

REDD+ Window in the Green Climate Fund

November 2012

Deforestation and forest degradation are **costing the world's economy between \$2 trillion and \$5 trillion US dollars a year in losses of biodiversity and ecosystem services**.¹ Across all tropical forests, **more than 1 million hectares are lost each month**.² Parties in Doha need to provide finance decisions on REDD+³ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation) in relation to the Green Climate Fund (GCF), as well as the finance discussions under the Ad hoc Working Group for Long-Term Cooperative Action (LCA) under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference (UNFCCC).

During its most recent session in Bangkok, the LCA proposed the establishment of "a REDD+ window for the financing of REDD+ in all phases" as one of the options for institutional arrangements to be decided in Doha. Since 2009 there has been **consensus among many parties for the need of a specific REDD+ window**. The decision to create such a window is therefore long overdue, and should not be further delayed.

The reasons for a specific REDD+ window are numerous. **REDD+ has advanced more rapidly than other areas under the UNFCCC, and provides perhaps the best opportunity for large-scale emission reductions in the near term**. However, the recent past has seen an increase of initiatives trying to undermine that process by transforming REDD+ into yet another market-driven offset scheme, benefitting mainly industrial polluters, financial institutions and traders. A bold commitment by the international community to provide sufficient and reliable funding to a REDD+ window designed to deliver results for the people, forests, and climate is therefore needed now more than ever.

The current REDD+ landscape is an inefficient mess that requires coordination. Such coordination could only be provided by a specific REDD+ window under the GCF, rather than the divergent mitigation and adaptation windows. The World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), Forest Investment Programme (FIP), BioCarbon Fund, UNREDD, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the REDD+ Partnership and bilateral agreements are only some of the entities that both donor and developing countries are having to deal with on REDD+. While parties may decide that multiple implementation agencies would be preferable for purposes of competition and innovation, the lack of coordination and the large-scale duplication of efforts should not be confused with those ends.

REDD+ demands special attention not required for other mitigation and adaptation actions. Forests are home to millions of people, and store more biodiversity and carbon than any other terrestrial biome in the world⁴. REDD+ will have a significant impact on the livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as biodiversity. Recent news headlines have contained scandals – for example highlighting disregard for indigenous peoples' rights – from some early REDD+ efforts, which will likely intensify over time. This is why the Cancún Agreement on REDD+ codified a phased approach to REDD+, to ensure that such rights are fully respected and that incentives are not perverse. The Cancún Agreement includes safeguards for biodiversity and the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, and addresses the issues of leakage (where drivers of deforestation merely shift from one part of the country to another), impermanence (areas being subsequently destroyed due to fires, infestations and even climate-related impacts) and non-additionality (where finance is provided to protect an area of rainforest that would have been protected anyway).

¹ TEEB (2009). TEEB Climate Issues Update. September 2009

² FAO FRA (2010). www.fao.org/forestry/fra/

³ Given the drastic need for global emission reductions, Greenpeace believes that REDD+ financing should currently be directed to halting industrial-scale deforestation and degradation where it occurs, and preventing it from occurring in forests at high risk (rather than to certain "+" activities such as afforestation).

⁴ Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005). Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Biodiversity Synthesis. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC.

Civil society support for REDD+ remains contingent on the implementation of these safeguards. Lumping REDD+ in with other mitigation and adaptation efforts will not give the people and biodiversity at issue the attention required by the Cancún agreement.

Finally, **REDD+ provides both mitigation and adaptation benefits**, and many countries with tropical forests are among those highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. Short-sighted mitigation actions that will not help a country and its peoples to adapt to a changing climate would be not only wasteful but counterproductive. Rather than directing financing to diverging and potentially competing ends, parties should agree to direct forest-related financing to a REDD+ funding window that will best enable it to achieve multiple ends as required by the Cancún Agreement on REDD+.

Greenpeace has been, and remains, a passionate and vocal advocate for scaled-up finance to help protect the world's remaining forests and combat climate change. It has also been a vocal advocate against the promotion of false solutions – such as a market-driven sub-national offset approach – to REDD+. Significant funding made available under a REDD+ window in the GCF needs to be a core element of a good deal on REDD+ in Doha.

For more information contact:
pressdesk.int@greenpeace.org

Greenpeace International
Ottho Heldringstraat 5,
1066 AZ Amsterdam,
The Netherlands
Tel: +31 20 7182000