

# REDD+ MRV of BD

WNF-WUR

11 juni 2013

Zeist, The Netherlands

Jan Willem den Besten



# IUCN NL and REDD+

- **Community of Practice**
  - South-south learning
  - Building capacity
  - Balance technical with governance work
- **Work with private sector**
  - Private sector finance as leverage
  - Learning on setting standards
- **Work with public sector**
  - Promote 'pro-poor' themes, equitable benefit sharing
  - Inform international and national decision making
- **Knowledge management**

# REDD+: Potenties for Biodiversity

- Conservation, Sustainable Use en Restoration
- National approaches; nesting of projects
- Performance based payments
- Reference levels, permanence, additionality,
- Alignment relevant sectors; agriculture
- Safeguards: local communities, biodiversity
- Leverage public and private funding



# REDD+ MRV of BD: Perspectives



# Project developers perspectives

- CCBA in combination with VCS
- Participation, transparency, tenure and rights
- Certification takes a lot of time, resources
- Southern partners reach limit of capacity
- Is this the most effective and efficient use of our resources to stem biodiversity loss?
- Need for a more balanced approach to carbon and social/ biodiversity benefits

# Communities' perspectives

- International, national, local “knowledges”
- Funds and markets
- Central role and ownership of local community
- Biodiversity values and use
- Benefit sharing
- Gender and inter-generational considerations
- Relevance of CBD



# Communities' perspectives (2)

- Community-led MRV: Biodiversity and access
- Dependency on external expertise
- Limited technical, monitoring and institutional capacity
- FPIC process costly
- REDD+ not to be treated as extractive industry

# Examples Philippines (Mt. Malindang; Palawan)

- Dependency on external experts
- Areas monitored regularly for Biodiversity insufficient
- More training of community members needed
- FPIC process expensive and time consuming
  - Staff and other costs while waiting
  - No resources to speed up the process (compare mining industry)
  - Mining interests within the community
  - Slow moving government apparatus



# Summary REDD+ VCS/CCBA (WLT in India, Paraguay)

- Produces certified voluntary market credits, high credibility;
  - Suits large corporates for CSR and/or trading purpose
- BUT**
- Laborious, bureaucratic, protracted, expensive, risky;
  - Only good for large-scale projects, too complex for most civil society organizations, inefficient means of obtaining social/biodiversity benefits;
  - Must be additional – uncertain future status of voluntary credits, depends on national policy; on-going debate

# Private investors perspectives

- Why do they do it?
- Demonstrate REDD+ can work for biodiversity and for communities
- Ambitious Code of Conduct (Eneco, WNF, IUCN NL)
- Link biodiversity to footprint thinking
- Reporting is knowing

# Private investors perspectives (2)

- Link with EPNL accounting
- Natural capital
- Stacking of income streams and PES at the landscape level
- Link to greening of and safeguarding of supply chains
- Biodiversity as a separate offset class



# Approaches to MRV of biodiversity?



# Safeguards information systems

- Build on and link to existing forest information systems
- How standardize?
- Registry of projects
- SISA Monitoring and reporting
- Secondary source info not good enough
- Independent civil society and community institutions

## Biodiversity approaches

- Comprehensive approach
- Carbon as entry point to lever finance
- Give importance to all ecosystem functions and produce
- Ensure that benefits flow quickly
- our resources to stem biodiversity loss?
- Need for a more balanced approach to carbon and social/ biodiversity benefits

# WLT's Carbon balanced model

- Projects have REDD+ characteristics but 'self-certified', no tradable credits;
- Has taken off rapidly, to equivalent volume as full REDD+:
  - Suits CSR requirements ancillary to other emission reduction actions;
  - Cost-effective delivery, allows bundling of individually smaller-scale initiatives;
  - Suits wide spread of corporates (including prominent image-conscious organisations);
  - Also high uptake by selective institutions (e.g. other NGOs, Wildlife Trusts).

# Advantages and disadvantages of WLT

## ‘Carbon Balanced’ model

- Does not have the credibility of independently validated credits – but variants possible (CCBA alone, micro-project criteria, ...);
- Complements existing emission reductions/offsetting programmes and structured for retro-fitting to credit production;
- Very attractive for benefit delivery - cost-effective, very flexible, allows bundling of individually smaller-scale manageable initiatives, allows full local involvement;
- Avoids the eco-political arguments – good ‘no-regrets’ entry point.



# Conclusion

- MRV of safeguards: link to existing info systems
- Align standards
- Explore alternative models
- Balance technical (C) and governance approaches
- Community led MRV; bridge capacity gaps
- Landscape approach and local knowledge
- Biodiversity and access to communities
- FPIC, tenure & benefit distribution



Thank You