

FCPF Carbon Fund Short Submissions on Methodological Framework Topics
Some comments from AFD [[l'Agence Française de Développement (AFD)]]

Issue Paper 3, Q4. Issue Paper 6, Q3 and Q4.

1. Regarding these issues, AFD suggests to comply with the guidelines already endorsed by the FCPF and with the decisions endorsed by the UNFCCC and the CBD, among which in particular:

- the FCPF Carbon Fund Issues Note (revised version of February 9, 2011) on Non-Carbon Values (Section 6) which states that:

“Especially in the early days of incentive payments for REDD+, when limited resources are available, the FCPF will seek to give priority to ER Programs that exhibit strong additional benefits for only a marginal increase in costs, if any at all [...].”

“ER [...] should help to improve social and environmental issues, for such improvements will likely also foster the primary goal of climate change mitigation. For example, REDD+ activities could seek to preserve or improve livelihoods for local communities [...] and use ER revenues to finance programs that would help forest communities to protect their immediate environment. [...] REDD+ could also enhance biological diversity by protecting and restoring natural habitat (e.g., by concentrating ER Programs on biodiversity hot spots).”

- Decision 2 CP17 “Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention” which requires compliance with the Cancun Safeguards and their monitoring and report” :

“63. Agrees that, regardless of the source or type of financing, the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, should be consistent with the relevant provisions included in decision 1/CP.16, including the safeguards in its appendix I, in accordance with relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties;

64. Recalls that for developing country Parties undertaking the results-based actions1 referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraphs 73 and 77, to obtain and receive results-based finance, these actions should be fully measured, reported and verified,2 and developing country Parties should have the elements referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 71, in accordance with any decisions taken by the Conference of the Parties on this matter”.

- The FCPF should liaise with the UNFCCC SBSTA’s work on methodological issues related to non-carbon benefits resulting from the implementation of REDD+ activities, as mandated by §40 of UNFCCC Decision -/CP.18 (Agreed outcome pursuant to the Bali Action Plan).

- The FCPF should highlight that REDD+ countries are welcome to use the advice from the Convention on biological diversity on the application of biodiversity-related safeguards, as per Decision CBD XI/19 and its annex (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/35).

- In addition, under component 4b of the R-PP template, countries are required to design monitoring systems for social and environmental additional benefits. Under component 2d, countries

have to define baselines (or zero states) for those social and environmental aspects, as part of the SESA..

2. Besides, extensive work has been done under the framework of the CBD¹ to support the integration of environmental and social concerns all along REDD+ implementation, from the early readiness stage to the valuation stage. It demonstrates that it is feasible and might be not so costly if existing work carried out under the framework of the CBD is used. Some indicators as well as a framework² have been proposed: they have not been endorsed by the CBD and some of their proposals are questionable but they are still interesting to consider.

3. The work on carbon and biodiversity mapping done by the UNEP – WCMC in many UN-REDD countries³ and the national environmental and social principles and criteria to seek non-carbon benefits⁴ developed in several countries under the UN-REDD program may provide also useful materials.

4. As a consequence, AFD would suggest to review in-depth all the background literature in order to propose criteria to assess non-carbon benefits bearing in mind country-specific environmental and social specific challenges.

Regarding the “feasibility issue” raised under question Q4, a distinction should be made between estimating those non-carbon benefits and providing information on them. Indeed, if high quality measurement is not possible in practice in the short term, some simpler criteria can be used nonetheless. We note that the work done in Colombia, Mexico, Ecuador, Cambodia, Vietnam (work of SNV) and DRC with regard to “practical criteria” to address non-carbon values monitoring is useful in that regard. Some of these criteria could be operated at relatively moderate cost, including the area of natural forest, endangered species, high-value conservation sites (defined by the countries as part of their biodiversity strategies or by some other conservation initiatives such as CEPF), and any appropriate proxies in relation to connectivity, ecosystem services and the interests of local and indigenous communities.

¹ Epple, C., Dunning, E., Dickson, B. & Harvey, C. 2011. Making Biodiversity Safeguards for REDD+ Work in Practice. Developing Operational Guidelines and Identifying Capacity Requirements. Summary Report. Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC.; Tyrrell, T.D. & Alcorn, J.B. 2012. Analysis of possible indicators to measure impacts of REDD+ on biodiversity and on indigenous and local communities. UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/19. Convention on Biological Diversity. ; Gardner, T.A. & al 2012. Cadre de travail pour l’intégration des questions liées à la biodiversité dans les programmes nationaux REDD+. UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/22. Montreal: Convention on Biological Diversity.; CBD 2012. Communication du Secrétariat de la Convention sur la Diversité Biologique au Secrétariat de la Convention-Cadre des Nations-Unies sur les Changements Climatiques. UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/20. Montreal: Convention on Biological Diversity; CBD Secretariat 2009. The CBD PoWPA Gap Analysis: A tool to identify potential sites for action under REDD-plus. CBD 2009. The Ecosystem Approach. Advanced User Guide.

² Tyrrell, T.D. & Alcorn, J.B. 2012. Analysis of possible indicators to measure impacts of REDD+ on biodiversity and on indigenous and local communities. UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/19. Convention on Biological Diversity. ; Gardner, T.A. & al 2012. Cadre de travail pour l’intégration des questions liées à la biodiversité dans les programmes nationaux REDD+. UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/22. Montreal: Convention on Biological Diversity.

³ Kapos, V. & al 2008. Carbon and biodiversity: a demonstration atlas. Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC.

⁴ UN-REDD Program 2012. Social and Environmental Principles and criteria of the UN-REDD program.

Issue Paper 4, Q2

Leakage should be assessed not only in the area surrounding the Program area but at least at the national scale, to avoid national leakage, in accordance with footnote 7 in paragraph 71 (c) of UNFCCC decision 1/CP.16, referring to the development of subnational forest monitoring system as an interim measure : “ *Including monitoring and reporting of emissions displacement at the national level, if appropriate, and reporting on how displacement of emissions is being addressed, and on the means to integrate subnational monitoring systems into a national monitoring system* ». Where and when international leakage is likely to appear, measures should be taken to prevent it or adjust results accordingly, noting in that regard safeguard (g) of decision 1/CP.16, Appendix I, paragraph 2 : “*actions to reduce displacement of emissions*”, which concerns national leakage as well as international one.

Issue Paper 5, Q1

Countries should not only report on the WB’s safeguards but also on the Cancun Safeguards, taking into account any provisions to be agreed at UNFCCC COP19 with respect to the content and frequency of reporting on safeguards, as part of national communication and biennial update reports.

Issue Paper 2

Regarding this issue, we suggest to propose approaches that can match different situations in terms of deforestation rates (high deforestation rates but also low deforestation rates in order to keep a high incentive for the latter countries not to increase it).