator and stakeholder understanding of the key issues in the negotiations for an international REDD mechanism, in the context of the negotiations for a new international agreement on climate change;
- Provide expert information on the key options on the negotiating table and analysis of the likely implications in different countries;
- Provide a forum for the exchange of experiences and lessons learned in REDD implementation; and
- Provide a forum for South-South cooperation.

The workshop was delivered by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) and the Alternatives to Slash and Burn for the Tropical Forest Margins, World Agroforestry Centre (ASB-ICRAF), with the generous support of the Government of Norway.

The key messages from the first workshop for the African region were:

**Scope and principles**

- REDD-plus should be in the international climate change agreement.
- A holistic approach is needed that includes both REDD-plus and agriculture; all approaches for agriculture should be considered in the negotiations (sectoral, nationally appropriate mitigation actions [NAMAs], Clean Development Mechanism [CDM]). REDD negotiations should include representatives from the agricultural sector.
- A phased approach is needed. The first phase could include capacity building and grant funding and the incorporation of sub-national approaches.
- Safeguards are important to ensure full and effective participation, but these should not be a barrier to project development or impose greater costs on REDD projects than other mitigation projects.
- A linkage is needed between developing country needs and provision of support for REDD-plus.
- Equity and gender issues should be factored into all aspects of REDD-plus.
Baselines

- Methodologies and guidance need to be improved. The applicability of Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) guidelines for REDD-plus should be explored. It is recommended that the IPCC develop a report on the capacity of 2006 guidelines to meet the needs of REDD-plus. (This would address the question of how to account for activities that avoid deforestation and sequester carbon.)
- Regional approaches to baselines could be explored.

 Leakage

- Options to address leakage could include:
  - Cost-benefit analysis of alternative land uses;
  - Regional cooperation to address leakage (e.g., Economic Community of West African States [ECOWAS] and Central African Forest Commission [COMIFAC]); and
  - Improve forest law enforcement and governance.

 Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV)

- Identify the minimum safeguards needed to make REDD-plus effective.
- Complex requirements could be a barrier to early action/participation. Whatever MRV requirements are required of REDD-plus should be required of other NAMAs in order to keep REDD-plus competitive.
- Flexibility is needed in MRV requirements in a phased approach.

 Costs and benefits

- Co-benefits are important. Poverty reduction is the most important co-benefit, and biodiversity and ecosystem services should also be considered. There needs to be consideration of how to capture co-benefits in a way that does not create barriers to REDD-plus. It is important that co-benefits reach those developing the projects.
- Ensuring benefits go to local communities (local ownership/decision making) and improving governance can help to address permanence.
- Cost-benefit analysis is important to assess opportunities.
- The true costs of REDD-plus are unknown; work is needed at the local level.

 Financing

- A hybrid approach to financing is needed that includes funds and market mechanisms.
- Financing and support (markets and grants) for REDD-plus can take place within and outside the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).
- Acceptance of sinks offsets from developing countries in EU-ETS and other emission trading systems should be encouraged.
- Assessment of capacity building needs, to be funded through grant funds, is required.
Links to the carbon market

- Success in REDD-plus depends on stringent emission reduction targets in developed countries (and perhaps separate REDD-plus commitments) and their willingness to pay.
- Further research is needed to determine if REDD-plus should be considered as a supported NAMA, unilateral NAMA and/or creditable NAMA.
- Further research is needed to determine if REDD-plus should be part of the CDM or a separate market mechanism.

Social and environmental benefits

- REDD-plus design will need to consider involvement of and benefits to indigenous people and local communities and how to include traditional knowledge.
- REDD-plus design will need to consider financing of prior informed consent and stakeholder participation.

Capacity-building needs

- Support is needed for efficient implementation of REDD-plus, including policies, strategies and guidelines, and for accessing markets.
- Credible/reliable data are needed. There is technical capacity, but extra measures are needed to prepare for REDD-plus (for example, baselines; additional data collection above national forest inventories; locally accurate data collection specific to different types of forest; and data beyond forest area and carbon density, such as co-benefits and ecosystem services).
- Targeted support is required, such as education to deal with drivers of deforestation, which will help to address leakage and permanence (for example, improving farming systems); and support for local stakeholders.
- Demonstration projects on REDD-plus implementation at the sub-national level are needed.
- Other capacity-building needs include cost-benefit analysis, awareness raising, governance, media engagement, institutional strengthening and education for youth and children.
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Workshop Report

Introduction and background

The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) and the Alternatives to Slash and Burn Partnership for the Tropical Forest Margins (ASB-ICRAF) are delivering a series of workshops on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD), with the generous support of the Government of Norway.

The workshops aim to increase understanding of the negotiations, as well as provide information on experiences in the forestry sector to lay the technical and policy foundations for better REDD programs. The first set of workshops, REDD at the Copenhagen Climate Talks and Beyond: Bridging the Gap between Negotiation and Action were held in November 2009. The focus was on sharing experiences and views and providing expertise with regard to key issues on the REDD agenda of the Copenhagen climate talks in December 2009. The main conclusions of the first two workshops, held in Nairobi, Kenya, and Hanoi, Vietnam, were summarized in a policy brief presented at a side event at COP-15. The policy brief can be accessed at http://www.iisd.org/climate/land_use/redd.asp.

The first workshop for the African Region was held 16-18 November 2009 in Nairobi, Kenya. The workshop was attended by over 70 participants and experts. The participants were from African countries that receive support through the UN-REDD program and the World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership facility (FCPF). The workshop program included updates on the state of the REDD negotiations, expert presentations on technical issues, presentations on country experiences in REDD implementation and readiness activities. During the workshop participants discussed and exchanged views in plenary sessions and breakout groups. This report summarizes the presentations and discussions of the Nairobi workshop.

Opening of the workshop

Peter Akong Minang, ASB-ICRAF (Cameroon) welcomed participants, noting that there were more than 70 participants and experts in the room from various countries and institutions. In opening the workshop, Frank Place, Senior Scientist, ICRAF, thanked the government of Kenya for hosting the workshop. He also thanked the government of Norway for funding the workshop.
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and for its global leadership in funding REDD readiness and capacity-building activities. Noting the “high calibre” of expertise and experience among participants, he stressed the need to carefully plan and prepare for the REDD negotiations in Copenhagen and to ensure that collaborative work on REDD continues after the conference. Deborah Murphy, Associate, IISD, explained that the main objectives of the workshop are to share experiences and develop key messages for the REDD negotiations in Copenhagen, noting that this workshop was preceded by a similar workshop in the Asian Pacific Region.

Her Excellency Elisabeth Jacobsen, Ambassador of Norway to Kenya, remarked that this workshop comes at a crucial time, as countries should now focus on reaching consensus on a political agreement in Copenhagen, noting that REDD implementation could start immediately. The Ambassador outlined Norway’s REDD strategy, stressing that one of the fundamental principles is equity among all forested countries. She explained that Norway promotes a REDD-plus framework that includes forest conservation, forest carbon stock enhancement and sustainable management of existing forests. Finally, Her Excellency outlined Norway’s vision for a three-phased REDD mechanism in a post-2012 climate regime. Each phase would see increased commitments from developing countries and more measurement, reporting and verification (MRV). She called on all developed countries to contribute funding to REDD activities and applauded developing countries that have embraced REDD.

Alice Kaudia, Environment Secretary, Kenyan Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, stressed the need to build broader understanding of REDD and how to achieve benefits. She explained that one of the difficulties in negotiating REDD is related to potential negative impacts on the livelihoods of local communities. Developing countries also face challenges in understanding the complexities of the carbon market and in developing the methodologies and competencies necessary to avoid negative impacts. Noting that lack of ensuring livelihoods would undermine a REDD mechanism, she stressed that the current negotiating text does not include concepts such as payments for ecosystem services (PES) that could help ensure the safeguard of livelihoods. In closing, she thanked the government of Norway for supporting the workshops and welcomed participants on behalf of the government of Kenya.

**Setting the scene**

**State of the negotiations:** Dr. Louis V. Verchot, climate change scientist at the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Indonesia, summarized some of the key issues on REDD that are currently under negotiation, touching on the scope and scale of REDD, financing and benefits distribution, MRV, stakeholder involvement and environmental and social co-benefits. For each issue, Dr. Verchot highlighted points of agreement, unresolved questions and options for moving forward. Underlying questions included how to ensure that REDD-plus provides opportunities for many countries, how to address the intersectoral linkages that are driving land use change, and how to ensure that REDD brings meaningful development benefits.

**Key issues and questions:** Building on Dr. Verchot’s presentation, Dr. Stefan Jungcurt, IISD (Canada), addressed the same issues in more detail, linking them with the latest version of the REDD negotiating text, and raising questions to help negotiators and stakeholders assess these options from their country’s perspective. For each issue, he highlighted which option held the strongest consensus, but emphasized that much of the negotiating text is still up for debate. He encouraged participants and experts to share their experiences, knowledge, interests and
concerns in the workshop to help each other gain insights and perspectives to link international negotiation to local action.

**Some aspects on ongoing climate change negotiations—Africa’s perspective:** The Secretary of the African Ministers Conference on Environment (AMCEN), Dr. Peter Aquah, outlined the progress of African engagement in international climate change negotiations leading up to Copenhagen. The key principles underlying Africa’s common negotiating position are: Africa should be equitably compensated for damage to environmental resources and economic and social losses attributable to the historical responsibility of developed countries for climate change; and Africa reaffirms the UNFCCC principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities as basis for the post-2012 regime. He noted that despite the common position, Africa is still unclear where the current negotiations are leading, and that “Africa’s common voice should be much stronger and should go far beyond the claim for compensation for the region since it is the very survival of the people of this continent which is at stake.” Responding to a comment from the audience that Africa has no common position on REDD, Dr. Acquah said that this workshop could help generate some of the elements that African countries would like to see in a political declaration on REDD at COP-15.

**Scope of REDD**

**Presentation:** Peter Akong Minang presented on the scope of REDD. He explained that REDD focuses on reducing negative change in two factors determining variations in forest carbon: changes in forest area and changes in forest carbon density. He presented examples of carbon densities of different land uses in Cameroon, examples of drivers of deforestation in Kenya and estimates of carbon change in African forests. He outlined the changes in forest carbon that would be included under the different options on scope, stressing that not including agriculture and other land uses could lead to a fragmented international framework. He suggested that REDD should be part of a more general framework on reducing emissions from all land uses. He also elaborated on the implications of using different definitions of forest, noting that the lack of an agreed approach towards definitions could be a key problem to operationalizing REDD.

**Breakout group:** Discussions focused on the definitions of the scope of REDD and their implications in African countries. Many participants expressed their discomfort with the existing definitions, noting that the meanings of REDD and REDD-plus needed to be clarified. The group also discussed whether all land uses should be part of a REDD mechanism or whether some aspects should remain under other mechanisms such as the CDM. Most participants supported the inclusion of agriculture in an international REDD mechanism in order to ensure benefits for African countries, with some mentioning challenges arising out of growing demand for food and the need to develop alternative energy sources. The group also discussed different options of how agriculture could be addressed in the current REDD negotiations.

**Conclusions:** The group’s main conclusions included:

- The negotiations on REDD under the Ad hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA) negotiating track and other land use related issues under the Ad hoc Working Group on Further Commitments under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) should remain separate;
- A holistic approach to REDD is needed that includes reduced emissions from agriculture. However, discussions on agriculture should remain separate from REDD in Copenhagen, while recognizing that REDD is one building block of a broader mechanism to address reduced emissions from all land uses;

- Certain policy issues such as tenure rights, illegal logging and illegal timber trade should not be addressed by an international mechanism, but addressed at the national level; and

- The meaning of REDD-plus should be clarified.

**Discussion:** Participants discussed the potential disadvantages of negotiating REDD and reduced emissions from agriculture under separate negotiating tracks, including the need for larger delegations, lack of negotiating capacity and potential problems in integrating the tracks at a later stage. Others cautioned that integrating the tracks at this stage would delay agreement on REDD. One participant suggested that REDD should cover afforestation/reforestation activities rather than the CDM, while others preferred keeping these separate for technical reasons.

**Baselines, permanence and leakage**

**Presentation:** Willy Makundi, Environment Consultants (Tanzania) provided an overview of the potential for REDD mitigation in major tropical forest countries. He then introduced the concepts of baselines, permanence and leakage, elaborated on their relevance for REDD, and explained essential guidance given by UNFCCC decisions. He described different ways of setting national baselines using examples of Asian countries and their position on the forest transition curve. He elaborated on different approaches to address permanence, including temporary certified emissions reductions (CERs), long-term CERs and buffer solutions. On leakage, he discussed different causes and methods of accounting.

**Breakout group:** On measures necessary to address baselines, permanence and leakage, participants discussed the need for technological capacity and financing. Several mentioned that technical monitoring capacity in their countries would be sufficient, but that they lacked the financial means to carry out additional monitoring activities necessary for REDD. On leakage, participants agreed that national level accounting could address leakage problems at the sub-national level. Regarding transboundary leakage, participants explored opportunities for regional cooperation, with several participants reporting on activities within regional organizations. On drivers of deforestation, participants stressed that countries lack the means to support sustainable intensification of agriculture on existing land to address permanence risks through agricultural expansion, while others mentioned pressures such as fuelwood collection and illegal encroachments. Participants also raised the issue of how to address customary access and use rights that could be risks to permanence. On international requirements for baselines, permanence and leakage, several called for an equitable approach to establishing baselines that would not disadvantage countries with low rates of deforestation.

**Conclusions:** The main conclusions presented by the group included:

- There is a need to fund capacity building; targeted funding is needed to establish baselines and cover the costs of additional monitoring and data collection activities, to clarify how activities at different scales (national, sub-national) can be integrated into a national baseline, and to improve forest law enforcement and governance;
- Drivers of deforestation, including improving farming systems and investing in education and capacity building, must be addressed;
- Cost-benefit analysis is a useful tool to assess risks of non-permanence; and
- Opportunities for regional cooperation to address leakage, along with the applicability of IPCC guidelines, should be explored.

**Discussion:** In plenary, participants discussed whether sustainable forest management (SFM) is adequate to address leakage and non-permanence, noting that this was a controversial issue in the negotiations. Others argued that any kind of sustainable or selective logging practice must be adapted to REDD and that increasing countries’ capacities to monitor SFM would reduce the extent of leakage. Some noted that baselines should be applied to areas affected by deforestation rather than at the national level to account for specific circumstances, while others suggested that baselines should be measured in economic, not only geophysical, terms.

**Monitoring, reporting and verification**

**Presentation:** Xavier Mugumya, National Forestry Authority, Uganda, began by explaining how MRV are closely linked to the objectives, scope and guiding principles for REDD in the text of the Bali Action Plan. He touched on the implications of the proposals and options for a country like Uganda and the key questions and information needed to assess the different proposals and options from a country perspective. Methodological issues include estimation and monitoring, setting reference emissions levels, national and sub-national approaches, capacity building and effectiveness of actions. Noting that MRV will often be a data-intensive and complicated process, he proposed establishing a single, mandated MRV institution to be used by all developing countries intending to do REDD-plus.

**Breakout group:** Participants focused on developing country capacity for MRV and discussed whether MRV requirements would represent barriers to REDD participation and access to funding. It was pointed out that experience to date with the CDM could highlight some of the challenges for fair MRV rules under REDD. One participant noted that the MRV rules for afforestation/reforestation under the CDM were unnecessarily complex, particularly when compared with the rules for other types of CDM projects. It was suggested any MRV requirement for REDD should also apply to other NAMAs in order to keep REDD competitive. Participants then gave examples of the types of data available for MRV in their countries. Many countries have good capacity for analysis but lack data, whereas others have insufficient political will and/or funding to get the work done. Finally, many countries do have data, but it is not sufficiently credible. Capacity building should therefore focus on the specific needs to enable countries to engage in credible MRV for REDD.

**Discussion:** The plenary discussion focused on MRV requirements. On minimum standards and tiers, participants discussed that there should be targeted capacity building and flexibility regarding the upgrading from Tier One to Tier Two. One participant noted that MRV should be adequate to ensure financing through the market.

**Financing options, mechanisms and distribution of benefits**

**Presentation:** Luis Salgado, EcoRessources (Peru) began his presentation with an overview of the mandates of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP and initial proposals on financing from Latin
American countries. He explained that most countries support a phased approach consisting of fund-based financing for capacity building, readiness and early action, followed by a transition phase and a full implementation phase during which a substantial part of financing would be generated by the carbon market. He elaborated on the pros and cons of funds and market-based mechanisms, noting that neither approach alone will generate sufficient funding for REDD implementation, as well as on the details of the phased approach. He closed his presentation with an overview of REDD-related provisions in the U.S. Waxman Markey Bill.

**Breakout group I:** Participants in the first group focused their discussion on a comparison of sub-national versus national approaches to funding and strategies to ensure long-term funding. The group agreed that fund-based financing through initiatives such as UN-REDD and FCPF should be used to secure long-term funding. Many participants also acknowledged that neither fund- nor market-based financing will be available forever and discussed how REDD can be used to catalyze a change of mind set in countries with deforestation.

**Breakout group II:** The second group discussed linkages between national and sub-national funding and the need for benefit sharing. On long-term commitments, participants stressed the need to address poverty reduction and discussed ways in which developed countries can stimulate long-term financing through carbon markets within and outside the UNFCCC framework.

**Discussion:** In plenary, participants discussed different ways to finance REDD projects. It was clarified that during the readiness phase, financing would be available to reduce up-front costs for establishing projects. Participants also considered that all costs and benefits should be analyzed in order to determine if a project is viable. It was also noted that national approaches to financing would facilitate access to funding from large donors. One participant raised concerns that access to credit markets would be restricted, as was the case for CDM afforestation and reforestation credits under the European Union emissions trading scheme. Others replied that such restrictions would be unlikely to apply in the long run and that new markets, such as the United States, would be very open to REDD.

**Cost-benefit analysis at the country level**

**Presentation:** Daniel Martino, Carbosur (Uruguay) explained that costs and benefits can be broken down into those that have a cash (market) value and those with a non-cash (non-market) value. He summarized concepts such as net present value (NPV) and discounting as they relate to REDD and carbon markets, and described how these assessments must inform REDD investments. He also classified different types of costs, including readiness costs, design and implementation costs and opportunity costs, which must all be considered together. In cases where the costs outweigh the cash benefits, non-cash benefits can help make a project worthwhile if other supporting mechanisms are in place, such as PES regulations. Moreover, there may be a higher risk of project failure if there are not many co-benefits or if co-benefits are not reaching the local community.

**Breakout group I:** The group discussed the cost-benefit implications of different options of the scope of REDD. A REDD framework would only benefit a few countries in Africa, while REDD-plus would add several more to the list. Even wider participation from African countries would require including agriculture and other land uses. Countries need to assess the costs and
benefits of these different options in order to determine the opportunities for REDD participation. The group then discussed costs of capacity building such as building technical MRV capacity, enhancing institutional governance for environmental management, implementing high level policies and mobilizing scientific knowledge to support REDD.

**Breakout group II:** The group agreed that cost-benefit analysis is needed for informed decision making. Analysis of benefits must take into account the agreed scope of REDD such as co-benefits of including agricultural landscapes, which can create significant co-benefits for food and income security. Including local communities in project ownership and decision-making can enhance permanence of REDD credits. Participants also noted that any REDD payment must take into account the transaction costs of setting up and monitoring a REDD project.

**Discussion:** In plenary, participants discussed how to offset upfront costs. Some noted that fund-based financing can provide upfront money for dealing with start-up costs and support co-benefits until the market picks up, whereas others pointed out that fund-based financing for up-front costs is essential to make a project financially viable. On costs and benefits of national and sub-national REDD schemes, it was suggested that a strategic approach could start with a national strategy and then move to the project level, with some stressing the need to clearly assess national and sub-national readiness costs. Regarding the relationship between compliance mechanisms and voluntary markets, participants noted that the voluntary market provides competition and has emerged due to opportunities created by compliance mechanisms.

**Links to the carbon market, the CDM and NAMAs**

**Presentation:** Agus Sari, EcoSecurities (Indonesia) described the current market mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol and gave an overview of possible new market mechanisms for REDD, including a simplified CDM, programmatic or sectoral CDM, creditable NAMAs, domestic markets and voluntary markets. He summarized the transactional relationships between communities, countries, buyers and sellers in the carbon market and elaborated on different types of risk and perceptions of risk, and how these risks are addressed in various types of contracts, such as investment schemes, forward contracts, options, spot market exchanges and financial derivatives.

**Discussion:** Participants discussed the link between REDD and NAMAs. Sari clarified that, while from a market perspective it does not matter whether REDD is part of NAMAs or not, NAMAs need to be clearly defined first and a high level of political commitment to emissions reductions secured in countries that want to address REDD as part of NAMAs. Regarding the market potential of REDD, Sari noted that the supply of REDD credits needs to be absorbed by a high demand for offsets and that deep emission reduction commitments and a dual market will be needed to avoid flooding the carbon market with REDD credits. On whether REDD should be part of the CDM, Sari noted that Africa’s priority should not be to determine whether a REDD market would be established under the CDM or in a separate mechanism, but to ensure deep emissions reduction commitments by developed countries. Participants also discussed types and legal forms of contracts, as well as opportunities to secure international arbitration.
Assessing the opportunity costs of avoided emissions from deforestation: ASB case study

Presentation: Vanessa Meadu, ASB (Canada), presented on ASB research on opportunity costs analysis for REDD, starting with an overview of the timing and methods for opportunity cost analysis in different project phases. She presented an opportunity cost curve for conversion to different land uses, including pasture, agriculture and agroforestry. On the methodology, Ms. Meadu explained the use of remote sensing for land-use cover analysis, time-averaged carbon stocks as measure for carbon values, and NPV of land uses to assess the opportunity cost. She concluded that 80 per cent of emissions from deforestation could be offset at less than US$5 per ton and that agroforestry is the most suitable solution to address tradeoffs between conservation of carbon stocks and revenues from other land uses.

Discussion: The discussion focused on methodological issues of estimating the NPV of alternative land uses, emission reductions and costs over longer timeframes. Participants also discussed how other types of land uses such as ecotourism could be included in the analysis. It was also clarified that opportunity cost analysis does not reflect the whole costs of REDD and that other types of costs need to be included in the analysis of a project’s economic viability.

Stakeholder involvement

Presentation: Susan Chomba, ASB (Kenya), presented on stakeholder involvement, indigenous rights and equity issues under REDD. She provided a list of safeguards that should be applied in different phases of REDD to avoid negative consequences for the poor forest-dependent communities. Ms. Chomba gave examples of national and sub-national stakeholder groups and ways to involve them, followed by an overview of key rights and equity issues in REDD. She then showed how stakeholder rights are currently addressed in the REDD negotiations and presented a list of relevant international human rights instruments.

Discussion: Responding to a question regarding the definition of “indigenous person,” Chomba clarified that this should be defined in terms of forest user rights and suggested referring to the websites of the International Labour Organization and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues for further information. On implications for financing stakeholder participation, she suggested that REDD cannot succeed without participation and that all ways for involvement should be considered, not only financing. Participants further discussed involvement of children, minorities other than indigenous people and scientists.

Country and regional presentations

COMESA: George Wamokoya, Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), reported on REDD regional initiatives including cooperation under COMESA on insurance, investment and banking, which could facilitate investments in REDD; the common pool of knowledge created under UN-REDD; and pooling of resources and a common framework to address leakage under COMIFAC. He stressed the need for uniform policies for regional cooperation on REDD and opportunities to use regional bodies to transfer technical knowledge on issues such as MRV.

Peru: Luis Salgado, EcoRessources (Peru), reported on Peru’s experience in establishing a national process for developing its position on climate change. He explained that negotiators in
developing countries are often ill-prepared for the negotiations due to lack of expertise, high turnover among delegates, and the absence of processes to coordinate national activities, leading to a dominance of Annex I parties in the negotiations. Peru’s strategy consisted of creating a “vertical” dialogue comprising a national commission for climate change and ad hoc technical groups addressing key issues, and a “horizontal” dialogue to further cooperation among countries within the region and develop common positions. The process led to the elaboration of positions supported by several Latin American countries, elements of which were also supported by the African Group.

**Vietnam:** Mr. Vu Tan Phoung, Research Center for Forest Ecology and the Environment, ICRAF Vietnam, presented on Vietnam’s experience toward REDD readiness. He provided an overview of Vietnam’s forestry sector, including types of forest use and ownership, export values of wood products and emissions from the forest sector, noting that forest cover has been increasing in recent years. He presented the legal framework for REDD and the proposed national REDD strategy, as well as the current institutional framework and capacity-building activities. Accessing REDD opportunities requires strong political support, alignment of interests among constituencies, strengthening of programs for PES and changes to create co-benefits and improve forest governance. Challenges include the need for a higher level of forest monitoring, inadequate and inconsistent forest data, insufficient MRV capacity and inadequate funding to address drivers of deforestation.

**Madagascar:** Mr. Jean Roger Rakotoarjaona, from Madagascar’s institution for national data and carbon monitoring, presented on the country’s progress with REDD. After describing how the forest cover is changing, and revealing the key drivers of this change—namely slash-and-burn agriculture and charcoal production/fuel wood—Mr. Rakotoarjaona detailed Madagascar’s policies to support REDD implementation. These policies include a combination of protective measures, SFM, reforming land tenure and focusing on rural development. Madagascar’s experiences include development of baselines, cost-benefit analysis, institutional development and promotion of PES. One project sees 50 per cent of revenue going to local communities. A number of remaining methodological issues were highlighted including quantification of carbon stocks and managing financial risk. Remaining institutional issues included dealing with multiple sectors and sharing of carbon revenues.

**Democratic Republic of the Congo:** Mr. Ineet Nicky Kingunia, director of the office of carbon stock research at the Ministry of Environment, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), outlined the country’s REDD progress and strategies to date. Noting that 40 million Congolese depend on forest resources and that the DRC has the most dense forest areas in the Congo Basin, representing about half the tropical forests in Africa, he explained that the DRC’s REDD strategies have been supported by UN-REDD and FCPF since January 2009 to build capacity for eventual participation in an international REDD mechanism. National coordination includes stakeholder engagement and the establishment of a civil society REDD working group that works closely with negotiators. The country is also working toward fulfilling some of the requirements for active participation in REDD including developing a system to monitor deforestation and degradation via geographic information systems, developing and negotiating reference emissions scenarios, and developing a national REDD strategy and three-phased implementation plan.
Key messages

Deborah Murphy, IISD (Canada), introduced the key messages from the workshop, noting that these summarize common ideas and views expressed and do not represent consensus among participants. Participants made numerous comments, clarifications and additions to the messages, which were included in the revised key messages set out at the beginning of this report.

Several participants stressed the need to address agriculture more clearly in the negotiations, both to avoid negative impacts of REDD on agriculture and food security as well as to advance the discussion on including emissions from agriculture under an international REDD mechanism. Participants also stressed the need to address gender roles in REDD and to involve youth. Others called for considering lessons learned from the CDM experience when elaborating an international REDD mechanism. Participants also suggested addressing inter- and intra-generational equity, poverty eradication and generation of co-benefits, with several noting that REDD should be a country-driven process. One participant encouraged the group to call for action by their national governments in order to move the REDD agenda forward in Africa and provide the ground for “learning by doing.” Ms. Murphy explained that the messages would be revised and used as a basis for a policy brief that would be distributed at COP-15.