



Introducing the REDD+ standard

**17th workshop Climate Technology Initiative
29./30.06.2017**

Ruth Irlen

**Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation,
Building and Nuclear Safety, Germany**



EU Council Conclusions on REDD+ and EU-ETS

TAKES THE VIEW that a step-by-step approach, respecting the environmental integrity and the 2°C objective, is appropriate; ... CONSIDERS that verified emission reductions could in the medium term be used for compliance subject to strict quantitative limitations and could, in light of experience gained, and after thorough review, in the medium to long term be phased into the international carbon market under the condition that market integrity is preserved, and robust measurement, reporting and verification requirements are met; ...



Warsaw Framework for REDD+

- 9/CP.19 Work programme on results-based finance
 - 10/CP.19 Coordination of support
 - 11/CP.19 Modalities for national forest monitoring systems
 - 12/CP.19 Summary of information on how safeguards
are being addressed and respected
 - 13/CP.19 Guidelines for the technical assessment of
proposed forest reference emission levels
 - 14/CP.19 Modalities for measuring, reporting & verifying
 - 15/CP.19 Addressing drivers of deforestation & degradation
- > *REDD+ requires multi-level governance to ensure
integrity of REDD+ emission reductions or removals***



Accounting

- independent verification of results is key
 - variability of approaches (CDM, REDD+, voluntary projects) reduces the comparability of credits generated; could act as a barrier to investments
 - only common accounting rules ensure comparability
 - transparency / REDD+ Information Hub
 - double counting
 - double claiming
- > need for a national registry**
- > nesting of projects**
- > clarity on carbon rigths**



Leakage

- *Activity*: reducing deforestation increases degradation
- *Spatial*: illegal deforestation; poverty as driving force, need to address complex underlying issues
- *Economic*: Prices for agricultural products drive agricultural frontier, difficult to be influenced by project or state
- Leakage effects can be accounted for in national framework, still cross boarder leakage remains

Project versus **National Implementation**





Permanence

- CDM: certificates are temporary and have to be replaced after a few years, render afforestation/reforestation projects unattractive
- natural carbon sequestration is reversible
- set-aside of between 30-50% of ER in a buffer
- project lifetime < time a tree needs to grow
- El Nino effects and long term climate change are not yet calculated in
- Methodological Challenge: distinguish anthropogenic from non-anthropogenic effects

Project versus

National Implementation



Additionallity

- credible and conservative crediting baselines are key, setting baselines in the land use sector is complex
- Principle of conservativeness doesn't rule out projected or modelled baselines
- risk of recording false emissions -> third-party independent verification is required
- projects: assessment of additionality depends on the reference region chosen
- CDM only for af/reforestation to ensure additionality

Project versus

National Implementation



Social and environmental safeguards

- REDD+ addresses high risk regions: forest frontier with biggest loss in forest area, in post-conflict situations state is often not present
- Cancun safeguards are REDD+ specific safeguards: natural forests, participation, rights of indigenous peoples
- safeguards systems hold governments accountable by including civil society participation, reporting systems
- Reputational risk is relevant for private & public actors

Project versus

National Implementation





Concluding Remarks

Projects deliver information needs with regard to permanence, leakage, safeguards, but do they bring about changes in the political economy of deforestation and support governments in creating an enabling environment for investments in forest and restoration?

Forest will play an important role in limiting warming to <2°C/ 1,5°C. The remaining carbon budget is too limited to allow forests to offset continued emissions.

To ensure liability of REDD+ environmental integrity, robustness and transparency have still to be proven at scale. An institutional and governance architecture is still in its infancy & risks mitigation needs to be addressed.