



Greenpeace Policy on Saving Forests to Protect the Climate

www.greenpeace.org

GREENPEACE

Greenpeace Policy on Saving Forests to Protect the Climate



Published in August 2009
Greenpeace International
Ottho Heldringstraat 5
1066 AZ
Amsterdam
The Netherlands
www.greenpeace.org

© Greenpeace/Kate Davison

Introduction

The Bali Action Plan recognised that forests will be an essential part of the discussions on REDD, LULUCF and the CDM at the UNFCCC Climate Change negotiations to be held in Copenhagen, Denmark, in December 2009

While REDD originally dealt with two issues - deforestation and degradation - the Bali Action Plan, in its Paragraph 1, extended the REDD discussion with the so-called REDD+ issues: conservation, sustainable forest management, and increasing forest carbon stocks (afforestation and/or reforestation).

Bali Action Plan:

"Policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries."

UNFCCC Bali Meeting, 2007

LULUCF refers to the mechanism by which Annex I countries can reach part of their emission reduction objectives through enhancing domestic carbon removals from land use, land-use change and forestry activities. In Poznan, parties agreed that this mechanism should remain available for Annex I parties during the next commitment period.

Afforestation/reforestation is an approved methodology in the CDM, although the criteria necessary for such temporary and/or impermanent activities have resulted in only a few projects being financed through the CDM. In Poznan there was a call for these criteria to be softened, so that more afforestation and reforestation projects can be funded. This will, most likely, form part of the Copenhagen negotiations.

In short, the issues of deforestation, degradation, conservation, sustainable forest management, enhancement of forest carbon stocks (afforestation, reforestation, forest restoration) and forest carbon accounting - in Annex I countries and developing countries - are all on the agenda of the Copenhagen negotiations.

Acronyms used in Forest Climate Policy

CDM Clean Development Mechanism
LULUCF ... Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry
REDD Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation in developing countries
UN FAO United Nations Food & Agricultural Organisation
UNFCCC .. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Why protect forests?

1

The world's primary forests **maintain ecological systems essential for life on Earth**. These ancient forests are home to **millions of indigenous peoples and forest communities** who depend on them for their survival - both physically and spiritually. These forests **regulate water flows and rainfall** – even at long inter-continental distances.¹

Forests also play an extremely important role in **biodiversity conservation**, with over half of the world's land-based species of plants and animals living in them.² Biodiversity is vital to mankind's continued existence, since it is an essential component of the healthy ecosystem needed to provide the **clean water and breathable air**, among other ecosystem services, that all life depends on. In addition, there is a substantial economic cost of losing biodiversity; a recent study estimated that, for example, we are losing biodiversity on an annual basis that would have produced ecosystem services worth around € 50 billion each year³.

Forests play a vital role in **stabilising the world's climate** by storing large amounts of carbon that would otherwise contribute to climate change. They store nearly 300 billion tonnes of carbon in their living parts –roughly 40 times annual fossil CO₂ emissions⁴. When forests are destroyed, the stored carbon is released into the atmosphere through the rotting and burning of vegetation. Furthermore, it has recently been shown that primary forests take up - or sequester - an important amount of CO₂ from the atmosphere⁵, roughly equal to the amount of CO₂ emitted from deforestation⁶.

Despite all this, these magnificent primary forests are under threat. Forests are vanishing at a rate of 13 million hectares per year⁷, which is comparable to losing a forest area the size of a football pitch every 2 seconds. Most of this loss is in tropical forests, which are highly valuable in terms of both carbon uptake and biodiversity. **Deforestation, therefore, significantly decreases the potential for forest uptake of CO₂, as well as being a major contributor to global greenhouse gas emissions.**

Projections indicate that some forests, such as in boreal areas, might temporarily gain from climate change. However, the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), in its 2007 Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), suggests forest dieback towards the end of this century and beyond in tropical, boreal and mountain areas, with significant biodiversity losses in tropical forest diversity hotspots.⁸

The continued destruction of forests, together with climate change, poses a grave threat to the future of forests. Climate change is predicted to increase drought in tropical forests, which will induce dieback and increased release of carbon to the atmosphere as dead trees decay⁹. This effect is expected to be especially pronounced in the Amazon, where the forest could **reach a tipping point and cease to be a forest**¹⁰.





© Greenpeace/Natalie Behring

Deforestation magnifies climate change impacts in tropical forests by fragmenting the remaining forest, making it drier and more vulnerable to drought-induced fire. The more vulnerable a forest to climate change, the more vulnerable the carbon stocks are to being lost to the atmosphere. This increases the risk of runaway climate change, and disastrous losses of biodiversity and vital ecosystem services such as clean water and breathable air.

Forest degradation increases the vulnerability of forests to climate change. This is particularly important for Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs). Timber extraction - even by so-called 'sustainable forest management', selective logging and/or reduced impact logging - degrades forests.

In addition to removing carbon, opening up the forest to further logging (for example, through the creation of roads and other infrastructure), and the effects it has on biodiversity and ecosystem functions, degradation also affects the moisture regime in forests. Selective logging, especially in tropical forests, opens up the canopy, which in turn dries the understory and litter layer. The forest is left prone to drought, and hence fire¹¹. Selective logging also greatly increases the amount of dry, fire-prone forest edges (for example, along roadsides).

Climate change is predicted to increase weather extremes (for example, increased periods of drought). Evapotranspiration, due to higher temperatures, will cause increased moisture loss¹². Degraded forests are less able to cope with these impacts because they are already moisture-stressed.

Plantations are not forests

2



A landowner protesting against Turama Forest Industries, Paia, Gulf Province. © Greenpeace/ Jeremy Sutton-Hibbert 2008

We need to stop the conversion of forests to plantations, and in particular the destruction of natural forests.

One cannot simply replace primary forests with plantations. As the Ad-Hoc Technical Expert Group on biodiversity and climate change (AHTEG) of the CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity)¹³ notes:

“Primary forests are generally more carbon dense, biologically diverse and resilient than other forest ecosystems, including modified natural forests and plantations.”

“In largely intact forest landscapes where there is currently little deforestation and degradation occurring, the conservation of existing forests, especially primary forests, is critical both for protecting carbon stocks and preventing future greenhouse emissions, as well as for conserving biodiversity.”

“Forest plantations may store and sequester considerable amounts of carbon but are not as beneficial for biodiversity conservation as natural forests and have lower resilience to climate change.”

CBD AHTEG Table 2: Different carbon (a) and biodiversity benefits of main forest types

(the more +s, the better a forest/plantation type scores on a given feature)

Forest type ^(b)	Biomass carbon stock ^(c)	Carbon sequestration potential ^(d)	Biodiversity value	Value of ecosystem services
Primary forest	+++	++(+)	+++	+++
Modified natural forest	++	++	++	++
Plantations (indigenous species)	+	+++ (depending on species used/management)	+(+)	+
Plantations (exotic species)	+	+++ (depending on species used/management)	+	(+)

(a) refers to total ecosystem carbon.

(b) forest definitions are a simplified version of FAO classification.

(c) refers to the carbon stored in the forest ecosystem. Plantation forests store less carbon because stands are usually harvested at a relatively young age, and young trees store less carbon than older trees. Also, timber harvesting causes emissions from collateral damage to living and dead biomass and soil carbon. This is also why modified natural forests store less carbon than primary forests.

(d) refers to the uptake of CO₂ from the atmosphere.

a) Forest classification – different types of forest need to be recognised by the UNFCCC, and plantations need to be distinguished from natural forests

Tree plantations are not forests. It is important that the Copenhagen agreement recognises the differences between plantations and natural forests. Only natural forests should be eligible for REDD funding as preventing their destruction has the greatest potential for reducing greenhouse gas emissions entering the atmosphere and protecting biodiversity. Including plantations would be a perverse outcome of REDD.

The current UNFCCC forest definition does not differentiate between natural forests and plantations. Although both UNFCCC and FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation) use similar definitions of a forest¹⁴, FAO further classifies forests to distinguish between natural forests and plantations (which they term 'planted forests'). While Greenpeace prefers the FSC definition of plantations, the FAO classification is a UN classification, and therefore directly applicable to the UNFCCC.

Greenpeace is therefore calling for the UNFCCC to adopt the most recent FAO forest classification¹⁵, in order to distinguish between natural forests and plantations. While Greenpeace supports the use of FAO classifications in the UNFCCC we do not agree with plantations being referred to as forests.

UN FAO classification of forests for FRA 2010¹⁶

Natural forest comprises the following FAO categories:

primary forest: naturally regenerated forest of native species, where there are no clearly visible indications of human activities and the ecological processes are not significantly disturbed.

other naturally regenerated forest (also called secondary forest): naturally regenerated forest where there are clearly visible indications of human activities, but excluding a sub-category of the latter.

other naturally regenerated forest of introduced species: other naturally regenerated forest where the trees are predominantly of introduced species.

Plantations comprise the following FAO categories:

planted forest: forest predominantly composed of trees established through planting and/or deliberate seeding;
and

planted forest of introduced species: planted forest, where the planted/seeded trees are predominantly of introduced species.

b) Natural forests have more carbon and more biodiversity than plantations

Protecting natural forests (intact landscapes, primary and secondary forests) for their carbon stocks also benefits biodiversity conservation and maintains a wide range of ecosystem services essential for human well-being, e.g. water regulation. **Natural forests are a reservoir of biodiversity and allow the ecosystem to adapt to climate change.**

c) Primary forests are the most important to conserve

Primary forests, particularly IFLs, are the most resilient to climate change, contain the biggest carbon stock and have the highest biodiversity value of all forests. IFLs are defined as territories, within today's global extent of forest cover, which contain forest and non-forest ecosystems minimally influenced by human economic activity, and have an area of at least 500 km².¹⁷

IFLs are the most important forests, as much as for biodiversity - they contain large areas for animals with large home ranges - as for climate change. IFLs are resilient to climate change because they are not fragmented and are thus not harmed by edge effects (edges being vulnerable to drying, wind and fire). Generally, their inaccessibility better protects them against logging and drought, and allows for species to better adapt to climate change.

d) Secondary (or degraded) forests are also important

Natural forests that have been impacted by human activities (i.e. secondary forests) can become primary forests over time and often have high biodiversity and social values. Allowing secondary forests to recover from logging and disturbance can have a positive impact on climate change through increased carbon sequestration. However, afforestation, reforestation and forest restoration/regrowth cannot replace the carbon and biodiversity lost during deforestation, especially in the short term (approximately 20 years). **It is therefore important to prevent deforestation.**

Secondary forests correspond to the FAO classification of 'other naturally regenerated forest' (excluding the sub-category where such forests are composed of introduced species).

e) How much forest protection is enough?

Greenpeace advocates **zero deforestation**, and **zero degradation** (for example, by industrial logging) in IFLs.

Climate change and deforestation are a deadly combination, and only zero deforestation will sufficiently maintain the resilience of forests to climate change to prevent forests from becoming a large source of atmospheric carbon (for example, through forest fires).

Countries who receive payments for the protection of their forests must implement adequate and permanent protection mechanisms in order to ensure that they are not subsequently degraded. Only well-managed protected areas can confidently lead to permanent emission reductions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries.

Greenpeace wants **participatory eco-regional land use and conservation planning**, and a climate protection process carried out with the **prior informed consent of indigenous peoples and other traditional forest users**, to be completed in forested landscapes. Following this, global, regional and national **networks of protected areas must be established**, consisting of strictly protected areas and core zones as well as community-protected areas and buffer zones allowing for small-scale and low-impact forest use.

Only declared protected areas have any semblance of permanency. Forest management can take place outside of protected area networks that encompass all IFLs and other forests with a high conservation value, but must be ecologically responsible and socially just. The standards of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) should be seen as the minimum standards for this forest management, with a focus on secondary forest areas and applying these standards as a conservation and restoration tool.

Key policy principles and criteria for a REDD mechanism

3

Absolute priority should be given to halting deforestation and preventing forest degradation. To that end, Greenpeace has developed Forests for Climate - a proposal for such a mechanism.

This mechanism is built upon the following principles:

(1) Deeper emission cuts in industrialised countries

Fossil-fuel emission reduction and deforestation targets must be established based on the need to prevent dangerous climate change. Targets set on reducing emissions from deforestation must be additional to ambitious emissions reductions from the use of fossil fuels in industrialised countries. If not, this could run the risk of a trade-off, i.e. there will be a transfer of emission reduction targets from fossil fuels to deforestation at the risk of not making real and timely emission reductions in the energy sector.

(2) 'Polluter Pays' principle

In view of their historical responsibility for the greenhouse gas emissions currently active in the atmosphere, and their greater capacity to act, Greenpeace expects **industrialised countries to take responsibility for providing the necessary funds to ensure a drastic reduction of emissions from deforestation, leading to zero deforestation by 2020.**

(3) National emissions approach: not project-based or sub-national

Greenpeace believes that **every country should do its fair share in combating global climate change and that approaches are needed that reduce transaction costs, ensure the integrity of baselines, and prevent** the problem of 'leakage' (i.e. when destruction merely shifts from one area of the country to another). Therefore, **Greenpeace supports REDD mechanisms with national accounting for emissions where policies and approaches are coordinated at the national level.** At the same time, a REDD mechanism must ensure that benefits are equitably shared both among and within countries, and reach those whose livelihoods depends on these forests. Under certain conditions this could mean that resources are allocated to actors at the sub-national level¹⁸.

(4) Broad country participation

It is **critical to ensure large-scale participation of forest countries** into any REDD agreement, in order to avoid international leakage and to maximise biodiversity protection. Therefore, the incentive mechanisms to help reduce emissions from deforestation must take into account individual national capacities, governance and other relevant circumstances to ensure this broader participation.

© Greenpeace/Daniel Beltr

(5) Accounting deforestation rather than carbon fluxes

Measuring carbon storage and fluxes in forest ecosystems, and their responses to disturbance, cannot currently be done with any significant degree of accuracy. It is not like measuring carbon from a factory chimney; there are many unknowns and uncertainties with detailed carbon accounting of forests. Conversely, deforestation rates can be measured reasonably accurately, either on the ground or by satellite. Therefore, in the short term, efforts to quantify carbon losses from deforestation should be based on **deforestation rates using nominal carbon values** rather than trying to account for carbon through a system that is poorly understood and not well-defined.

(6) No to funding for afforestation and reforestation

Greenpeace opposes the inclusion of afforestation and reforestation activities in any REDD (or other UNFCCC) mechanism. The **inclusion of such activities could lead to deforestation of natural forest**, while maintaining the same apparent forest cover through the use of plantations. Tree plantations are not forests and their inclusion into REDD could provide a perverse incentive to convert high biodiversity natural forests into low biodiversity plantations. In the short term absolute priority should be given to halting deforestation and forest degradation, but in a later stage ecological forest restoration could become part of the REDD mechanism.

(7) Gross deforestation rates approach

Greenpeace believes that an accounting system based on gross, rather than net, deforestation rates should be used. To maximise the environmental benefits of reducing deforestation it is important that **carbon losses from deforestation form the accounting basis for estimating emissions for incentive schemes**, as opposed to including gains from planting and forest growth. A net rate approach could balance losses from deforestation against carbon uptake gains on cleared land from subsequent land uses - such as afforestation, reforestation, and sustainable land management. Under a net deforestation approach, countries could hide deforestation by increasing plantations or could even be incentivised to replace primary forests by plantations.

(8) Integrated biodiversity protection

The **conservation of biodiversity must be a central guiding principle** for any REDD mechanism. Large intact forests and other natural forests with high biodiversity values should be prioritised for protection under a REDD mechanism. In order to provide full benefits to forest biodiversity, measures must be taken that ensure policies and incentives to reduce deforestation under the UNFCCC are consistent with other international conventions, including the UN Convention on Biological Diversity.

(9) Inclusion of degradation

Forest degradation is a significant source of emissions in its own right and also acts as a precursor to deforestation. It is therefore important to establish **area-based monitoring of degradation and reward countries for areas kept free from forest degradation**. However, technical and definition issues, and problems of monitoring emissions associated with degradation, may pose challenges to its inclusion in a REDD mechanism for the second commitment period.

Nevertheless there is a risk that, without proper accounting of the effects of degradation, substantial releases of carbon could occur from forests for which rewards have been given for protection.¹⁹ The establishment of well-managed protected areas can overcome this problem and confidently lead to permanent emission reductions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries. While the implications of including degradation still need to be fully investigated, Greenpeace will continue to work to ensure that the impacts of forest degradation are addressed in any adopted mechanism and that funding is made available to nations with low deforestation rates.

(10) Respecting the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities

Due regard must be given to **protect the rights and livelihood of indigenous peoples and local communities**. In order to do so, land tenure systems that are non-discriminatory and provide clear rights over land and its associated values, as well as mechanisms for resolving conflicts over tenure rights, need to be in place. All efforts should be made to avoid land conflicts, increased state control over forests, exclusionary models of forest conservation, and violations of customary land and territorial rights. In particular, clear provisions must be established that recognise the land, resource-use and ownership rights of indigenous peoples, and directly engage indigenous peoples and local communities in international and national processes discussing policies, mechanisms, and approaches to reduce emissions from deforestation. Free prior and informed consent, equitable benefit-sharing, and respect for traditional knowledge, land tenure and human rights, in particular those outlined in the UN Declaration on the rights of Indigenous Peoples, should all be central components of national and international deforestation policy discussions.

(11) Strong principles and criteria for activities that reduce emissions from deforestation

It is important that funding is spent on the right priorities, and that solid investments are made to strengthen governance, conservation policies and high-quality monitoring and reporting systems. It will therefore be necessary to include in the REDD mechanism **strong environmental and social principles and criteria on how projects are set up and carried out.**

(12) Addressing the drivers of deforestation

Without properly tackling the drivers of deforestation, the efficacy of any mechanism will be considerably hindered. These drivers include: unsustainable consumption and trade in commodities (timber, soya, palm oil, cattle, etc.); land conversion for agriculture; illegal and destructive logging; poor forest governance and law enforcement; unfair land distribution; corruption; expansion of the mining sector and other extractive industries; infrastructure development; and the need for fuel-wood. The REDD mechanism should **support efforts already under way** to deal with these issues, and it will be important to invest in governance structures, institutions and enforcement capacity.

(13) Ensure activities promote coherence and support between the relevant multilateral and regional forest processes

Following on from the need to tackle the drivers of deforestation, there are a number of multilateral agreements and work programmes that have been developed to try to address these issues, in particular the regional Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (and Trade) (FLEG/T) processes and the work programmes on forest biodiversity and protected areas of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD). It is important that any future REDD agreement supports the work that is under way in these fora, to ensure the conservation and ecologically-responsible and socially-just use of forests.

(14) Independent monitoring and verification

Rigorous, reliable, and accessible monitoring and verification procedures are needed to ensure real reductions in deforestation and related emissions. In particular, there needs to be a **consistent independent international monitoring and verification system that will meet international standards.** However, there also needs to be flexibility, to ensure that countries that cannot meet the highest level of stringency can also participate, while ensuring some confidence in the volume of emission reductions accounted. At least in the short-term, such monitoring should be area-based rather than emission-based as measuring carbon storage and fluxes in forest ecosystems is currently not possible with any degree of accuracy, while conversely, deforestation rates can be measured reasonably accurately, either on the ground or by satellite.



*An elder woman near her village of Omati, Gulf Province
© Greenpeace/ Jeremy Sutton-Hibbert 2008*

(15) Strong compliance system

Whichever approach is examined, a strong compliance system needs to be implemented to ensure the long-term effectiveness of any REDD mechanism. **Developed and developing countries should both make commitments, take action and provide financial resources to achieve the objective of halting deforestation by 2020.** A structure should be set up within the UNFCCC that provides a strong basis for facilitating and evaluating compliance of developed countries to provide sufficient funding, and of developing countries to effectively halt deforestation and prevent degradation.

(16) Assure permanence

It is critical to ensure the permanence of deforestation emissions reductions. Mechanisms must be designed in a manner that prevents areas from becoming deforested or degraded at a later date. This could be done by including: insurance systems; reserves; a suspension of further access to the system; or setting aside a percentage of earned credits to cover any losses. Furthermore, it will be important to ensure that there is **no incentive to allow deforestation if the economic benefit of other uses of the forest land arise.**

(17) Effective classifications of forests

The definition and classification of 'forest' has a significant implication for emissions accounting. There is a need for the UNFCCC to **use the UN FAO internationally-agreed classification in order to distinguish plantations from natural forests** (i.e. primary forests and other naturally-regenerated forests, excluding those composed of introduced species), including recognising IFLs. **Plantations should be excluded from REDD.**

The greater the flexibility in the classification and/or definition, the greater the risk of loopholes. Following from these international definitions and recognising that there are differences in ecological conditions from country to country - i.e. from tropical rainforests to northern boreal - it will be effective to **also agree to biome-based definitions** that would be more narrowly delineated by biome. This will avoid potential loopholes and inappropriate 'one-size-fits-all' definitions.





© Greenpeace/Daniel Beltr

(18) Need for early action and capacity building

Early action is desperately needed to reduce emissions from deforestation. Greenpeace believes that the forest and climate crisis is of such magnitude that **it is not feasible for countries to wait until 2013 before taking significant measures**, following the policy principles set out in this document, to reduce deforestation. Therefore, it is necessary for the international community to develop efforts to build **capacities that will provide institutional, technical and financial support to developing countries** to reduce forest destruction immediately.

Such capacity-building activities should support and directly feed into the multilateral process under the UNFCCC to ensure that once a mechanism is in place countries will be ready to participate. This could be in the form of pilot initiatives to implement actions at the national scale while full capacity is being developed. For countries with existing capacity, reward-payment should be made that rewards reduced deforestation and forest degradation against a stated deforestation reduction target.

(19) Historical baselines

Establishing credible baselines for reduced deforestation and forest degradation is likely to be difficult because of poor monitoring and data in many countries. A **conservative approach to the establishment of country-specific historical emissions baselines** is therefore required.

It is essential that future emissions are progressively reduced below these levels to generate continuing incentives for zero deforestation. Host countries must show significant progress, relative to their economic and other circumstances, to reduce their own emissions before they receive payment for emission reductions. **Predetermined deforestation reduction targets should be stated and acted upon prior to payments being made.** The setting of targets and baselines must ensure that the commitments require real deforestation emission reductions and do not provide incentives to increase the rates of deforestation before the system starts. All national forests and forest-related ecosystems in the country should be included, including government-owned and privately-owned land.

Greenpeace supports the option of a well-established historical baseline for the post 2012 period, rather than projection baselines, to ensure that emission reductions are real. Countries with low historical rates of deforestation deserve special attention and specific measurements and approaches will need to be developed.

(20) No fungibility

A fungible market - where credits from reducing emissions from deforestation would be tradable with fossil fuel emission credits - applying to all parties and including deforestation credits would carry large risks and would not be open to many countries with significant tropical forests in the second (and possibly third) commitment periods, due to capacity limitations and governance issues. A funding mechanism is needed that could apply to **all countries with tropical forests**, not merely those that could meet strict emission monitoring, verification and compliance standards. In order to take advantage of the market but avoid the risks associated with full fungibility, a **hybrid approach is required**, whereby funding for deforestation reduction activities is derived through a market-based mechanism but deforestation units are not tradable within it.²⁰

(21) Emphasis on protected areas to reduce deforestation: no financing for logging forests

Protected areas should be promoted as a **key tool in implementing measures to reduce emissions from deforestation**. Involving industrial logging of natural forests or an expansion of plantations, the so-called 'sustainable forest management' promoted by the forest industry and international bodies such as the UN Forum on Forests (UNFF) and FAO allows for significant fragmentation and forest degradation, and would be unacceptable under a REDD mechanism. **Funding from a REDD mechanism must not be directed to destructive forest activities such as logging and agribusiness.**

(22) Accounting for Harvested Wood Products (HWP) would incentivise logging and further forest destruction

When defending sustainable forest management's place as part of REDD, the forest industry argues that the benefits of logging include the carbon stored in harvested wood products. However, it is likely that the carbon stored in HWP is **only a tiny fraction of the total carbon released through forest degradation**. The introduction of HWP accounting under a REDD mechanism would further incentivise logging and lead to intensification of logging activities and forest destruction. Furthermore there are no guarantees that these products would not be wasted and there are no possibilities to monitor their carbon storage. Greenpeace is **against providing support for HWP** within the climate regime.

(23) No financial support for conservation of plantations

In Bali, parties argued for incorporating the concept of 'compensated conservation' as a policy approach for compensating countries adopting forest conservation policies and measures under REDD. However, their definition of 'conservation' is meant to connote conservation plantings, or plantations that are not harvested, and not - as the name suggests - conservation of primary forests. For Greenpeace, **reducing deforestation and forest degradation must be the primary role of REDD**, with secondary provisions for reducing degradation with conservation of primary forests. Financing the establishment of plantations will dilute the global benefits of REDD. Providing funding for established plantations is unacceptable.

(24) Addressing fragmentation

Emissions from forest fragmentation related to the building of logging roads and other industry-related infrastructure are significant. This is in addition to the emissions from the conversion of forest areas to agriculture and other activities that follow the opening up of forest areas and increasing the forest's vulnerability to drought (for example, drought induced by climate change). While Greenpeace does not oppose ecologically and socially-responsible logging practices outside of IFLs, it does oppose the extension of carbon financing to such activities.

(25) Ending forest destruction: zero deforestation

Because the climate demands **permanent reductions in emissions**, mechanisms and actions to reduce emissions from deforestation should be designed and implemented to achieve the goal of **halting gross emissions from deforestation by 2020**. Funding should be directed to countries whose actions are consistent with an end to destructive forest practices and the long-term protection of biodiversity values, while fully respecting the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities. Efforts to reduce, but not end, this source of emissions will only prolong the problem and not provide the results needed to avoid dangerous climate change.



Wawoi falls, Western Province. © Greenpeace/Birch

References

- 1 Avissar, R. & Werth, D. 2005: Global Hydroclimatological Teleconnections Resulting from Tropical Deforestation. *Journal of Hydrometeorology* 6: 134-145.
- 2 WRI. 2005: Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Biodiversity Synthesis. World Resources Institute. Washington DC
- 3 Braat & Ten Brink, P. (eds.) 2008. The Cost of Policy Inaction (COP1): the case of not meeting the 2010 biodiversity target. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/economics/index_en.htm1
- 4 Solomon S. et.al. 2007: Technical Summary. In: *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- 5 Stephens et. al. 2007: Weak northern and strong tropical land carbon uptake from vertical profiles of atmospheric CO₂. In: *Science* 316: 1732-1735. Luyssaert, S., Schulze, E.-D., Börner, A., Knohl, A., Hessenmöller, D., Law, B.E., Ciais, P., & Grace, J. 2008: Old-growth forests as global carbon sinks. *Nature* 455: 213-215; and Lewis, S.L. 2009: Increasing carbon storage in intact African tropical forests. *Nature* 457: 1003-1007.
- 6 Denman K.L. et.al. 2007: Couplings Between Changes in the Climate System and Biogeochemistry. In: *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- 7 FAO. 2005: FRA (Global Forest Resource Assessment). FAO, Rome, Italy. <http://www.fao.org/forestry>
- 8 Fischlin, A. et al. 2007. Ecosystems, their properties, goods, and services. In: *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- 9 Bonan G.B. (2008) Forests and climate change: forcings, feedbacks, and the climate benefits of forests. *Science* 320: 1444-1449. and Lewis, S.L. 2009. Increasing carbon storage in intact African tropical forests. *Nature* 457: 1003-1007.
- 10 Malhi, Y., Aragão, L.E.O.C., Galbraith, D., Huntingford, C., Fisher, R., Zelazowski, P., Sitch, S., McSweeney, C. & Meir, P. 2009. Exploring the likelihood and mechanism of a climate-change-induced dieback of the Amazon rainforest. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* doi: 10.1073/pnas.0804619106; and Lenton, T.M., Held, H., Kriegler, E., Hall, J. W., Lucht, W., Rahmstorf, S. & Schellnhuber, H.J. (2008). Tipping elements in the Earth's climate system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105: 1786-1793.
- 11 Malhi, Y., Roberts, J.T., Betts, R.A., Killeen, T.J., Li, W. & Nobre, C. 2008. Climate change, deforestation, and the fate of the Amazon. *Science* 319: 169-172.
- 12 Fischlin, A. et al. 2007. Ecosystems, their properties, goods, and services. In: *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- 13 CBD. 2008: Draft Findings of the CBD AHTEG on Biodiversity and Climate Change. <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/cc/ahateg-bdccc-01/other/ahateg-bdccc-01-findings-en.pdf>
- 14 'Land spanning more than 0.5 hectares with trees higher than 5 metres and a canopy cover of more than 10%, or trees able to reach these thresholds in situ. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use'.
- 15 FAO (2007) Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010. Specification of National Reporting Tables for FRA 2010. Working paper 135, Rome, <http://www.fao.org/forestry/media/14119/1/0>
- 16 FAO 2007. Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010. Specification of National Reporting Tables for FRA 2010. Working paper 135, Rome, <http://www.fao.org/forestry/media/14119/1/0>
- 17 Potapov, P. et al. 2008 Mapping the World's Intact Forest Landscapes by Remote Sensing. *Ecology and Society* 13: 51
- 18 The Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol provides a precedent for striking a balance between developing countries' national sovereignty issues and developed countries' input on funding priorities, while ensuring the efficient allocation of resources to actors at the sub-national level as needed.
- 19 Karousakis, K., 2007. Incentives to Reduce GHG Emissions from Deforestation: Lessons Learned from Costa Rica and Mexico. Paris, OECD/ IEA. http://unfccc.int/files/methods_science/redd/application/pdf/incentives_to_reduce_ghg_emissions_from_deforestation_lesson_learned_from_costa_rica_and_mexico.pdf
- 20 See: Greenpeace. 2008: Forests for Climate: Developing a hybrid approach for REDD (www.greenpeace.org/raw/content/international/press/reports/forestsforclimate2008.pdf). And: KEA. 2009: REDD and the effort to limit global warming to 2°C: implications for including REDD credits in the global carbon market. Greenpeace (www.greenpeace.org/raw/content/usa/press-center/reports4/redd-and-the-effort-to-limit-g.pdf)

JN 266
August 2009
Greenpeace International
Ottho Heldringstraat 5
1066 AZ
Amsterdam
The Netherlands

GREENPEACE