

**Submission to the
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (“SBSTA”)**

**Methodological guidance and modalities
for measuring, reporting and verifying (“MRV”) of REDD+**

This submission is made on behalf of the Ecosystems Climate Alliance and the following organisations:

Les Amis de la Nature et des Jardins (ANJ), DRC
CARE International
Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL)
Centre d'Accompagnement des Autochtones Pygmées et Minoritaires Vulnérables (CAMV), DRC
Centro de Planificación y Estudios Sociales (CEPLAES), Ecuador
Council for Environmental Defense by Legality and Traceability (CODELT)
Ecoforestry Forum Inc, PNG
Environmental Investigation Agency
Environnement, Ressources Naturelles et Développement (ERND Institute), DRC
Federation of Community Forestry Users (FECOFUN), Nepal
Forest Peoples Programme
Forum pour la Gouvernance et les Droits de l’Homme (FGDH), Republic of Congo
Friends of the Earth, Switzerland - Pro Natura
Global Witness
Greenpeace International
Groupe de Travail Climat REDD (GTCR), DRC
Humane Society International
Perkumpulan HuMa, Indonesia
Rainforest Foundation Norway
Rainforest Foundation UK
Réseau des communicateurs de l’environnement (RCEN), DRC
Tebtebba (Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education)
Union Pour l’Emancipation de la Femme Autochtones (UEFA), DRC
Wetlands International

This submission is also made on behalf of the following non-admitted observer organisations:

Australian Climate Justice Programme (accreditation pending)
David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation
Society for New Initiatives and Activities (SONIA)

The draft conclusions proposed by the SBSTA Chair¹ at Bonn in June 2011 invited Parties and accredited observers to submit to the secretariat, by 19 September 2011, their views on, *inter alia*, methodological issues including modalities for measuring, reporting and verifying (“MRV”) as referred to in appendix II to decision 1/CP.16 (“the Cancun Decision”).

Appendix II to the Cancun Decision requests the SBSTA as a part of its work program to develop modalities for MRV of anthropogenic forest-related emissions by sources and removals by sinks, forest carbon stocks, forest carbon stock and forest area changes resulting from the implementation of activities referred to in paragraph 70 of the Cancun decision, consistent with any guidance for MRV of nationally appropriate mitigation actions (“NAMAs”) by developing country Parties agreed by the Conference of the Parties, taking into account methodological guidance in accordance with decision 4/CP.15 (“the Copenhagen Decision”), for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its seventeenth session at Durban.

Paragraph 70 of the Cancun Decision encourages developing country Parties to contribute to mitigation actions in the forest sector by undertaking the following activities, as deemed appropriate by each Party and in accordance with their respective capabilities and national circumstances:

- (a) Reducing emissions from deforestation;
- (b) Reducing emissions from forest degradation;
- (c) Conservation of forest carbon stocks;
- (d) Sustainable management of forest;
- (e) Enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

(“the 5 REDD+ activities”)

Paragraph 71(c) of the Cancun Decision requests developing country Parties to develop a robust and transparent national forest monitoring system for the monitoring and reporting of the activities referred to in paragraph 70. The monitoring system would, if appropriate include subnational monitoring and reporting as an interim measure² in accordance with national circumstances, and with the provisions contained in the Copenhagen Decision, and with any further elaboration of those provisions agreed by the Conference of the Parties.

Further, it is important to note that Parties are developing a work program on modalities and guidelines for MRV and International Assessment and Review (IAR) for developed country commitments and actions³ and on the development of modalities and guidelines for MRV and International Consultation and Analysis (ICA) of developing country actions⁴ as well as on the initial scheduling of the process on the work for both developed and developing countries. Any work undertaken concerning MRV of REDD+ must be done in parallel with and contribute to the work being undertaken more broadly on MRV.

¹ FCCC/SBSTA/2011/2 dated 3 August 2011;

² 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;

³ FCCC/CP/2010/Add 1 section III.A;

⁴ FCCC/CP/2010/Add 1 section III.B;

Guidance on modalities for MRV should include the following characteristics, elements, and process for reporting.

Characteristics

The characteristics of an MRV system for REDD+ should include the items listed in paragraph 1 of appendix I to the Cancun Decision, namely:

- (a) Contribute to the achievement of the objective set out in Article 2 of the Convention⁵;
- (b) Contribute to the fulfillment of the commitments set out in Article 4, paragraph 3, of the Convention⁶;
- (c) Be country-driven and be considered options available to Parties;
- (d) Be consistent with the objective of environmental integrity and take into account the multiple functions of forests and other ecosystems;
- (e) Be undertaken in accordance with national development priorities, objectives and circumstances and capabilities and should respect sovereignty;
- (f) Be consistent with Parties national sustainable development needs and goals;
- (g) Be implemented in the context of sustainable development and reducing poverty, while responding to climate change;
- (h) Be consistent with the adaptation needs of the country;
- (i) Be supported by adequate and predictable financial and technology support, including support for capacity-building;
- (j) Be results-based;
- (k) Promote sustainable management of forests.

⁵ To achieve, stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. Such a level should be achieved within a time frame sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change, to ensure that food production is not threatened and to enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner;

⁶ That developed country Parties and other developed Parties included in Annex II shall provide new and additional financial resources to meet the agreed full costs incurred by developing country Parties in complying with their obligations under Article 12, paragraph 1 of the Convention which requires that each Party shall communicate to the Conference of the Parties, through the secretariat, the following elements of information:

- a. A national inventory of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all greenhouse gases not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, to the extent its capacities permit, using comparable methodologies to be promoted and agreed upon by the Conference of the Parties;
- b. A general description of steps taken or envisaged by the Party to implement the Convention; and
- c. Any other information that the Party considers relevant to the achievement of the objective of the Convention and suitable for inclusion in its communication, including, if feasible, material relevant for calculations of global emission trends.

Further, Article 4, paragraph 3 requires that developed country Parties shall also provide such financial resources, including for the transfer of technology, needed by the developing country Parties to meet the agreed full incremental costs of implementing measures that are covered by paragraph 1 of Article 4;

Elements of an MRV System for REDD+

The elements of an MRV system for REDD+ should:

1. take into account **methodological guidance in accordance with decision 4/CP.15 (“Copenhagen Decision”)** relating to:
 - (a) **Drivers of deforestation and forest degradation** resulting in emissions and also the means to address these. In this context it should also be noted that the Cancun Decision requests⁷ the SBSTA to identify land use, land-use change and forestry activities in developing countries, in particular those that are linked to the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, to identify the associated methodological issues to estimate emissions and removals resulting from these activities, and to assess their potential contribution to the mitigation of climate change. Further, all Parties are encouraged to find effective ways to reduce the human pressure on forests that results in greenhouse gas emissions, including actions to address drivers of deforestation⁸;
 - (b) The **identification of activities** within the country that result in reduced emissions and increased removals, and stabilization of forest carbon stocks;
 - (c) Use of the **most recent IPCC guidelines**, as adopted or encouraged by the COP. The COP should adopt or be encouraged to use the latest version of the IPCC guidelines as adopted by the IPCC. This should include the latest revisions to the 2006 guidelines that have been undertaken or are currently in progress. Recent science available has modified the emission factors currently used to estimate emissions and removals from peatlands. Use of these revisions will assist with accuracy of reporting;
 - (d) The establishment of, 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 balanced 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, verifiable, consistent, as far as possible accurate, and that reduce uncertainties, taking into account national capabilities and capacities. Guidance should be developed including selecting indicators or types of data and using methodologies/calculations that are transparent, clearly defined and easy to verify objectively;

⁷ See Appendix II to the Cancun Decision at paragraph (a);

⁸ See paragraph 68 of the Cancun Decision;

- iii. Ensure results are available and suitable for review including review and verification by independent third parties;
2. Be consistent with MRV provisions applicable to **nationally appropriate mitigation actions** by developing country Parties (NAMAs). It should be noted that consistency of MRV provisions in the land use sector will not be possible without proper definitions concerning the measurement of deforestation and forest degradation emissions and carbon stocks. It is essential that REDD+ Parties define proper terminology concerning ‘reference levels’⁹ and ‘baselines’¹⁰ as a matter of priority;
3. **Be supported**, including financial resources and technical and technological support and capacity building. In developing guidelines for domestic and international MRV of supported actions, Parties should ensure *inter alia* that: these guidelines for domestic and international MRV of supported actions are streamlined and harmonized to reduce inefficiencies where possible; non-carbon impacts are considered, particularly taking into account safeguards and related monitoring processes developed under the REDD+ and GCF context (see below); and, there is adequate support to conduct MRV;
4. Ensure the **full and effective participation of stakeholders** in both design and implementation, consistent with the Copenhagen Decision, recognizing the need for full and effective engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities in, and the potential contribution of their knowledge to, monitoring and reporting of activities, particularly for ground-based forest carbon inventory approaches¹¹;
5. Establish criteria and procedures for the **identification and monitoring of different carbon pools**. Each Party should account for all changes in carbon pools, including peat forest soils and deforested peatlands, unless transparent and verifiable information is provided that the pool is not a source;
6. Aim for **continuous improvement**. One important area for improvement, which is long overdue, is that relating to clarity and definitions. The long standing inadequate definition of the term ‘forest’ should be resolved in the context of REDD+ otherwise it will not be possible to properly distinguish between the 5 REDD+ activities and also to implement the important safeguard against conversion. There is a need to clearly distinguish between primary or natural forests, other naturally regenerated forest (i.e. anthropogenically degraded forest), planted forest and planted forest of introduced species. It may be useful for Parties to use the FAO categories that countries are using for their 2010 Forest Resource Assessment as specified in **Annex 1** of this Submission. Of note, the Convention on Biological Diversity’s Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Biodiversity and Climate Change, which explicitly covered

⁹ Variants including ‘reference emissions levels’ (REL’s), ‘reference carbon stock levels’ (RCL’s) and ‘reference peat area levels’ (RPL’s), would be used to describe technical estimates of real stock levels or emissions based on application of agreed methodologies;

¹⁰ Variants including ‘forward looking / projected baselines’, ‘historical baselines’, ‘target baselines’ and ‘compensation baselines’, would be used to describe numbers derived from reference levels by application of politically chosen conversion or transposition factors;

¹¹ See para 72 of the Copenhagen Decision and the preamble to decision 4/CP.15;

REDD+, employed the classifications based on the FAO categories to draw distinctions between the carbon stocks in natural forests and plantations. **Annex 2** herein contains a table which sets out how the five REDD+ activities can be usefully harmonised with the FAO categories and proposes definitions to clarify the different terms ('conservation of carbon stocks', 'sustainable management of forests', 'enhancement of forest carbon stocks', 'degradation' and 'deforestation')¹²;

7. Inform requirements for **legal reform** at the national and sub-national levels, for example through the provision of public information and outcomes of conflict resolution and grievance mechanisms established as a part of any accountability requirement included as part of the Safeguards Information System.
8. Provide information and guidance on how any **interim sub-national monitoring and reporting** systems are to be integrated into one national monitoring and reporting system. Guidance should also clarify when interim sub-national monitoring and reporting is appropriate.
9. Set out **standard approaches** to establish inventories and to report the progress of mitigation actions and support provided and received;
10. Recognize that MRV of REDD+ goes **beyond carbon**. The underlying purpose of the seven safeguards is to identify social, environmental and governance requirements necessary to ensure emissions reductions are achieved. It is recognized by some Parties that there are two types of MRV; that relating to emissions; and that relating to conservation, and we agree that this is a concept that warrants further discussion. It is also necessary to include MRV of finance provided and finance received and for the MRV system to be coherent with the system (developed under paragraph 71(d) of the Cancun Decision) for providing information on how the REDD+ safeguards are being addressed and respected so there is one functioning, integrated monitoring and reporting system for REDD+;
11. Be **country driven and flexible to national circumstances**;
12. Be **simple** in order to reduce administrative costs and minimize potential for misunderstanding the information. Time should not be lost in developing complicated methodologies to measure carbon, which are a distraction from urgent action; instead, simpler metrics to measure carbon relating to both deforestation and forest degradation should be applied;
13. Be **suited for review**. The system should be aligned with the ICA process and should facilitate a collaborative review of biennial reports that is open to the public.

In developing the modalities for an MRV system, it would be useful to incorporate lessons learnt and best practices from other systems for monitoring, reporting, verification and review developed under other conventions, such as the International Labour Organization (ILO), the

¹² While highlighting the importance of a practicable and reliable MRV system, we stress that it is more urgent to act on the ground than to further improve the MRV system. In the case of peatlands, in particular in SE Asia, without rapid adequate action – the peat swamp forests will have been decimated in 2020.

Montreal Protocol and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. There is a window of opportunity to improve on current practices, which should be used to the fullest extent possible to ensure a robust and transparent system.

Process for reporting

The process for reporting in the context of MRV of REDD+ should ensure broad participation, enabling input from all relevant stakeholders, be transparent and accurate and in addition to being consistent with other MRV processes, be especially designed to accommodate for the unique requirements of REDD+. Information will be derived from a variety of sources, including the Safeguards Information System (developed under paragraph 71(d) of the Cancun Decision), and importantly should be subject to review through the process of International Consultation and Analyses (ICA). The following components are considered of importance.

Public Participation in the MRV process: Transparency must apply to the MRV process itself. This is particularly important in the context of REDD+. Public access and participation must be guaranteed throughout all MRV processes. Civil society organizations, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities, will play a critical role in providing data on country actions and support, and cross-checking the information.¹³ It should be noted that the Copenhagen Decision also encourages the development of guidance for effective engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities in monitoring and reporting. To take advantage of the resources and knowledge civil society has to offer, its current unofficial status should be changed to allow for official consideration of its information in the UNFCCC processes, and for direct civil society representation in the MRV processes, including the development and implementation of the work program on developing modalities and guidelines for MRV.

Inclusion of REDD+ in Low Carbon Development Plans: Developing countries should include REDD+ in Low Carbon Development Strategies or Plans¹⁴. These plans should outline how countries plan to reduce emissions in their forest sector relative to their forest reference level or forest emissions reference level by 2020 and explain country goals for 2030 to 2050.

Greenhouse Gas inventories: Emissions data in the GHG inventory that relates to REDD+ actions should be reported in a transparent, consistent, and comparable manner with complete and accurate information, following the latest IPCC guidelines (i.e., the 2006 guidelines). In addition to using consistent methodologies, Parties should communicate any additional information relating to methodology usage and data assumptions with the inventory. Inventories should be submitted with national communications and, subject to capacities and support, in biennial updates.¹⁵

National Communications: Guidelines for reporting in National Communications should be enhanced. This should include: updates of greenhouse gas inventories; a national inventory report; information on REDD+ mitigation actions, needs, support received for REDD+;

¹³ The Institute for European Environmental Policy's (IEEP) January 2009 evaluation of the EU's fulfilment of its 2001 Bonn pledge provides one example of civil society's key contribution to the tracking the allocation of climate finance. The IEEP assessment compiled aid data on the EU's climate finance transfers through bilateral aid, the GEF, and MDBs. In addition, in the absence of a formal reporting process for short-term climate financial flows (2010-2012) as promised in Copenhagen in December 2009, civil society organizations such as the World Resources Institute, climatefundupdate.org, and Project Catalyst have stepped in to play a de facto role of collecting climate financial information.

¹⁴ Decision 1/CP.16, at para 65.

¹⁵ See paragraph 60 of the Cancun Agreement.

information on how the REDD+ safeguards are addressed and respected throughout the implementation of REDD+ mitigation activities; and effectiveness of implementing actions. Additionally, in enhancing reporting guidelines, it is important to include reporting on other actions (not only mitigation) and, provisions for public access and ability to comment on information.

Biennial reports: Parties should identify a subset of the elements, from the National Communications with particular emphasis on updates from the Safeguards Information System as to how the safeguards are being addressed and respected and the effectiveness of implementing actions to be included in the biennial report, subject to capacity and support. The Biennial reports should not be an additional report on top of the National Communication.

International Consultation and Analysis (ICA): Technical expert panels that review biennial reports and input into the summary report should be independent and open to both international and national experts, and specialists from private sector, academia, civil society and representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities. Broad participation, including allowing non-Parties to submit information that would be compiled and addressed through the ICA process, will be particularly important with regard to consultation and analyses concerning REDD+. The ICA process should also have a capacity building role available to countries for the improvement of inventories, policies and measures and for assistance with issues of REDD+ and NAMA implementation through the establishment of a facilitative process.

MRV of finance

A common reporting format for REDD+ finance provided and finance received, which is subject to International Assessment and Review or ICA as appropriate is critical to help ensure comparable, consistent, accurate, and transparent reporting.¹⁶ Key lessons can be drawn from previous experience with guidelines for reporting finance in UNFCCC national communications. In 2007, the UNFCCC Secretariat prepared a synthesis of financial information based on the fourth national communications from Annex I Parties¹⁷ The Secretariat noted that multiple methodological and reporting issues limited the utility of their analysis. For example, Parties reported funding to multilateral institutions without distinguishing funding for climate change, and provided information on bilateral contributions using different and sometimes incomparable formats. In addition, the guidelines provide no information on how to report projects that have multiple components, nor on how to determine additionality; they do not clearly distinguish among financing types (i.e., grants, loans, and guarantees) nor public versus private funding. These limitations should be considered by the COP, and addressed, in the drafting of enhanced guidelines for reporting finance. The guidelines should also address reporting on: the effectiveness of support provided, including support provided during the readiness phase of REDD+ for *inter alia* implementation of the REDD+ safeguards (and link this review to developing country reporting of supported actions); and other means of support, such as technology transfer and capacity building.

¹⁶ Ibid at para 41

¹⁷ UNFCCC, "Compilation and synthesis of fourth national communications. Note by the secretariat. Addendum. Financial resources, technology transfer, vulnerability, adaptation and other issues relating to the implementation of the Convention by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention." FCCC/SBI/2007/INF.6/Add.2. (Bonn, 2007).

The Cancun Decisions require that funding be “**new and additional**”, i.e. new and additional to existing Official Development Assistance (ODA) targets,¹⁸ but Parties have yet to agree on a definition of the term. Nevertheless better data would eventually allow Parties to determine from a technical standpoint whether there has been an increase or decrease in climate finance over time, and whether any increase has simply been at the expense of existing ODA targets that have already been committed and are required in order to meet the Millennium Development Goals.

Reporting on Fast-Start Finance: Finalizing and implementing a comprehensive reporting system will take time. Fast-start financing information will be key to ensuring that developing countries, particularly the poorest and most vulnerable, build their capacity to adapt and cope with the effects of climate change and take the necessary immediate actions to mitigate their greenhouse gas emissions. It will also be essential for building trust between countries that action is being taken. The REDD+ Partnership database is already providing information on REDD+ finance, and this database can be built upon so that it is eventually linked to, and provides the information necessary for MRV of REDD+ finance under the UNFCCC. The secretariats for the UNFCCC and REDD+ Partnership should provide guidance for this reporting in order to ensure that the information provided is adequate, comparable and complete, and allows for an assessment of whether or not developed country Parties are meeting their fast-start finance pledges.

Monitoring and Reporting on Safeguards

The Cancun Decision contains important provisions on safeguards both for REDD+ activities and for the Green Climate Fund. The implementation of these safeguards will depend on having effective monitoring and reporting systems that build on existing structures where possible.

REDD+ Safeguards

Paragraph 71(d) of the Cancun Decision¹⁹ requests that Non Annex1 country Parties aiming to undertake REDD+ activities develop a system for providing information on how the safeguards are being addressed and respected.

Drawing on well established core objectives for non-Annex 1 National Communications²⁰ and IPCC Good Practice Guidance, **safeguards information should be provided in a transparent, consistent, comparable, complete and accurate way.** Further, in accordance with the Cancun Decision and Decision 4/CP.15, the information should be provided in a participatory way. The information system also should be harmonised with other systems for providing information (e.g. under the FCPF, FIP and UN-REDD), so that the information provided meets the needs of all relevant stakeholders

Reporting of information obtained through an effective monitoring system is necessary to demonstrate the adequate design, implementation and respect for the safeguards and will improve overall implementation and effectiveness of REDD+.

¹⁸ Op cit 17 at para 95.

¹⁹ Paragraph numbers refer to paragraphs in the advance unedited version of Draft Decision -/CP.16 (the outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA).

²⁰ Decision 17/CP.8.

Accountability for Green Climate Fund (GCF) Safeguards

Paragraph 1 (h) of the Terms of Reference for the Transitional Committee specifically calls for the development of a mechanism “to ensure the application of social and environmental safeguards” in the operation of the GCF. Unlike the REDD+ safeguards, these safeguards are yet to be articulated in more specificity. However, in general terms, the overall GCF safeguards must include clear policies and procedures that prevent social and environmental harm and maximize public benefit, participation, transparency, accountability, equity and the protection of rights. As a matter of logic and efficiency, we would submit that the well established REDD+ Safeguards would be applicable to any REDD+ finance window under the GCF, and the Safeguards Information System would supply the information necessary for monitoring and evaluation under the GCF

In order to achieve effective implementation of these safeguards the GCF framework must: (1) provide access to information based on internationally recognized norms; (2) build on the REDD+ safeguards and strengthen their implementation; (3) maintain policies and processes designed to help countries implement safeguards in national laws and systems that support low-carbon sustainable development, have good governance structures, and are consistent with international obligations; (4) support international-level grievance mechanisms as well as appropriate national-level grievance mechanisms; and (5) establish standardized and regular reporting requirements (including participatory monitoring) regarding how safeguards are addressed and respected throughout the design and implementation of activities.

It is imperative that the safeguards framework apply to all financial intermediaries, delivery partners, or implementing agencies that may be involved in projects or activities funded by the GCF.

Annex 1

Summary of FAO forest characteristics

<p>PRIMARY FOREST</p> <p>Naturally regenerated forest of native species, where there are no clearly visible indications of human activities and the ecological processes are not significantly disturbed.</p> <p>Explanatory note</p> <p>1. Some key characteristics of primary forests are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - they show natural forest dynamics, such as natural tree species composition, occurrence of dead wood, natural age structure and natural regeneration processes; - the area is large enough to maintain its natural characteristics; - there has been no known significant human intervention or the last significant human intervention was long enough ago to have allowed the natural species composition and processes to have become re-established.
<p>OTHER NATURALLY REGENERATED FOREST</p> <p>Naturally regenerated forest where there are clearly visible indications of human activities.</p> <p>Explanatory notes</p> <p>1. Includes selectively logged-over areas, areas regenerating following agricultural land use, areas recovering from human-induced fires, etc.</p> <p>2. Includes forests where it is not possible to distinguish whether planted or naturally regenerated.</p> <p>3. Includes forests with a mix of naturally regenerated trees and planted/seeded trees, and where the naturally regenerated trees are expected to constitute more than 50 percent of the growing stock at stand maturity.</p>
<p>OTHER NATURALLY REGENERATED FOREST OF INTRODUCED SPECIES (<i>sub-category of OTHER NATURALLY REGENERATED FOREST</i>)</p> <p>Other naturally regenerated forest where the trees are predominantly of introduced species.</p> <p>Explanatory note</p> <p>1. In this context, predominantly means that the trees of introduced species are expected to constitute more than 50 percent of the growing stock at maturity.</p>
<p>PLANTED FOREST</p> <p>Forest predominantly composed of trees established through planting and/or deliberate seeding.</p> <p>Explanatory notes</p> <p>1. In this context, predominantly means that the planted/seeded trees are expected to constitute more than 50 percent of the growing stock at maturity.</p> <p>2. Includes coppice from trees that were originally planted or seeded.</p> <p>3. Excludes self-sown trees of introduced species.</p>
<p>PLANTED FOREST OF INTRODUCED SPECIES (<i>sub-category of PLANTED FOREST</i>)</p> <p>Planted forest, where the planted/seeded trees are predominantly of introduced species.</p> <p>Explanatory note</p> <p>1. In this context, predominantly means that the planted/seeded trees of introduced species are expected to constitute more than 50 percent of the growing stock at maturity.</p>

Annex 2**Proposed framework for harmonisation between the 5 REDD+ activities
and FAO categories**

	Primary forest	Other naturally regenerated forest	Planted forest	Other land uses
Primary forest	Conservation of carbon stocks	Forest degradation	Forest degradation (safeguard exclusion)	Deforestation (safeguard exclusion)
Other naturally regenerated forest	Enhancement of forest carbon stocks	Sustainable management of forest	Forest degradation (safeguard exclusion)	Deforestation (safeguard exclusion)
Planted forest	Enhancement of forest carbon stocks	Enhancement of forest carbon stocks	Sustainable management of forest	Deforestation (safeguard exclusion)
Other land uses	Enhancement of forest carbon stocks - afforestation	Enhancement of forest carbon stocks - afforestation	Enhancement of forest carbon stocks – afforestation	Not Applicable

Notes to the table

1. **‘Conservation of carbon stocks’** equates to maintaining ‘primary forest’ as categorised by FAO, to ‘conservation’ as originally set out in the Bali Action Plan and ‘stabilization’ in paragraph 1(b) of Decision 4/CP.15 in Copenhagen.
2. **‘Sustainable management of forests’** equates to maintaining extractive use of forest, either as ongoing management of ‘naturally regenerated forest’ as naturally regenerated forest or ongoing management of ‘planted forests’ (plantations) as planted forest. [There may be boundary issues (with enhanced carbon stocks or forest degradation) depending on whether specific activities enhance or degrade carbon stocks

- in any particular reporting year or, within a single reporting or commitment period, or when viewed at different timescales.]
3. **‘Enhancement of forest carbon stocks’** equates to all those movements between FAO categories as a result of specific activities that result in increases in the carbon stock of a particular area of forest. [NB there are five such cells in the matrix above. NB such activities may result in enhancement for only part of the time and may involve conservation or degradation of carbon stores at different times or over different reporting or commitment periods.]
 4. **‘Forest degradation’** equates to all those movements between FAO categories as a result of specific activities that result in decreases in the carbon stock of a particular area of forest. [NB degradation involving conversion of primary forest or other naturally regenerated forest to planted forest (plantations) would be ineligible for REDD+ support pursuant to the safeguard in paragraph 2(e) of Appendix 1 of Cancun Decision 1.][NB there are three such cells in the matrix above.] [NB such activities may result in degradation for only part of the time and may involve conservation or enhancement of carbon stores at different times or over different reporting or commitment periods.]
 5. **‘Deforestation’** equates to all those movements between FAO categories as a result of specific activities that result in forest being converted to non-forest use. [NB deforestation would be ineligible for REDD+ support pursuant to safeguards in paragraph 1 of Appendix 1 of Cancun Decision 1.][NB there are three such cells in the matrix above.] [NB such activities involve degradation at a single point in time with no intention to restore carbon stocks.
 6. **‘Not applicable’** simply identifies that this final cell in the matrix is not relevant to discussions about support for eligible activities for REDD+ pursuant to the Bali Action Plan and Decision 1/CP.16. Insofar as ‘agriculture’ and ‘blue carbon’ are being discussed elsewhere, however, this matrix could readily be expanded to embrace land use categories relevant for a wider discussion across the entire AFOLU sector, either involving an expanded REDD+ mechanism or the creation of new mechanisms. In all circumstances, having a single categorisation system would be needed to allow relevant activities to be appropriately characterised for eligibility, safeguard and policy treatment purposes.

For further information please contact:

Davyth Stewart
Global Witness
dstewart@globalwitness.org
Tel: +44 (0)207 492 58 53