ADB

RECOFTC
THE CENTER FOR PEOPLE AND FORESTS

National REDD+ Strategies in Asia and the Pacific

PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

Asian Development Bank

National REDD+ Strategies in Asia and the Pacific

PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

Background Paper

October 2010

Asian Development Bank

Printed in the Philippines.

Publication Stock No. ARM102726

Cataloging-In-Publication Data

Asian Development Bank.
National REDD+ Strategies in Asia and the Pacific: Progress and Challenges.
Mandaluyong City, Philippines: Asian Development Bank, 2010.

1. Climate change 2. REDD+. I. Asian Development Bank.

This document meant to encourage discussion. Reactions from readers are welcome. Please send these to dmccauley@adb.org.

Note: In this publication, "$" refers to US dollars, unless otherwise stated.

Cover photo by Peter Walpole
Photos on pages vi and x were provided by Rowena Soriaga

6 ADB Avenue, Mandaluyong City
1550 Metro Manila, Philippines
Tel +63 2 632 4444
Fax +63 2 636 2444

www.adb.org
For orders, contact Department of External Relations
Fax +63 2 636 2648
adbpub@adb.org

Contents

Abbreviations iv
Boxes and Tables v
Preface vii
Executive Summary ix

1. Introduction 1

2. REDD+ Overview in Asia and the Pacific 2
2.1 Vulnerable Forests 2
2.2 Vulnerable Peoples 4

3. REDD+ Progress in the Region 6
3.1 Global REDD+ Support 7
3.1.1 Multilateral REDD+ Support Mechanisms 8
3.1.2 Bilateral Partners 10
3.1.3 In-country Contributions 10
3.1.4 Voluntary Carbon Markets 10
3.1.5 Financing Challenges and Needs 10
3.2 Status of National REDD+ Strategy Development 11

4. REDD+ in Asia and the Pacific: Summing Up 15

References 17

Appendix 1 19
Appendix 2 21
Appendix 3 22
Appendix 4 25

Abbreviations

ADB	–	Asian Development Bank
AFN	–	Asia Forest Network
APEC	–	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
ASEAN	–	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CIFOR	–	Center for International Forestry Research
CO_2e	–	carbon dioxide equivalent
EMP	–	Ecosystem Marketplace
FAO	–	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FCPF	–	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FIP	–	Forest Investment Program of the Climate Investment Fund
FMT/PT	–	Facility Management Team of FCPF (FMT) and Programme Team (PT) of UN-REDD
FPIC	–	Free, prior, and informed consent of indigenous peoples and local communities
GEF	–	Global Environment Facility
GMS-BCI	–	Greater Mekong Subregion Biodiversity Conservation Corridors Initiative
GTZ	–	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (German Technical Cooperation Agency)
HoB	–	Heart of Borneo
IPCC	–	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LULUCF	–	Land use, land use change and forestry
MAICC	–	Mountain Alliance Initiative for Climate Change
MRV	–	Monitoring, reporting, and verification or measuring, reporting, and verification
NCF	–	New Carbon Finance
NORAD	–	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
OECD	–	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PAM	–	Policies and measures
PIF	–	Pacific Islands Forum
RECOFTC	–	Center for People and Forests (formerly Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific)
REDD+, REDD-plus	–	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation, as well as through sustainable management of forests and forest carbon stocks conservation and enhancement, in developing countries
R-PP	–	Readiness plan proposal
SAARC	–	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SACEP	–	South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme
SPREP	–	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
STAR	–	System for Transparent Allocation of Resources under the GEF
UNDP	–	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	–	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCAP	–	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
UNESCO	–	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	–	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UN-REDD	–	United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries
WRI	–	World Resources Institute

Boxes and Tables

Tables

1. Classification of Asian and Pacific Developing Countries by Forest Cover Context and Ranked by Forest Area 3
2. Forest Area of Ten Asian and Pacific Countries with High Potential Gains from Avoided Deforestation 4
3. Preliminary Assessment of Asian and Pacific REDD+ Strategy Development 13

Box

1. REDD+ Phased Approach 7

Appendix Tables

1. Forest Cover Context in Asian and Pacific Countries 19
2. Estimated Market for Avoided Deforestation in Selected Asian and Pacific Countries 21
3. Estimated 2010–2012 Financing for Asian and Pacific Countries in High-Moderate Forest and High Deforestation Category and/or Receiving REDD+ Support 22
4. Status of National REDD+ Strategy Development in Selected Asian and Pacific Countries 25

Preface

This paper is written for people interested in how countries of Asia and the Pacific are preparing themselves to take advantage of emerging financial and forest conservation opportunities created through the "REDD+" approach for reducing carbon emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and other actions that conserve and enhance forest carbon stocks. It also documents the support they are receiving from a variety of bilateral and multilateral REDD+ development mechanisms, many of which are part of the fast-start financing commitments made under the Copenhagen Accord. The paper reviews the extent of global REDD+ support allocations that have been directed to countries of the Asia-Pacific region and analyzes their distribution.

A wide range of stakeholders may find this paper of interest, including those drawn from regional government and development agencies, non-governmental organizations, civil society organizations, indigenous peoples groups, academia and the private sector. The analysis of global REDD+ support allocated to the region aims to contribute the dialogue on how to improve coordination and narrow gaps between needs and financing. It is hoped that this paper will help to inform those interested in how the REDD+ mechanism is evolving and the emerging issues facing its wider use in Asian and Pacific countries.

The paper is presented in four sections. Following an Introduction to the subject, Section 2 describes why the establishment of the REDD+ mechanism is particularly crucial to forest conservation and sustainable rural development financing in the region. The diverse context of Asian and Pacific forests and peoples are highlighted to place the REDD+ potential in this context. Section 3 reviews progress in establishing REDD+ arrangements and actions in the region, including national REDD+ strategy development. Section 4 summarizes the current state of REDD+ development in the region, including the key issues moving forward. Four annexes provide country level data and are the basis for the analysis presented in the paper.

This paper was originally written as background for an official side event entitled "Asian and Pacific REDD+ Progress and Challenges", held on 6 October 2010 during the UNFCCC climate talks in Tianjin, People's Republic of China. The event was co-organized by ADB and RECOFTC. After the event, the paper was circulated to interested parties to solicit comments, with many of these incorporated in this version. David S. McCauley, Principal Climate Change Specialist at ADB, Rowena Soriaga, Project Coordinator for the ADB Technical Assistance Activity on Capturing the Economic Benefits of Ecosystem Services, and Ben Vickers, Senior Program Officer at RECOFTC are the main authors. Lauren Sorkin of ADB and Charles McNeill and Tim Clairs of UNDP have provided valuable comments. This paper is considered an interim assessment only, and the authors retain responsibility for its shortcomings.

The authors would also like to acknowledge the country presenters and panelists at the Tianjin event, who provided both up-to-date information and insights into REDD+ developments and issues in the region. Side event organizers include Celine Yong and Duncan McLeod of RECOFTC, and Ancha Srinivasan and Lu Xuedu of ADB. The country presenters were Dr. Nur Masripatin from Indonesia, and Mr. Khamsene Ounekham of Lao PDR. Panel speakers included Thomas Paka of PNG EFF, Reinhard Wolf of GTZ, Xuemen Wang of FCPF, Charles McNeill of UN-REDD and Dirk Gaul of GEF. Support for editing, layout and production were kindly provided by Valerie Pacardo, Kavita Sherchan, and Amelita de Dios at ADB.

Executive Summary

Reducing carbon dioxide emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and associated actions to conserve and enhance forest carbon stocks, collectively referred to as REDD+, offers an important new approach to both climate change mitigation and the financing of sustainable rural development in Asian and Pacific forested countries. Under this scheme, forest managers in developing countries are compensated by developed countries and businesses for the global benefits derived when these forests reduce atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide that lead to global warming.

Putting market values on global forest ecosystem services is a relatively new idea. And the flow of finances will be conditional on the establishment of markets to trade verified emissions reductions. The prospect of REDD+ payments has breathed new life into efforts to address the old problem of forest conservation which has been plagued by governance constraints, and it holds the promise of supporting truly sustainable forest management practices. Negotiations are underway to make REDD+ an important part of a new global climate agreement, and several Asian and Pacific countries are busily establishing the basis for participating in this new market-based mechanism for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Studies have shown that the Asia and Pacific region offers huge potential to benefit from REDD+ because its forests and peat lands are significant carbon sinks and are also currently important sources of carbon dioxide emissions. Through avoiding further deforestation and forest carbon stock enhancement, the region has the potential to contribute about 40% of the total global REDD+ potential in carbon dioxide emissions reductions by 2050.

There are 10 countries in the region that have both high to moderate forest cover and are also experiencing high deforestation rates. These 10 countries alone could generate around $2.8 billion in REDD+ revenues from even a modest forest carbon market, if their historical deforestation rates were reduced by half.

Across the region, 13 countries are actively preparing national REDD+ strategies, and they are receiving support in these efforts from a range of multilateral and bilateral REDD+ "readiness" mechanisms.

While progress in establishing these strategies is encouraging, immense governance challenges remain. Many countries will require legislative reform and enhanced forest law enforcement, improved interagency coordination, broad-based and meaningful stakeholder consultation and engagement, and the creation of a transparent and accountable REDD+ monitoring, reporting, and verification system at the subnational and national levels.

There is a need for improved coordination among multilateral and bilateral support mechanisms. Emergence of the interim global REDD+ Partnership holds considerable potential for furthering this objective. There also is a need for better communication and exchange of best practices. While the REDD+ Partnership can help at the global level, there may be a need for similar or related mechanisms at the regional level to allow for sharing and learning across Asia and the Pacific on this important new source of financing and hope for addressing a key contributor to global warming.

1. Introduction

Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation as well as through conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+)[1] is an important new approach to climate change mitigation. Furthermore, it represents a potentially large new source of financing for sustainable rural development in developing countries tied to securing forest ecosystem services that generate local, regional and global benefits.

The goal of this background paper is to stimulate discussion on emerging issues facing countries of the region as a wide variety of actors work toward introducing the REDD+ mechanism. Several countries are preparing national strategies to establish systems for organizing REDD+ actions and arrangements. As this field is developing rapidly, it is useful to periodically take stock of developments and share experience.

The paper consolidates and synthesizes knowledge about the region's engagement in REDD+, drawing upon the growing literature on the subject. The paper pays more attention to REDD+ "arrangements" than to "actions", mostly because it is much easier to ascertain this information through materials prepared by the countries in partnership with international support mechanisms. There is a high degree of interest in the REDD+ subject. On the internet alone, Google generates 1.4 million results for a search on 'REDD-plus'. During the last two negotiating sessions in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) process, 26 side events (14% of total) were held related to REDD+. Formation of the interim global REDD+ Partnership (described below) has also increased interest and available materials.

In preparing this paper, data concerning Asian and Pacific countries were extracted from global datasets and surveys, as well as from documents developed in conjunction with various REDD+ readiness support vehicles.[2] It is important to note that this is only a cursory review. It is not comprehensive nor is it even entirely up to date, given the rapid developments on this topic. Comments, additions, and corrections from interested stakeholders are welcome.

1 Wording based on negotiating text of the UNFCCC Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action, Eleventh Session, Bonn, 2–6 August 2010 (Chapter VI.3)

2 Forest cover data from FAO's State of the World's Forests (2009); REDD+ financing data from the REDD+ Financing and Activities Survey presented during the Oslo Climate Conference (2010) then validated or updated using organizational websites and other surveys; REDD+ activities data from CIFOR's preliminary survey (Wertz-Kanounnikoff et al. 2009). The analysis method for REDD+ trends and patterns in Asia and the Pacific is also inspired by these surveys.

2. REDD+ Overview in Asia and the Pacific

When the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), in 2007, confirmed that land use change, including deforestation, is the second largest source of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions—accounting for 15%–20% of global emissions—attention quickly turned to the Asia and Pacific region as a significant source, alongside the Amazon and Congo Basins. The climate stabilization goal will not be achieved without actions to address this source of emissions.

According to estimates, Southeast Asia was responsible for 12% of the world's total greenhouse gas emissions in 2000, with emissions rising twice as fast as the global average during 1990–2000. Land use change, including deforestation, accounts for 75% of Southeast Asia's greenhouse gas emissions (ADB 2009). Hence, any effort to limit the region's carbon footprint cannot gain credence without strong attention to this source. The global community has long been concerned over the loss of biodiversity from rainforest destruction in the region, but the potential of the forests to help stabilize the global climate has drawn international attention to conserving these unique resources. In the absence of action, conversion of the region's forests to other land uses could potentially release around 39 million tons of carbon stocks (FAO 2009).

2.1 Vulnerable Forests

The region is home to almost one-fifth of the world's forests (18.6%), covering 734 million hectares (ha) of land and representing a wide array of ecosystems that provide direct services to more than half of the world's population. While recent trends indicate a net increase in forest area—mainly due to afforestation and reforestation in the People's Republic of China, India, and Viet Nam—this masks a simultaneous and rapid loss of highly biodiverse and carbon-rich natural forests. From 2000 to 2005, the region lost around 3.7 million ha of natural forest annually, which constituted one-third of the global losses (FAO 2009).

The decline in the region's natural forests can be attributed to a range of deforestation drivers. Expansion of commercial plantation and agricultural crops is a major cause. Forty-two percent of forest area changes from 1990 to 2000 were attributed to direct conversion of forests to agriculture, both large- (29%) and small-scale (13%). Over the same period, intensification of agriculture in shifting cultivation areas was the cause of 23% of forest area changes while 9% were linked to expansion of shifting cultivation into undisturbed areas (FAO 2009).

The potential gains to be made from avoiding deforestation and forest degradation are greatest in countries with high to moderate forest cover and a high rate of forest loss. Table 1 shows that 10 developing countries in the Asia and Pacific region fall into this category: five countries in Southeast Asia (Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, and Myanmar), three in the Pacific (Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, and Timor-Leste) and two in South Asia (Nepal and Sri Lanka). This brings to the

fore Southeast Asia's relevance to and opportunities in REDD+. Details of each country's forest cover context may be found in Appendix 1.[3]

Using FAO figures, ADB has estimated that a 50% reduction in the deforestation rate of the 10 Asian and Pacific countries most suited for REDD+ would generate $2.8 of $5 per ton of avoided CO_2 emissions (Appendix 2). By avoiding deforestation, the region has the potential to sequester around 40% of global carbon in the atmosphere by 2050 (Sohngen and Sedjo 2006).

The 10 countries in the 'high forest cover/high deforestation rate' category hold more than 206 million ha of forests, constituting 28% of Asian and Pacific forests (Table 2). Indonesia holds almost half of these most vulnerable forests. Section 3.1 on financing patterns indicates how present international mechanisms are responding to the sense of urgency in these countries.

Table 1. Classification of Asian and Pacific Developing Countries by Forest Cover Context and Ranked by Forest Area[4]

Forest Cover	Country	
	High deforestation rate (≤ –0.5% annual forest cover change)	Low deforestation rate (> –0.5% annual forest cover change)
High to moderate forest cover (≥25% of land area)	Indonesia Myanmar Papua New Guinea Malaysia Lao People's Democratic Republic Cambodia Nepal Solomon Islands Sri Lanka Timor-Leste	Thailand Viet Nam Bhutan Georgia Fiji Islands Vanuatu Samoa Micronesia, Federated States of Palau Cook Islands Tuvalu
Low forest cover (<25% of land area)	Mongolia Philippines Pakistan Afghanistan Armenia	China, People's Republic of India Turkmenistan Kazakhstan Uzbekistan Azerbaijan Bangladesh Kyrgyz Republic Tajikistan Tonga Kiribati Maldives Marshall Islands Nauru

Source: FAO 2009

3 Which includes all ADB developing member countries.

4 Includes all ADB developing member countries.

Countries not included in the 'high-moderate forest cover/high deforestation rate' category of Table 1 also have significant roles to play in REDD+ through the reduction of forest degradation, conserving and enhancing forest carbon stocks, and by sustainable management of forests.

Countries with low forest cover and high deforestation rates are also critical, not only for their potential contribution to emissions reductions through avoided deforestation.[5] The unsustainable exploitation of Pakistan's sparse forest resources (which, at 2.5% of land area, constitute one of the lowest levels of coverage in the region) is said to have contributed to the severity of the recent floods in the country by releasing greater amounts of sediments that choke riverbeds. The Philippines, with 24% forest cover and a forest area of 7.2 million ha, holds important potential for carbon sequestration through reduced forest degradation and assisted natural regeneration.

Table 2. Forest Area of Ten Asian and Pacific Countries with High Potential Gains from Avoided Deforestation

Country	Forest extent 2005 ('000 hectares)	Natural Forest extent 2005 ('000 hectares)	Annual Forest Cover Change 2000–2005 (%)	Annual Natural Forest Cover Change 2000–2005 (%)
Indonesia	88,495	85,096	(2.0)	(2.1)
Myanmar	32,222	31,373	(1.4)	(1.5)
Papua New Guinea	29,437	29,345	(0.5)	(0.5)
Malaysia	20,890	19,317	(0.7)	(0.6)
Lao PDR	16,142	15,918	(0.5)	(0.6)
Cambodia	10,447	10,388	(2.0)	(2.0)
Nepal	3,636	3,583	(1.4)	(1.4)
Solomon Islands	2,172	nd	(1.7)	nd
Sri Lanka	1,933	1,738	(1.5)	(1.4)
Timor-Leste	798	755	(1.3)	(1.4)
Total Extent of Forests	206,172			
Asia-Pacific Forest Area	744,018			

( ) = negative, nd = no dataa
Source: FAO 2009; WRI Earth Trends Database (natural forest area and change)

2.2 Vulnerable Peoples

With two-thirds of the world's poor living in Asian and Pacific countries, it is not possible to discuss improved forest and land use without addressing poverty. Forests provide food, fiber, and fuel—goods that are vital to the rural poor. About 70% of the world's extremely poor rural people[6] are concentrated in Asia and the Pacific region (ADB, 2008), with 1.8 billion people living on less than $2 a day, and 947 million struggling on less than $1.25 a day (ADB et al. 2010). Poverty is more pervasive in forested areas, where many people have limited or no access to basic services and markets.

5 Avoided deforestation is only one of the five mitigation actions under REDD+. According to the latest negotiating text issued by the UNFCCC, these five actions are: (i) reducing emissions from deforestation (avoided deforestation); (ii) reducing emissions from forest degradation; (iii) conservation of forest carbon stocks; (iv) sustainable management of forests; and (v) enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

6 Defined to include those living on $1 or less a day.

To many of the indigenous peoples in the region, comprising 210 million–260 million of its inhabitants, forests are not only a source of income and employment, but they also are an integral part of their cultural identities (AFN 2009). The value of forests for indigenous peoples stems from their cultural, social, and spiritual relations with forests as well as their dependence on the forest for food, fuel, and other economic needs. The communities that rely upon forests for their livelihoods and cultural identity are extremely diverse. Papua New Guinea and Indonesia together have more than 22% (1,500) of the world's languages, most of which are not spoken in any other country. More than 61% of endangered languages are found in Asia and the Pacific region (UNESCO 2005 in AFN 2009). Therefore, any discussion of the forests of this region must recognize its rich cultural diversity and how this is linked to biological diversity.

While carbon sequestration and biological diversity generate global ecosystem services, watershed protection and the socio-cultural functions of forests also generate enormous local benefits that contribute directly to national development and identity.

Watershed protection is a major concern in the region. As noted most recently in Pakistan, there have been many instances of floods in deforested watersheds carrying greater sediments and other debris with resulting downstream damage in times of high river flows. There also is growing interest among water supply companies and dam managers in approaches involving compensation from downstream beneficiaries to upstream land and forest managers to provide services through protection of watershed ecosystems.

3. REDD+ Progress in the Region

REDD+ was recognized in the Bali Action Plan (2007) as a climate mitigation approach with huge potential for long-term cooperative action. Since that time, a range of actions have been initiated to build capacity in financing to implement REDD+ strategies across the region.[7]

There is general agreement among a diverse body of stakeholders—including within the UNFCCC process—that a phased approach to REDD+ is needed for the proper development of this climate mitigation approach.

Box 1 provides examples of REDD+ actions and arrangements and shows how they relate to the commonly-used three-phase approach toward achieving long-term, measurable, reportable, and verifiable results.

REDD+ phase 1 measures include the formation of working groups or task forces to facilitate a broad-based process for developing and adopting national REDD+ strategies. In some countries, there is an active effort to establish a stock of on-the-ground experience from subnational demonstration pilots. In others, early work has started on designing mechanisms for performance-based payments.

The timing and movement of country transitions from one phase to another will vary. Some countries may qualify to skip a particular phase if they meet the eligibility criteria for the next phase. Within countries, overlaps between phases may also be necessary and even desirable (Angelsen et al. 2009).

7 At least four surveys have been conducted on REDD+ actions in Asia and the Pacific. From November 2008 to May 2009, CIFOR conducted a survey of REDD+ readiness and demonstration activities in Asia, Africa and Latin America (Wertz-Kanounnikoff et al. 2009). In October 2009, the ASEAN-Korea Environmental Cooperation Unit of the Seoul National University and the Faculty of Forestry in Bogor Agricultural University held an international workshop to survey the status of REDD in eight ASEAN member countries (Sundawati et al. 2010). At the Oslo Climate and Forest Conference in May 2010, an intergovernmental task force led by Australia, France, and Papua New Guinea, released the results of a survey on REDD+ financing and activities that synthesized 33 responses from 15 developing countries, 10 developed countries, and eight international organizations. FAO has commissioned a working paper from RECOFTC and partners (Vickers et al. 2010) that synthesizes the climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies of countries in the region, for presentation at the 20th Session of the FAO Committee on Forestry in October 2010. The status of REDD+ developments presented here draw from these surveys. Other web-based REDD+ and climate finance monitoring facilities are available online such as www.reddpluspartnership.org, www.climatefundsupdate.org, and www.faststartfinance.org.

3.1 Global REDD+ Support

Six contributing countries[8] pledged $3.5 billion for REDD+ support in Copenhagen in December 2009 as part of the $30 billion commitment to "fast-start" climate financing. At the Oslo Climate and Forest Conference in May 2010,[9] an interim global REDD+ Partnership was formed, with its contributing partners increasing the pledge to about $4 billion from 2010 to 2012.[10]

Box 1: REDD+ Phased Approach

Phase 1: Readiness

Development of a national REDD-plus strategy, including:
- formation and operation of REDD+ "working groups";
- identification and prioritization of key policy and institutional capacity building measures (for both state and non-state actors);
- national cross-sectoral dialogue and stakeholder consultations to plan policies and measures (PAMs);
- procedures for free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) of indigenous peoples;
- preparation of proposals (e.g., FCPF readiness plan proposal) to access fast-start financing;
- updating national forest inventory;
- forest carbon stock research;
- identification of required protocols and planning for demonstration activities;
- initial capacity building and demonstration activities; and
- design of monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV) schemes to pave the way for investments in Phase 2.

Phase 2: Transformational Changes

Implementation of PAMs proposed in the national REDD+ strategies including:
- agreement on reference levels;
- improvements in MRV schemes;
- improvements in participation of indigenous peoples and local communities;
- scaled-up capacity building and demonstration activities; and
- performance-based payments on the basis of proxy indicators:
  (a) institutional strengthening, forest governance, and information;
  (b) activities in the forest sector such as land tenure reforms, forest management and restoration of degraded forest landscapes, community-based fire management, assisted natural regeneration, etc.;
  (c) activities outside the forest sector to reduce the pressure on forests (e.g., certified sustainable agriculture, sustainable wood energy supply chains, and agro-forestry).

Phase 3: Performance-Based Payments

Payment for performance on the basis of quantified forest emissions and removals against agreed reference levels. This may take the form of creditable or non-creditable payments.

Sources: Angelsen et al. 2009; Streck et al. 2009; IUCN 2009

8 Australia, France, Japan, Norway, United Kingdom, and United States

9 http://unfccc.int/files/methods_science/redd/application/pdf/key_note_address_norvege_en.pdf

10 Actual pledges are now at about $4.5 billion, but allocations data are incomplete for this amount. Under the interim global REDD+ Partnership, a financial "gap analysis" is under way to better define supply and demand.

The REDD+ Partnership is progressing, with financial pledges and membership growing (there are now 68 partners), and it held a workshop on 2 October in Tianjin to review its analytical program. Its work centers on compiling and disseminating more reliable information on REDD+ developments around the world. The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Facility Management Team (FMT) and the UN-REDD Programme Team (PT) are providing secretariat services to the REDD+ Partnership, supporting an agreed work program with five current elements: (i) creating a REDD+ Partnership website for compilation and dissemination of information (www.reddpluspartnership.org); (ii) establishing a Voluntary REDD+ Database, (iii) analyzing REDD+ financing gaps and overlaps; (iv) moderating a dialogue on the effectiveness of multilateral REDD+ institutions; and (v) assessing ways to improve lessons sharing on best practices, safeguards, MRV, and coordination.

The website and drafts of the database and "gaps analysis" are expected to be launched in the last quarter of 2010. Initiation of an independent study on improving the effectiveness of multilateral REDD+ institutions will take account of a similar analysis to be discussed at a joint meeting on 6 November 2010 of the governing bodies of FCPF, UN-REDD, the Forest Investment Program (FIP), and the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The study on developing and sharing lessons from REDD+ experience is being formulated. Reports on the database and "gaps analysis"—along with interim reports on multilateral mechanisms and lessons learned—may be released in December 2010 at a REDD+ Partnership side event in Cancun on the sidelines of COP-16.

Of the resources pledged, around 23% has been allocated to countries of Asia and the Pacific, through multilateral and bilateral arrangements. In the global context, the region is receiving funds roughly in proportion to the climate change mitigation potential of its developing countries.

The proportion of bilateral and multilateral financing sources is roughly the same: bilateral sources are currently contributing 55% of total REDD+ financing in the region, while multilateral sources provide 45% of total funds. Appendix 3 provides a breakdown of the estimated financing by country. Funds are mainly:

- pledged and allocated, but largely undisbursed (e.g., FCPF, UN-REDD, FIP), and/or
- pledged, but based on performance and results (e.g., third phase of the Indonesia-Norway Letter of Intent).

Funding appears to be going where it can have the greatest impact. Countries with high to moderate forest cover and high deforestation rates are set to be the recipients of the bulk of the support to date—around 72% of interim financing allocations for the region. Indonesia's allocation represents more than half of the regional total. The pledges and allocations are mainly in the form of grants and technical assistance as well as some concessional loans. Multilateral funds (see below) are allocating between 18% and 30% of their total globally available REDD+ funds to the region.

3.1.1 Multilateral REDD+ Support Mechanisms

As indicated above, several multilateral REDD+ support mechanisms have been created to help create the conditions needed to achieve REDD+ benefits. There are four main multilateral sources of support available to countries of Asia and the Pacific:

(i) Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF);
(ii) UN-REDD Programme (UN-REDD);
(iii) Forest Investment Program (FIP) of the Climate Investment Funds; and
(iv) Global Environment Facility Sustainable Forest Management and REDD+ Program (GEF-SFM/REDD+).

FCPF, administered by and implemented through the World Bank, is supporting a total of 37 countries around the world from its Readiness Fund. Of these, 8 countries are within Asia and the Pacific (Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Thailand, Vanuatu, and Viet Nam). FCPF has proposed to improve its support to these countries by engaging additional delivery partners, such as the regional development banks and specialized UN agencies. FCPF also expects to make a $200 million Carbon Fund operational to pilot test the sale of REDD+ emissions reduction credits in five pilot countries. As of August 2010, 18 of the 37 target countries have submitted Readiness Plan Proposals (R-PPs), of which 3 are from the Asia-Pacific region (Indonesia, Lao PDR, and Viet Nam).

UN-REDD is a joint undertaking of three specialized UN agencies (UNDP, FAO, and UNEP), and has chosen 3 of its 9 pilot countries from Asian or Pacific countries (Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, and Viet Nam). UN-REDD has since expanded support to include 7 additional partner countries from the region (Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Nepal, Philippines, Solomon Islands, and Sri Lanka), out of 18 partner countries worldwide. It is worth noting that all 3 UN-REDD pilot countries in the region also have allocations from the FCPF Readiness Fund, though UN-REDD financial allocations in Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and Viet Nam exceed those from the FCPF Readiness Fund.

FIP has selected 2 countries in the region as pilots—Indonesia and Lao PDR—out of 8 countries globally. FIP will support the REDD+ development efforts of these two pilot countries by designing and financing investments and leveraging additional financial resources, including funds from the private sector, to establish patterns of future investment that can draw upon forest carbon financing.

GEF-SFM/REDD+ is a program under the GEF-5 replenishment that builds on two pilot programs tested by GEF over the past four years covering a land use, land-use change, and forestry (LULUCF) objective under GEF's Climate Change Focal Area, and a cross-cutting Sustainable Forest Management program window (with a total investment of approximately $450 million during GEF-4). The GEF-SFM/REDD+ program (GEF 2010a) is open to all forested countries (GEF 2010b) that are willing to leverage contributions—on a 3:1 basis—from their GEF-5 allotments received under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR). GEF-SFM/REDD+ is not strictly a REDD+ program like the other support mechanisms described, given that it draws upon funding focused not only upon GHG emissions reduction but also addressing on biodiversity loss and land degradation.[11] Among the four multilateral mechanisms, GEF is the only one with universal coverage of developing countries in Asia and the Pacific. Since there are 10 multilateral organizations that are GEF agencies (including all those involved with FCPF, UN-REDD, and FIP), GEF projects and programs also potentially offer useful ways to bring these partners together in a blend of forest carbon conservation and other global benefits.

In response to calls for better coordination among the multilateral mechanisms, FCPF, UN-REDD, and FIP have increased their communications and collaboration. In April 2009, an action plan to this end was agreed by all three governing bodies of these multilateral mechanisms, entitled *Enhancing Cooperation and Coherence among REDD+ Institutions to Support REDD+ Efforts*. With GEF-SFM/REDD+ increasingly engaged as well, the intent is to establish a framework for coordinated support based on the comparative advantages of these mechanisms. Collaboration is also being furthered under the interim REDD+ Partnership established in Oslo in May 2010 and through ongoing UNFCCC negotiations. Progress will be reviewed at a joint meeting of the FIP Subcommittee, FCPF Participants Committee, and UN-REDD Policy Board on 6 November 2010 in Washington, DC.

11 To avail of this program, a country needs to dedicate a portion of their resources under two or more focal areas (biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation) toward forest activities. For every $3 that a country invests on forests from its STAR resources, $1 will be released from the REDD+ challenge account.

3.1.2 Bilateral Partners

Among the bilateral contributing countries, Norway is the largest globally, followed by Germany, the United States, Japan, and Australia. Australia and Japan's REDD+ fast-start funding is primarily targeted toward Asian and Pacific countries—especially Indonesia and Papua New Guinea—with portions also allocated to multilateral support mechanisms (which, in turn, will provide some of their support to the region).

Bilateral partnerships for REDD+ actions in Asia and the Pacific build on long experience with development cooperation. Members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) maintain active programs for support to developing countries of the region. OECD members from within the region, Australia, Japan, and Republic of Korea, provide a significant portion of their bilateral development funding to neighboring developing countries through their development assistance agencies and other avenues. This contributes to robust regional cooperation. Germany leverages its REDD+ support on its long-standing relations with selected countries for technical cooperation on sustainable forest management, largely through GTZ. Norway's bilateral REDD+ cooperation initiatives in the region draw upon NORAD's experience with country programs and regional level support such as that provided to RECOFTC.

3.1.3 In-Country Contributions

While only weakly recorded, most international support is complemented by local currency and in-kind contributions amounting to between 10% and 25% of a given project's costs. For example, contributions made to REDD+ efforts by Asian and Pacific developing countries have been reflected in the reports of Indonesia, Lao PDR, and Papua New Guinea to the Oslo Forest Climate Conference REDD+ Financing and Activities Survey. Taken together, these three countries are contributing $1.15 billion from their national funds (though mostly Indonesia, with $1.14 billion).

3.1.4 Voluntary Carbon Markets

There is growing interest in the application of REDD+ within the voluntary carbon market, though absolute levels of investments and credits remain small. In the absence of a regulated market and clear REDD+ policies at the national and global levels, this has been the main window open to REDD+ project developers. There has been a notable increase in the share of registered forestry projects at the Chicago Climate Exchange, from 1% of total projects in 2007 to 22% in 2008. Asia's share of the world's forest-based offsets in the voluntary carbon market is reported to be 6%, or $9.9 million (EMP and NCF, 2010).

3.1.5 Financing Challenges and Needs

While financing has generally been flowing to the countries with large remaining natural forests, there is no international financing within the fast-start period (2010– 2012) for REDD+ recorded for 4 of the 10 Asian or Pacific countries with forests under threat—Malaysia, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Timor-Leste (Tables 1 and 2; Appendices 1 and 3). As of October 2010, UN-REDD is supporting Sri Lanka, for networking, participation in regional workshops and knowledge sharing only. GEF-SFM/REDD+ funding could be allocated, if countries choose to use their GEF-5 funding for this purpose (GEF, 2010).

In the REDD+ Intergovernmental Task Force survey in 2010, two countries in Asia and the Pacific indicated unmet financial needs to commence early implementation of REDD+ activities, including development of a low-carbon strategy, demonstration actions, and performance-based payments. Indonesia reported that an additional $15 million would be needed from 2010–2012 ($10 million for REDD+ strategy implementation and capacity-building and $5 million for demonstration activities). Papua New Guinea estimated that it needed $40 million–$50 million from 2010–2015 to implement its national REDD+ strategy and build capacity, and $3.7 billion for performance-based payments from emissions reductions from 2011–2030. The report

does not indicate whether these figures are on top of the international financing already allocated for these countries, and updated figures should be available soon under the "gap analysis" being conducted under the auspices of the REDD+ Partnership. REDD+ countries have expressed the need for bilateral and multilateral partners to provide support not via piece-meal type arrangements but through nationally-driven strategies and funding mechanisms.

3.2 Status of National REDD+ Strategy Development

As indicated, there is no single source of information on the status of REDD+ actions in developing countries of the region. Creation of the new REDD+ Partnership website is a welcome development, though it must now be populated with information on REDD+ arrangements and actions. This paper's review is based primarily on submissions that countries have made under one or more of the multilateral REDD+ support mechanisms. It is thus heavily oriented to arrangements and actions associated with the REDD+ "readiness" phase.

The development of national REDD+ strategies is a core outcome of this phase, including measures which document a country's self-assessment of the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; define a process for agreeing on reference scenarios; develop and adopt a framework for strategy implementation; and devise and propose a monitoring, reporting, and verification system (WRI et al. 2010).

At least 13 countries in the region have initiated or are planning the preparation of national REDD+ strategies (Table 3 and Appendix 4), with projected or ongoing support from funding mechanisms. Of these, 7 have both high forest cover and a high rate of deforestation—covering 74% of the region's 206 million ha of forests under great threat. These 7 countries also manage 20% of the region's total forest cover. Their approaches and progress vary, and it would be helpful to carry out a more in-depth assessment of lessons to be learned from early experience. A brief review follows, and further inputs from all stakeholders are welcome to refine the content of this paper.

Southeast Asian nations have been proactive in developing REDD+ systems and capacity, with seven countries from the subregion having established (or establishing) national coordination bodies. Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, and the Philippines have coordination mechanisms focused solely on REDD+. Thailand and Viet Nam have opted to make REDD+ an important new responsibility of their forestry ministries. Among the top 10 forested developing countries under greatest threat, Indonesia was the first to enact REDD+ regulations, and (with support from a range of bilateral and multilateral partners) it is moving forward rapidly to rationalize its national policy—having just formed a Presidential Task Force on REDD+ Preparation. Despite the Philippines not having access to support from the multilateral REDD+ mechanisms, it has developed and affirmed a national REDD+ strategy. This is reflective of the urgency the country has placed on gaining access to REDD+ resources, with an anticipated emphasis on addressing forest degradation—given the country's low forest cover, high deforestation rate, and conditions conducive to rapid natural forest regeneration. Most Southeast Asian countries have enacted decentralization policies in recent years (Phelps et al. 2010), which may facilitate links between national and subnational REDD+ actions and capacity.

Among Pacific countries, Papua New Guinea (PNG) leads in the development of REDD+ mechanisms, and understandably so, given that it is home to a large portion of the subregion's forests. The Solomon Islands is losing its forests three times faster than PNG, and it has started to develop community-based REDD+ pilot activities. Solomon Islands became a UN-REDD partner country in February 2010, which may support national-level efforts to identify and address the drivers of deforestation and build the country's REDD+ strategy. Vanuatu is also working on its national REDD+ strategy, in

its case with FCPF support. Given the social and cultural setting of the Federated States of Micronesia, which is home to the vast majority of Pacific forests, there is a strong emphasis on community ownership and management of land and forests.

In South Asia, Nepal has perhaps been the most active in its REDD+ readiness planning, being one of the first in the region to have, in June 2010, its readiness plan proposal (R-PP) assessed by FCPF. Nepal has also recently become a partner country of UN-REDD, along with Sri Lanka. Both countries are experiencing high rates of deforestation, though Sri Lanka has only half the area of forest. Inclusion of Nepal and Sri Lanka under UN-REDD holds the potential to spur cross-country learning and generate lessons of interest to the wider South Asia subregion.

National REDD+ strategies and country-level responses vary considerably in their emphasis—including whether they pay closest attention to avoided deforestation, degraded forests management, afforestation, reforestation, or other "plus" elements. Private sector interest in developing REDD+ pilots was highest immediately after issuance of the Bali Action Plan, with private banks, conservation entrepreneurs (so-called "carbon cowboys"), and government entities initiating projects. The organization and scope of pilots has varied, from the level of district governments to centrally issued forest concessions and provincial governments. Some have sought to align themselves with voluntary carbon market standards, but no systematic assessment of lessons has yet been conducted of the emerging experience in the region.

Most public sector REDD+ efforts center on readiness work, though there are early experiments with organizing and generating financing. This follows directly from the emphasis given under the major support mechanisms such as FCPF. In some countries there has been a proliferation of REDD+ pilot projects, many of which are only weakly sanctioned or related to national REDD+ strategies. The approaches being taken to REDD+ strategies reflect contrasting national and subnational conditions.

While there are some limited developments at the subnational level, most arrangements and actions are being organized either at the national or pilot project levels. Still, there are subnational actions being taken—sometimes quite independent of national REDD+ strategies. Several Asian and Pacific governors—including those representing Aceh and Papua Provinces in Indonesia—have attended the annual climate change conference sponsored by California's governor, Arnold Schwarzenegger, which encourages discussion of subnational climate action. ADB sponsored an Asian Green Governors Roundtable in November 2009 on the sidelines of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meetings in Singapore. Six governors or vice governors—from Indonesia, Philippines, and Lao PDR—exchanged information on their pilot REDD+ projects and perspectives on links between national and subnational REDD+ strategies and actions. They also took the opportunity to urge the APEC leaders, the international development community, and Parties to the UNFCCC to act on the REDD+ concept so that it may yield tangible local and global benefits.

Table 3. Preliminary Assessment of Asian and Pacific REDD+ Strategy Development

Country * (categorized according to forest context, Table 1)	FCPF	UN-REDD	FIP	REDD+ Coordination Mechanism established?	REDD+ Strategy Development in process?	Linking to a national climate change strategy?
High-Moderate Forest, High Deforestation						
Indonesia	+	+	+	+	+	+
Myanmar				…	…	…
Papua New Guinea	+	+		+	+	+
Malaysia				+	+	+
Lao PDR	+		+	+	+	+
Cambodia	+	+		+	+	+
Nepal	+	o		+	+	…
Solomon Islands		+		…	…	…
Sri Lanka		o		…	…	…
Timor-Leste				…	…	…
Low Forest, High Deforestation						
Philippines		+		+	+	+
High-Moderate Forest, Low Deforestation						
Thailand	+			+	+	+
Viet Nam	+	+		+	+	+
Bhutan		o		…	…	…
Vanuatu	+			…	…	…
Low Forest, Low Deforestation						
China, People's Rep. of **				…	…	+
India				…	…	+
Bangladesh		o		…	…	…

* - Countries included here are the ten Asia-Pacific countries categorized in the 'high-moderate forest, high deforestation' category (Table 1), and all countries receiving support from FCPF, UN-REDD and FIP. China and India are also included because of their large forest areas.
** - PRC is considering establishing a domestic market for REDD+ credits.
+ - Countries with national program funding allocations; see Appendix Tables 3 and 4 for details
o - UN-REDD partner/observer countries, as differentiated from UN-REDD pilot countries marked with a +
… - No data available

Development of systems for monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV) is a key consideration in REDD+ efforts across the region, but no analysis of alternative approaches to MRV has yet been conducted. Although there are obvious data collection and management needs—relating to forest carbon stocks, establishment of reference emission levels, leakage, etc.—the MRV approach remains highly dependent upon guidance still emerging from the UNFCCC process. Relative to physical aspects, it appears that less attention is being given to the accounting of governance systems, financial flows (tied to benefits sharing) and other non-tangible aspects of MRV. There is little evidence that third party verification has been explored much in the region, apart from several pilot projects having applied for certification under voluntary carbon market standards.

This is a part of wider governance considerations across the region. The variety of conditions means that approaches to ensuring good REDD+ governance varies

considerably. The greatest attention is being given to building adequate capacity of government institutions to manage REDD+ policies and programs. In some countries, concerns are high over illegal logging and forest law enforcement predominates. In others, issues of indigenous peoples engagement and rights is a key concern, though it may not yet be receiving systematic attention. Environmental and social safeguard systems exist in all countries, but there are questions as to their applicability and adequacy with respect to REDD+ actions.

Beyond the national level, there is increasing attention to REDD+ opportunities among the leading regional bodies in Asia and the Pacific. This may offer important opportunities for moving towards shared visions and agreements at the regional and global levels—covering information exchange, identification of drivers of deforestation, transboundary forest management, and other issues. Several subregional organizations have generated declarations and plans to cope with impacts of climate change, as well as three landscape-level initiatives for transboundary management of natural resources.

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has crafted the "Multi-Sectoral Framework on Climate Change: Agriculture and Forestry towards Food Security" (AFCC-FS) that builds on its economic, socio-cultural, and political security blueprints as well as the "ASEAN Integration Strategic Framework." Both touch on REDD+ opportunities, and the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity is an active partner. Knowledge networks on forests and climate change, social forestry, and forest law enforcement and governance are operating to inform member states about opportunities and challenges in the forest sector. An ASEAN Forest Clearing House Mechanism provides online policy briefs on key issues.

In the Pacific, the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) manages a dialogue on the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change: 2006–2015, which includes attention to deforestation's impacts on global and regional GHG emissions. The Pacific Islands Forum (PIF) passed the Niue Declaration on Climate Change (2008) to express concern over human security impacts of climate change in the subregion and call for outside assistance. It also has the Regional Forestry Programme that assists in strengthening nationwide programmes for sustainable land use and forest management (Vickers et al., 2010).

The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) launched its Action Plan on Climate Change in 2008, in part to communicate the concerns of member states to the UNFCCC negotiation process. The plan encourages regional cooperation and South-South support in identifying and creating opportunities for climate change mitigation and adaptation activities. The South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme (SACEP) is a parallel forum that monitors impacts of climate change on flora in the subregion, especially forests.

Transboundary impacts of potential climate change scenarios, and also of responses, call for a coordinated framework, strategy, and mechanism among countries sharing borders or ecosystem services, especially from watersheds. The Heart of Borneo Initiative (HoB), the Greater Mekong Subregion Biodiversity Conservation Corridors Initiative (GMS BCI), and the Mountain Alliance Initiative for Climate Change (MAICC) are some examples of landscape level collaboration among neighboring countries.

4. REDD+ in Asia and the Pacific: Summing Up

The Asia and Pacific region can significantly reduce its GHG emissions by implementing the REDD+ approach, with Southeast Asia offering the greatest potential reductions. Such actions should generate considerable REDD+ financing and be accompanied by a range of high-value co-benefits—including maintaining rainforest storehouses of biodiversity as well as protecting watershed and sociocultural benefits. The 10 countries with highest REDD+ potential would generate $2.8 billion in emissions reduction credits from 2015 to 2020 from a 50% reduction in the rate of deforestation if there were a market paying $5 per ton of CO_2.

There is considerable REDD+ preparatory action under way in these countries, with at least 13 countries at some stage of developing a national REDD+ strategy. While no systematic analysis has yet been conducted of these emerging strategies, they vary considerably in their scope and approach—including the extent to which they emphasize avoided deforestation, versus degraded forests management versus afforestation, reforestation, and other "plus" elements. The majority of public sector REDD+ efforts center on readiness work, though there are early experiments with organizing and generating financing. In some countries there has been a proliferation of REDD+ pilot projects, sometimes weakly sanctioned or related to national REDD+ strategies. While there are some limited developments at the subnational level, most arrangements and actions are being organized either at the national or pilot project levels.

Most of the countries that are actively involved in REDD+ preparations are receiving support from one or several available multilateral and bilateral REDD+ support mechanisms. FCPF, UN-REDD, FIP, and GEF-SFM/REDD+ are all active in the region. Coordination and integration among these mechanisms is improving—especially at the global and regional levels—though this requires further effort. Likewise, many bilateral partners are supporting REDD+ work, again reflecting a mixed record of coordination and integration with other support mechanisms.

Considerable funding is being made available, with the majority flowing to countries with the largest and most threatened forests. Indonesia has generated the highest levels of funding, but many other countries are well positioned to attract significant phase 2 and phase 3 REDD+ financing.

Private sector interest in developing REDD+ pilots was very high following the issuance of the Bali Action Plan, with private banks, conservation entrepreneurs, and government entities initiating projects. The organization and scope of pilots has varied. Some have sought to align themselves with voluntary carbon market standards, but no systematic assessment of lessons has yet been conducted of this emerging experience in the region.

The development of MRV systems is a consideration in REDD+ efforts across the region, but no analysis of alternative approaches to MRV has yet been conducted. Although there are obvious data collection and management needs—relating to forest carbon stocks, establishment of reference emission levels, leakage, etc.—the MRV approach remains highly dependent upon guidance still emerging from the UNFCCC

process. There appears to be less attention given to the accounting of governance systems, financial flows, and other less-tangible aspects of MRV. There is little evidence that third- party verification has been explored much in the region, apart from several pilot projects having applied for voluntary carbon market certification.

The region's diversity is also reflected in the wide range of approaches to ensuring good REDD+ governance. Attention to building adequate government capacity to manage REDD+ policies and programs is high. Concern over illegal logging and forest law enforcement is an issue in some countries. In others, indigenous peoples' engagement and rights are a key concern. The adequacy of existing environmental and social safeguard systems to REDD+ actions is under evaluation.

There is a need for improved coordination among multilateral and bilateral support mechanisms. Emergence of the REDD+ Partnership holds considerable potential for furthering this objective. There is a need for better communication and exchange of best practices. While the REDD+ Partnership can help at the global level, there may be a need for similar or related mechanisms at the regional level to allow for sharing and learning across Asia and the Pacific.

References

ADB, UNESCAP, and UNDP. 2010. Paths to 2015 MDG Priorities in Asia and the Pacific: Asia-Pacific MDG Report 2010/11. www.adb.org/Documents/Reports/Asia-Pacific-MDG-2010/default.asp

ADB. 2007. Mid-term Review of the Greater Mekong Subregion Strategic Framework (2002–2012). www.adb.org/documents/reports/mid-term-review-gms/default.asp

ADB. 2008. Rural Development Outcomes and Drivers: An Overview and Some Lessons. www.adb.org/Documents/Books/Rural-Development-Outcomes-Drivers/default.asp

ADB. 2009. The Economics of Climate Change in Southeast Asia: A Regional Review. Mandaluyong City, Philippines: Asian Development Bank.

AFN. 2009. Where is the Future of Cultures and Forests?: Indigenous Peoples and Forest Management in 2020 (APFSOS II-WP-2009–23). Bangkok: FAO-RAP. www.fao.org/world/regional/rap/APFSOS/APFSOS.html

Angelsen, Arild , Sandra Brown, Cyril Loisel, Leo Peskett, Charlotte Streck, and Daniel Zarin. 2009. Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD): An Options Assessment Report, prepared for the Government of Norway, March 2009. Meridian Institute. www.redd-oar.org/links/REDD-OAR_en.pdf

Bilingualism and Multilingualism - Language Diversity - Languages, Percent, World, Speakers, Population, and Spoken. http://science.jrank.org/pages/8450/Bilingualism-Multilingualism-Language-Diversity.html#ixzz0zfxiilmm

Bond, Ivan, Maryanne Grieg-Gran, Sheila Wertz-Kanounnikoff, Peter Hazlewood, Sven Wunder, Arild Angelsen. 2009. Incentives to sustain forest ecosystem services: A review and lessons for REDD. Natural Resouce Issues No. 16. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), London, UK, with CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia, and World Resources Institute, Washington, USA.

Demonstration Activities submitted to the UNFCCC website http://unfccc.int/methods_science/redd/demonstration_activities/items/4536.php

Durst, Patrick, Chris Brown, Jeremy Broadhead, Regan Suzuki, Robin Leslie, and Akiko Inoguchi (eds). 2008. Reinventing Forestry Agencies: Experiences of institutional restructuring in Asia-Pacific, RAP Publication 2008/05, Bangkok, Thailand: FAO-RAP.

Ecosystem Marketplace (EMP) and New Carbon Finance (NCF). 2010. Fortifying the Foundation: State of the Voluntary Carbon Markets 2009.

FAO. 2009. State of the World's Forests 2009. Rome, Italy: FAO.

FCPF Dashboard. www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/node/283 as of 10 August 2010.

GEF. 2010a. Investment Guidelines for GEF's Sustainable Forest Management and REDD-Plus Program. GEF Council Meeting, 29 June–1 July 2010, Washington DC (GEF/C.38/Inf.4/Rev.2).

GEF. 2010b. GEF-5 Initial STAR Allocations. GEF Council Meeting, 29 June–1 July 2010, Washington DC (GEF/C.38/Inf.8/Rev.1).

IUCN. 2009. Operational Framework for REDD action with specific reference to means of implementation and finance, Position Paper presented at the UNFCCC Climate Change Talks, 28 Sep–9 Oct 2009, Bangkok, Thailand.

IUCN. no date. Gender equality within the REDD and REDD-plus framework. www.generoyambiente.org/arcangel2/documentos/500.pdf

Norway Office of the Prime Minister. 2010. Norway and Indonesia in partnership to reduce emissions from deforestation (Press release 26.05.2010, No.: 66/10). www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/smk/press-center/Press-releases/2010/Norway-and-Indonesia-in-partnership-to-reduce-emissions-from-deforestation.html?id=605709

Phelps, Jacob, Edward Webb, and Arun Agrawal. 2010. Does REDD+ Threaten to Recentralize Forest Governance? In Science Vol 328 16 April 2010. www.sciencemag.org.

Poffenberger, Mark, Rowena Soriaga, and Peter Walpole. 2006. Communities and Forest Stewardship in Southeast Asia. Bohol: Asia Forest Network.

RRI. 2010. The End of the Hinterland: Forests, Conflict and Climate Change. www.rightsandresources.org/documents/files/doc_1400.pdf

Sohngen, Brent and Roger Sedjo. 2006. "Carbon Sequestration Costs in Global Forests." Energy Journal Special Issue: 109–126.

Soriaga, Rowena and Benjamin Cashore. 2009. Role, Contribution and Effectiveness of Local Government in Forest Law Enforcement and Governance in ASEAN (ASEAN Regional Network on Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (ARKN-FLEG) Policy Paper). Jakarta: ASEAN-German Regional Forest Program.

Streck, Charlotte , Luis Gomez-Echeverri, Pablo Gutman, Cyriel Loisel, and Jacob Werksman. 2009. REDD+ Institutional Options Assessment Developing an Efficient, Effective, and Equitable Institutional Framework for REDD+ under the UNFCCC, September 2009. Meridian Institute.

Sundawati, Leti, Soni Trison, and Sri Wilarso Budi R. 2010. Proceedings of the International Workshop on AKECOP Forum on REDD in ASEAN Region: Strengthening the Enabling Conditions for REDD Implementation in ASEAN, 14–15 October 2009, Bogor, Indonesia. Seoul, Korea and Bogor, Indonesia: ASEAN-Korea Environmental Cooperation Unit - Seoul National University and Faculty of Forestry—Bogor Agricultural University.

Synthesis Report: REDD+ Financing and Activities Survey, 27 May 2010, prepared by an intergovernmental taskforce composed of Australia, France, and Papua New Guinea, and released during the Oslo Climate Conference,

Umemiya, Chisa. Ewald Rametsteiner, and Florian Kraxner. 2010. Quantifying the impacts of the quality of governance on deforestation. In Environmental Science and Policy. doi:101016/j.envsci.2010.07.002. www.sciencedirect.com

UNFCCC. 2007. Bali Action Plan.

UN-REDD Newsletter 11. August 2010. www.un-redd.org/Newsletter11/tabid/5305/Default.aspx. Vickers B, Kant P, Lasco R, Bleaney A, Milne S, Suzuki R, Ramos L, Pohnan E, 2010; "Analysis of Forests and Climate Change in the Asia-Pacific Region", Forests and Climate Change *Working Paper* 7, FAO, Rome

Wertz-Kanounnikoff, Sheila and Metta Kongphan-Apirak. 2009. Emerging REDD+: A preliminary survey of demonstration and readiness activities (Working Paper 46). Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.

Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN). 2010. Brief Report on the Workshop on Gender in Climate Change and REDD+, 13–14 August 2010, Kathmandu, Nepal.

World Resources Institute, Global Witness, UN-REDD, and Chathtam House. 2010. Taking Stock of Governance in Readiness Proposals Submitted to the FCPF and UN-REDD Programme. Presentation by Crystal Davis at Monitoring Governance Safeguards in REDD+ Expert Workshop, 24–25 May 2010, Chatham House, London.

Yasmi, Yurdi, Lisa Kelley, and Thomas Enters. 2010. Conflict over forests and land in Asia: Impacts, causes and management.

Appendix 1

Appendix Table 1. Forest Cover Context in Asian and Pacific Countries

Country	Forest Extent 2005 1000 ha	Annual Forest Cover Change 2000–2005 (%)	High / Low Deforestation Country (high ≤ –0.5%; low > –0.5%)	Land Area with Forests 2000–2005 (%)	High-Moderate / Low Forest Country (high ≥ 25%; low < 25%)	Category
Afghanistan	867	–3.1	high	1.3	low	high, low
Armenia	283	–1.5	high	10	low	high, low
Australia	163,678	–0.1	low	21.3	low	low, low
Azerbaijan	936	0	low	11.3	low	low, low
Bangladesh	871	–0.3	low	6.7	low	low, low
Bhutan	3,195	0.3	low	68	high-mod	low, high
Brunei Darussalam	278	–0.7	high	52.8	high-mod	high, high
Cambodia	10,447	–2	high	59.2	high-mod	high, high
China, People's Republic of	197,290	2.2	low	21.2	low	low, low
Cook Islands	16	0	low	66.5	high-mod	low, high
Fiji Islands	1,000	0	low	54.7	high-mod	low, high
Georgia	2,760	0	low	39.7	high-mod	low, high
India	67,701	0	low	22.8	low	low, low
Indonesia	88,495	–2	high	48.8	high-mod	high, high
Japan	24,868	0	low	68.2	high-mod	low, high
Kazakhstan	3,337	–0.2	low	1.2	low	low, low
Kiribati	2	0	low	3	low	low, low
Korea, Republic of	6,265	–0.1	low	63.5	high-mod	low, high
Kyrgyz Republic	869	0.3	low	4.5	low	low, low
Lao People's Democratic Republic	16,142	–0.5	high	69.9	high-mod	high, high
Malaysia	20,890	–0.7	high	63.6	high-mod	high, high
Maldives	1	0	low	3	low	low, low
Marshall Islands,		–	low	–	low	low, low
Micronesia, Federated States of	63	0	low	90.6	high-mod	low, high
Mongolia	10,252	–0.8	high	6.5	low	high, low
Myanmar	32,222	–1.4	high	49	high-mod	high, high
Nauru	0	0	low	0	low	low, low
Nepal	3,636	–1.4	high	25.4	high-mod	high, high
New Zealand	8,309	0.2	low	31	high-mod	low, high
Pakistan	1,902	–2.1	high	2.5	low	high, low
Palau	40	0.4	low	87.6	high-mod	low, high
Papua New Guinea	29,437	–0.5	high	65	high-mod	high, high
Philippines	7,162	–2.1	high	24	low	high, low

continued.

Appendix Table 1 continued.

Country	**Forest Extent** 2005 1000 ha	**Annual Forest Cover Change** 2000–2005 (%)	**High / Low Deforestation Country** (high ≤ –0.5%; low > –0.5%)	**Land Area with Forests** 2000–2005 (%)	**High-Moderate / Low Forest Country** (high ≥ 25%; low < 25%)	**Category**
Samoa	171	0	low	60.4	high-mod	low, high
Singapore	2	0	low	3.4	low	low, low
Solomon Islands	2,172	–1.7	high	77.6	high-mod	high, high
Sri Lanka	1,933	–1.5	high	29.9	high-mod	high, high
Tajikistan	410	0	low	2.9	low	low, low
Thailand	14,520	–0.4	low	28.4	high-mod	low, high
Timor-Leste	798	–1.3	high	53.7	high-mod	high, high
Tonga	4	0	low	5	low	low, low
Turkmenistan	4,127	0	low	8.8	low	low, low
Tuvalu	1	0	low	33.3	high-mod	low, high
Uzbekistan	3,295	0.5	low	8	low	low, low
Vanuatu	440	0	low	36.1	high-mod	low, high
Viet Nam	12,931	2	low	39.7	high-mod	low, high
Total Asia and the Pacific	744,018					

Source: FAO State of the World's Forests 2009, using data from the FAO Global Forest Resource Assessment 2005

Appendix 2

Appendix Table 2. Estimated Market for Avoided Deforestation in Selected Asia and Pacific Countries

Country (ranked according to forest extent)	Forest Extent 2005 1,000 ha	Annual Forest Cover Change 2000–2005 (%)	Extent of Deforestation Per Year 2000–2005 1000 ha/yr	Forest Carbon in Biomass 2005 tonnes/ha	50% Avoided Deforestation		
					50% Avoided Deforestation 2015–2020 1,000 ha/yr	Carbon Value from 50% Avoided Deforestation 2015–2020 million tCO_2e in 5 years	Monetary Value at US$5 Per tCO_2e 2015–2020 million US$
	FAO 2005	FAO 2005	FAO 2005	FAO 2005			
	(a)	(b)	(c)=(a)*(b)	(d)	(e)=(c)*0.50	(f)=(d)*(e)*5yrs	(g)=(f)*$5
Indonesia	88,495	–2.0	–1769.9	67	–884.95	296.46	1,482.29
Myanmar	32,222	–1.4	–451.1	98	–225.55	110.52	552.61
Papua New Guinea	29,437	–0.5	–147.2	–	–73.59	–	–
Malaysia	20,890	–0.7	–146.2	168	–73.12	61.42	307.08
Lao PDR	16,142	–0.5	–80.7	92	–40.36	18.56	92.82
Cambodia	10,447	–2.0	–208.9	121	–104.47	63.20	316.02
Nepal	3,636	–1.4	–50.9	133	–25.45	16.93	84.63
Solomon Islands	2,172	–1.7	–36.9	–	–18.46	–	–
Sri Lanka	1,933	–1.5	–29.0	21	–14.50	1.52	7.61
Timor-Leste	798	–1.3	–10.4	–	–5.19	–	–
Total							2,843.06

Appendix 3

Appendix Table 3. Estimated 2010-2012 Financing for Asian and Pacific countries in High-Moderate Forest and High Deforestation Category and/or Receiving REDD+ Support (in million US$)

	MULTILATERAL				BILATERAL									Total per Country	In-Country Contribution
	FCPF - RF	UN-REDD	CIF-FIP	GEF SFM/ REDD+	Australia	Finland	Germany	Japan	Norway	Sweden	UK	US	Others		
Global allocation [1]/	101.80	86.32	542.00	1,000.00	100.20	40.09	460.00	163.00	1,036.00	63.00	54.00	204.00	345.40	4,195.81	
Technical Notes	[2]/	[3]/	[4]/	[5]/	[6]/	[7]/	[8]/	[9]/	[10]/	[11]/	[12]/	[13]/	[14]/	[15]/	
Country															
Azerbaijan				5.10			0.29							5.39	
Bangladesh		0.72		5.62										6.34	
Bhutan		0.72		1.50										2.22	
Cambodia	3.60	3.72		3.24				8.00						18.56	
China, People's Republic of				80.56			1.51	1.00						83.07	
India				53.14			0.29	47.00						100.43	
Indonesia	3.60	5.64	70.00	39.07	45.70	5.12	55.75	9.00	200.00		19.00	75.00		527.88	1,140.00
Lao PDR	3.60		30.00	4.83		0.20	17.24	14.00		0.10				69.97	1.20
Malaysia				13.47										13.47	
Myanmar				6.82										6.82	
Nepal	3.60	0.72		3.68		7.11		5.00						20.11	
Papua New Guinea	3.60	6.39		7.33	3.00		6.90							27.22	4.29
Philippines		1.22		15.92			3.88							21.02	
Solomon Islands		1.27		2.78										4.05	
Sri Lanka		0.72		5.63										6.35	
Thailand	3.60			14.06										17.66	
Timor-Leste				1.47										1.47	
Vanuatu	3.60			1.81										5.41	
Viet Nam	3.60	4.39		12.23		6.11								26.32	
Asia and the Pacific per Fund Source	28.80	25.52	100.00	278.26	48.70	18.54	85.86	84.00	200.00	0.10	19.00	75.00	na	963.78	1,145.49
% Asia and the Pacific to Global Allocation	28%	30%	18%	28%	49%	46%	19%	52%	19%	-	35%	na	na	23%	

Total per Fund Source		
Multilateral Sources	432.58	45%
Bilateral Sources	531.20	55%
Total for Asia and the Pacific (including GEF)	**963.78**	**100%**

Total per Forest Context		
High Deforestation-High Forest % to Land	695.91	72%
High Deforestation-Low Forest% to Land	21.02	2%
Low Deforestation-High Forest % to Land	51.61	5%
Low Deforestation-Low Forest % to Land	195.23	20%
Total for Asia and the Pacific (excluding GEF)	**963.78**	**100%**

TECHNICAL NOTES

Data Sources:

(a) Figures mainly come from the Synthesis Report: REDD+ Financing and Activities Survey, 27 May 2010, prepared by an intergovernmental task force and released during the Oslo Climate Conference. The report and country annexes may be found in www.oslocfc2010.no/documentslinks.cfm.

(b) Figures per country are based on reports of contributing countries, reports of recipient countries, websites of multilateral fund sources (FCPF, UN-REDD, CIF-FIP, and GEF) and other web resources monitoring climate financing (www.faststartfinance.org, www.climatefunds.org, and WRI Summary of Climate Finance Pledges as of Feb 2010)

(c) USD 1.00 is equivalent to EUR: 1.43686

Footnotes:

[1]/ **Global allocations** are based on reports on 2010–2012 interim financing commitments of each fund source included in the Synthesis Report: REDD+ Financing and Activities Survey, 27 May 2010, prepared by an intergovernmental task force (composed of Australia, France, and Papua New Guinea).

[2]/ **FCPF** total financing for 2010–2012 is $173.8 million ($101.8 for the Readiness Fund and $72 million for Carbon Finance). FCPF total allocation in this table represents only the Readiness Fund that allocates $3.6 million per country (including a $200,00 grant to support formulation of the Readiness Preparation Proposal).

[3]/ **UN-REDD Program Funding Framework** as of 1 Oct 2010 reports that pledges have reached $112 million from 3 donors, of which $86 million or 76% have already been received by UN-REDD, mostly from Norway. A further $7.4 million ($6 million from Denmark; $1.4 million from Spain) is to be confirmed during the 5th policy Board Meeting in Nov 2010, along with new direct national program allocations for Cambodia ($3 million), Solomon Islands ($0.55 million), and Philippines ($0.50 million).
Seven UN-REDD partner countries in the region (Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Nepal, Philippines, Solomon Islands, and Sri Lanka) receive support through the $13 million allocation for the Global Programme. Figures for these countries assume that each of the 18 partner countries worldwide receive equal allocations ($0.72 million) from the Global Programme.

[4]/ **CIF-FIP** support to Asian countries is indicative only. FIP has not yet indicated specific country allocations.

[5]/ **GEF-5**, under its System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR), allocated $2.38 billion to 144 countries for climate change, biodiversity, and land degradation, of which 36 are Asian and Pacific countries . Further, a funding envelope of $250 million is projected to operate as a REDD+ challenge account, based on rules in the GEF investment guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management and REDD+ Program (SFM/REDD+), projected to leverage up to $ 1 billion in financing for REDD+. For every $3 of investment from STAR resources for two or more focal areas (climate change, biodiversity, and land degradation) allocated to a particular country, $1 will be released from the REDD+ challenge account. Country figures are only indicative, based on the following assumptions: (a) one-third of combined STAR resources will be invested on REDD+ and (b) qualification guidelines will apply (i.e,. for a country to qualify for incentives under the REDD+ challenge account, it has to invest a minimum of $2 million, while countries investing more than $30 million can only claim a maximum of $10 million from the challenge account).

[6]/ **Australia** pledged $251.2 million over six years (2008–2013), of which $120 million is allocated as REDD+ fast-start contribution. Commitments for 2010–2012 of $100.20 million represents bilateral financing of $48.1 million, as well as financing under Australia's global programs (excluding multilateral contributions).

[7]/ **Finland** pledged $21 million, but the country report breakdown showed an allocation of EUR 51.2 million ($73.56 million) for 2009–2014, of which EUR 23.3 million ($33.48 million) represents multilateral contributions. Total allocation of $40.09 million includes regional and bilateral allocations. Country figures represent only those covering 2010–2012.

[8]/ **Germany** allocated $503 million for 2010–2012 ($43 million under multilateral and $460 million under bilateral financing). Country figures represent bilateral commitments to ongoing REDD-related project activities under bilateral development cooperation and the German International Climate Initiative (ICI). Projects mostly started in 2008 and 2009, but a large portion will be disbursed from 2010–2012.

[9]/ **Japan** pledged $500 million for 2010–2012, of which $163 million is under bilateral financing through grants, technical assistance, and loans. No commitment for 2010–2012 was reported under multilateral financing, but the earlier period (up to 2010) reported financing of $1,645 million (GEF $1,556 million, ITTO $79 million, FCPF-RF $10 million)

[10]/ **Norway** pledged $1,000 million for REDD+ fast-start financing in Oslo, with a significant portion for results-based payments. Total allocation of $1,036 million was estimated based on figures from the REDD+ survey by the intergovernmental task force and from the Table on Financing Allocation from the Norwegian Office of the Prime Minister website updated as of 30 July 2010. Indonesia is allocated up to $1,000 million, consisting of a $200 million initial grant to assist in readiness activities, with the balance of $800 million for disbursement under a performance-based payment scheme.

[11]/ **Sweden's** contribution is based on Section 2 (Cooperation on REDD+) and the Power Point presentation of the REDD+ Survey Synthesis report. As the Sweden country report is not available, the figure reported under Lao PDR is based on the Lao PDR country report. Sweden is not a contributing country to the multilateral financing mechanisms.

[12]/ **United Kingdom's** indicative allocation for 2010–2012 is GBP 152 million, including multilateral contributions of GBP 98 million to FCPF and CIF-FIP. The UK figure of $54 million for bilateral financing represents allocations for the Congo Basin Fund and bilateral arrangement with Indonesia.

[13]/ **United States** pledged $1,000 million for REDD+. The country report states that at least $314 million has been allocated ($110 million multilateral financing under FCPF and FIP, $204 million as bilateral financing). Indonesia's allocation is only indicative. Specific country allocations are not yet available.

[14]/ **Others** represent global allocations for fast-start bilateral financing from countries that have not indicated specific country allocations for Asia and the Pacific: France $200 million (pledge was $330 million), Netherlands $95 million, and Spain $27.1 million. France and Netherlands contribute to FCPF, Spain contributes to FCPF and UN-REDD. Denmark allocated $16.50 million for 2010–2012, of which $13.2 million represents multilateral contributions. The Denmark report mentions bilateral financing for Cambodia for 2010–2012 but figures have not yet been determined.

[15]/ **Total** pledges for REDD+ fast-start financing as of the Oslo Climate and Forest Conference in May 2010 is $4 billion, up from $3.5 billion announced at the UNFCCC COP15 in Copenhagen in December 2009.

Appendix 4

Appendix Table 4. Status of National REDD+ Strategy Development in Selected Asian and Pacific Countries as of October 2010

Country	REDD+ Strategy Reference Documents	Coordinating / Relevant Agencies for REDD+ Strategy	Cooperating Non-State Institutions	Broader Climate Change Strategies and/or Coordination Mechanisms
Bangladesh	-BCCSAP recommends to study the scope for carbon credits under REDD -active representation in UNFCCC CoPs and AWG meetings on REDD+	Ministry of Environment and Forests led the development of BCCSAP. Climate Change Secretariat to be set up in MoEF to support the National Steering Committee on Climate Change and will work with climate change cells in all ministries.	Programmes funded under the Action Plan will be implemented by line ministries and agencies, with participation, as appropriate, of civil society, professional and research bodies and private sector.	Bangladesh Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan 2008 (BCCSAP) National Steering Committee on Climate Change chaired by Special Assistant to the Chief Adviser and comprises the Secretaries of all climate-affected Ministries and Divisions
Bhutan	-joined UN-REDD as observer country in 2010	Watershed Management Division, Department of Forests and Park Services (DoFPS), Ministry of Agriculture and Forests	...	...
Cambodia	REDD+ Background Document (v1.5, 15Aug 2010) REDD+ Roadmap (Readiness Plan Proposal, draft v3.1, 4Oct2010)	REDD+ Taskforce composed of: Forest Administration (FA)-MAFF* Gen. Dept. of Administration for Nature Conservation and Protection (GDANCP), MoE Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction (MLMUPC) Fisheries Administration (FiA)-MAFF Ministry of Economy and Finance (MEF) Ministry of Interior (MoI) Ministry of Rural Development (MRD) Taskforce has 4 technical teams: consultation and safeguards; benefit-sharing; demonstration; MRV/REL Proposed arrangements for sectoral implementation and coordination through 3 Technical Working Groups: Forestry and Environment (TWG F and E) under FA; Fisheries under FiA; Environment and Climate Change under GDANCP	Development partners: AFD, Danida, DFID, NZAid, JICA, FAO, UNDP, USAID, WB Civil Society and NGOs: e.g., Clinton Climate Initiative, Wildlife Conservation Society, Winrock, Terra Global Capital, Community Forestry International, Buddhist Monks Association Children's Development Association	National Climate Change Committee (NCCC) composed of: Ministry of Environment- Climate Change Office * and 18 other ministries, including 3 Ministry Co-chairs: (i) Industry, Mines and Energy; (ii) Water Resources and Meteorology; and (iii) Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
China, People's Rep. of	...	...	...	National Climate Change Programme (2007); China Green Carbon Fund (2007)

continued.

Appendix Table 4 continued.

Country	REDD+ Strategy Reference Documents	Coordinating / Relevant Agencies for REDD+ Strategy	Cooperating Non-State Institutions	Broader Climate Change Strategies and/or Coordination Mechanisms
India	...	...	...	National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC) Prime Minister's Council on Climate Change (PMCCC)
Indonesia	Readiness Preparation Proposal; Readiness Strategy (2009–2012) REDD-related Regulations and Decisions: Procedures for Granting Utilization of Carbon Sequestration or Sinks in Production and Protected Forest (36/2009) Procedures for REDD (30/2009) Regulation on REDD Demonstration Activities (68/2008) Presidential Instruction on Revitalization and Rehabilitation of Sustainable Peat Land (2/2007) Presidential Instruction on Illegal Logging (4/2005) Government Regulation on Environmental Damage Control and or Environmental Pollution Related with Forest and Land Fire (4/2001)	National Working Group on REDD, composed of representatives from Ministries of: -Forestry -Environment -Foreign Affairs -National Development Planning -Agriculture -Home Affairs -Trade -Public Works -Finance -Mining and Mineral Resources -Economic National Land Use Agency -National Commission on Climate Change (NCCC) - Local Governments where REDD activities are located Representative from Civil Societies Indonesia Forest Climate Alliance (IFCA)	Norway Australia GTZ ITTO WWF The Nature Conservancy Global Eco-Rescue FFI David and Lucile Packard Foundation Rainforest Alliance Carbon Conservation International UN-REDD	National Action Plan (NAP) for climate change National Climate Change Strategy (draft) Low Carbon Development Programme National Council on Climate Change Ministry of Forestry Ministry of National Development Planning Indonesia Forest Climate Alliance (IFCA) National Working Group on REDD National Commission on the CDM
Lao PDR	REDD+ Readiness Preparation Proposal	National REDD Task Force Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry National Agriculture and Forest Research Institute Forestry Department Industry Department Land Management Division National University of Laos Local Governments Department of Forest Inspection Forest Inventory and Planning Division Donor Sub-Working Group on Forestry, Joint Working Group on Agriculture, Rural Development and Natural Resources Management REDD Working Group	Development partners: SUFORD, JICA, GTZ, and FCPF	National Climate Change Strategy (NCCS) National Steering Committee on Climate Change Water Resources and Environment Administration (WREA)- Climate Change Office *

continued.

Appendix Table 4 continued.

Country	REDD+ Strategy Reference Documents	Coordinating / Relevant Agencies for REDD+ Strategy	Cooperating Non-State Institutions	Broader Climate Change Strategies and/or Coordination Mechanisms
Malaysia	None yet, but four national policies and over 20 environment-related laws need to be reviewed, including National Forestry Policy (1992 rev), National Policy on Biological Diversity (1998), National Policy on Environment (2002), National Forestry Act (1984), National Parks Act (1980), Environmental Quality Act (1974), and Town Planning Act (1976)	National Core Group on REDD (composition not yet known)	ASEAN Regional Knowledge Network on Forests and Climate Change (ARKN-FCC) Coalition for Rainforest Nations (CfRN)	Cabinet Committee on Climate Change: Prime Minister * Ministries of: -Natural Resources and Environment -National Physical Council Works -Energy, Green Technology, and Water -International Trade and Industry -National Steering Committee on Climate Change -Conservation and Environment Management Division, NRE (secretariat) -Plantation Industries and Commodities -Finance -Education -Agriculture and Agro-based Industries -Foreign Affairs -Science, Technology and Innovation -Transport -Economic Planning Unit -Department of Environment -Malaysian Meteorological Service -Attorney General's Office -National Committee on CDM
Myanmar	None yet, but Myanmar Agenda 21 (1997) needs to be reviewed	…	…	DNA for CDM Ministry of Forestry* 22 members from 15 ministries
Nepal	Readiness Plan Idea Note to FCPF (R-PIN) Readiness Preparation Proposal to FCPF (RP-P)	REDD Working Group Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation (MFSC) * Department of Forests Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Department of Forest Research and Survey	Civil society organizations Community Forest User Groups	Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology is the focal ministry for climate change issues
Papua New Guinea	R-PIN to FCPF (not available online) REDD Readiness Roadmap (from UN-REDD joint scoping mission, Oct 2008) Forestry and Climate Change Framework for Action (2009–2015) National Forest Development Guidelines (revised to incorporate REDD+)	REDD+ Technical Working Group with 3 sub-working groups (forestry, agriculture, and MRV) PNG Forest Authority (PNGFA)	Coalition for Rainforest Nations (CfRN)	Office of Climate Change and Development (OCCD) (replacing the Office of Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability) Climate Compatible Development Strategy (CCDS) being developed by 3 technical working groups—REDD+, adaptation, and low-carbon growth. National Climate Change Plan National Development Strategy

continued.

Appendix Table 4 continued.

Country	REDD+ Strategy Reference Documents	Coordinating / Relevant Agencies for REDD+ Strategy	Cooperating Non-State Institutions	Broader Climate Change Strategies and/or Coordination Mechanisms
Philippines	National REDD-plus Strategy (July 2010) confirmed by DENR Executive Committee, for forwarding to Climate Change Commission	REDD-plus Strategy Team spearheaded by the Forest Management Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (FMB-DENR). The Strategy Team has representatives from: -Climate Change Commission -Ecosystems Research Development Bureau, DENR -Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau, DENR -National Commission on Indigenous Peoples -National Mapping and Resource Information Authority -Department of Science and Technology -Forestry Development Center, UP -Municipal governments and provincial councils CoDe REDD Network composed of 11 organizations	Non-state participants in REDD-plus Strategy Team: -Anthrowatch -Ateneo School of Government -Conservation International -Environmental Legal Assistance Center -Environmental Leadership Training Initiatives Fauna and Flora Intl -Go Organic Mindanao -Greenpeace SEA -IDEAS Inc -Kitanglad Integrated NGOs -Kalahan Educational Foundation -NATRIPAL -National CBFM PO Federation -Non-Timber Forest Products Exchange Program -Philippine Federation for Environmental Concerns -Society of Filipino Foresters -Women's Initiatives for Society, Culture and Environment -ICRAF-Philippines	Climate Change Commission Interagency Committee on Climate Change, chaired by Department of Environment and Natural Resources National Framework Strategy and Program on Climate Change
Solomon Islands	-joined UN-REDD as observer country in 2010 -demonstration sites underway (e.g., Tetepare) -active representation in UNFCCC CoPs and AWG meetings on climate change adaptation	Ministry of Environment	Solomon Islands Community Conservation Partnership Tetepare Descendants, Association (TDA) Solomon Islands Carbon Project Shift2Neutral	NAPA NCSA no data publicly available

continued.

Appendix Table 4 continued.

Country	REDD+ Strategy Reference Documents	Coordinating / Relevant Agencies for REDD+ Strategy	Cooperating Non-State Institutions	Broader Climate Change Strategies and/or Coordination Mechanisms
Thailand	R-PIN	No specific national REDD institution and working group yet, but R-PIN development was led by Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) esp. National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation Department (DNP)* Royal Forest Department Department of Marine and Coastal Resources Office of Natural Resources and Environment Policy (ONEP)-Climate Change Coordinating Unit Forest Industry Organization Thailand Greenhouse Gas Management Organization (DNA for CDM)	No specific mention yet of specific civil society and development partners Greater Mekong Subregion Core Environment Program enabling Thailand to collaborate with neighboring Mekong countries (Cambodia, PRC, Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam)	Climate Change Coordinating Unit, ONEP National Climate Change Master Plan (2010-2019) drafted in 2009 National Strategic Management Plan on Climate Adaptation Greenhouse Gas Management Organization (DNA for CDM) National Guideline Implementation of Clean Development Mechanism
Vanuatu	R-PIN National Priority Action Agenda, Ministerial Cooperate Plan, the National Forests Policy, Forests Act, Provincial Rural Economic Development Initiative Action programs	National Advisory Committee on Climate Change (NACCC) Department of Forests Ministry of Lands - Environment Unit Ministry of Agriculture	Vanuatu Carbon Credits Project (VCCP) - International Technical Advisory Team Carbon Partnership Ltd Victoria University of Wellington	National Advisory Committee on Climate Change (NACCC) National Climate Change Database
Viet Nam	Readiness Preparation Proposal to FCPF Decision 2614/QĐ-BNN-LN 16/9/09 establishing the National REDD Network and Working Group	National REDD Network and Working Group, with members from Ministries of: -Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), various departments, incl. -Forestry Directorate (DoF)* -FSSP Coordination Office (as secretariat) -Forest Protection (FPD) -International Cooperation -Science, Technology and Int'l Cooperation (ICD) -Legislation -Planning (DoP) -Finance -Forest Science Institute of Viet Nam (FSIV) -Forest Inventory and Planning Institute (FIPI) -Viet Nam Forestry University (VFU) -Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) -Planning and Investment -Finance -Office of Government	Development partners: ADB, FAO, Finnish Embassy, BMU, and GTZ, JICA, Norwegian Embassy, UNDP, UNEP, WB National organizations: Center for Research and Development in Upland Areas (CERDA), People and Nature Reconciliation (PanNature), Center for Sustainable Rural Development (SRD) International NGOs: CARE, FFI, Helvetas, ICRAF, SNV, Tropenbos, Winrock	National Target Program on Climate Change Response (2009–2015)

* - lead agency

Sources: Sundawati et al. (2010, AKECU-Fahutan IPB); Vickers et al. (2010, RECOFTC); REDD+ Survey intergovernmental task force (2010), Bond et al. (2009, IIED), Wertz-Kanounnikoff et al. (2010, CIFOR); Demonstration Activities submitted to the UNFCCC website, http://unfccc.int/methods_science/redd/demonstration_activities/items/4536.php

National REDD+ Strategies in Asia and the Pacific: Progress and Challenges

This paper takes stock of developments in Asian and Pacific countries as they prepare to take advantage of emerging financial incentives for forest conservation created through the "REDD+" approach for reducing carbon dioxide emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and other actions that conserve and enhance forest carbon stocks. The paper contributes to the active dialogue on how best to organize for good knowledge management and coordination in Asia and the Pacific for implementing the REDD+ approach. Countries of the region, and especially those of Southeast Asia, have the potential to significantly contribute to mitigating global climate change through forest conservation with incentives provided through REDD+ payments. Current REDD+ arrangements and actions in the region are reviewed along with the extent to which existing multilateral and bilateral REDD+ support mechanisms are allocating their time and resources to support countries of the region. Asian and Pacific countries are receiving considerable support, and coordination is improving as all try to use the new REDD+ incentives to address the major drivers of deforestation in the region.

About the Asian Development Bank

ADB's vision is an Asia and Pacific region free of poverty. Its mission is to help its developing member countries substantially reduce poverty and improve the quality of life of their people. Despite the region's many successes, it remains home to two-thirds of the world's poor: 1.8 billion people who live on less than $2 a day, with 903 million struggling on less than $1.25 a day. ADB is committed to reducing poverty through inclusive economic growth, environmentally sustainable growth, and regional integration.

Based in Manila, ADB is owned by 67 member countries, including 48 from the region. Its main instruments for helping its developing member countries are policy dialogue, loans, equity investments, guarantees, grants, and technical assistance.

Asian Development Bank
6 ADB Avenue, Mandaluyong City
1550 Metro Manila, Philippines
www.adb.org
Publication Stock No. ARM102726

Printed in the Philippines