

HIGHLIGHTS OF NATIONAL CONSULTATION ON REDD

Imperial Palace Suites, Quezon City

April 28-29, 2009

The 2-day consultative workshop was meant (1) to present the result of REDD scoping in the country; (2) to present the REDD project, initial indicative REDD Map, Baseline Piloting and local Stakeholders Consultation for the Philippines and Southeast Asia; (3) to share the experience of an existing REDD projects from Indonesia, Cambodia and Philippines; (4) to discuss the potentials and challenges of REDD in the Philippines; (5) to identify possible stakeholders and their needs; and (6) to discuss possible REDD funding facilities. The workshop was divided into four sessions: (1) Context Setting; (2) Experiential Sharing of Indonesia, Philippines, and Cambodia; (3) Updates on International and Regional REDD Discussions and Some Thoughts on Policy Direction; and (4) Response from Financing Institutions.

Workshop 1: Participants thoughts, views and perspectives on “REDD and Me”

In this workshop, the participants attempted to map their perceptions about REDD and its implications for them and their work. They were asked to identify issues under five (5) different thematic concerns, namely, “Scope and Scale”, “Methodological”, “Financing, Markets, and Fund Management”, “Governance”, and “Indigenous People and Community Rights.”

Under “Scope and Scale”, five (5) issues were identified. These were: (1) the need to promote REDD ++; (2) the neglect of REDD ++; (3) the determination of REDD-able areas; (4) the weak implementation of protected areas and other laws related to forests; (5) and the weak implementation of CBFM. The following recommendations were made: (1) Include Reforestation in REDD mechanism; (2) Reiterate government position and civil society in REDD ++; (3) the Philippine government should define where REDD-able areas are; (4) Prioritize PAs and natural forests, CBFM, watershed, CADC areas for REDD; (5) Use REDD funds for strengthening enforcement of environmental laws; and (6) Use REDD for better, more effective implementation of CBFM.

As for “Methodological” concerns, four (4) key issues were identified. These were: (1) gender and rights; (2) the need to identify the criteria in determining reference levels for countries participating in REDD; (3) whether or not the Philippines has the capacity to monitor, report, and verify (MRV) and what actions have been undertaken to improve the country’s MRV capacity, if any; and (4) whether or not monitoring degradation is a priority for pro-community REDD in the Philippines and the logistics of such.

Many issues were identified as regards “Financing, Markets, and Fund Management.” These include the following: (1) whether or not financing should be capped and, if at all, at what level; (2) the need for the inclusion and participation of all other forest stakeholders; (3) social justice issues pertaining to the sharing of benefits; (4) the need to define the role of private landowners, concessionaires, and industries; and (5)

specific financing schemes such as emission purchase agreements, investment agreements, and risk management buffers.

Several issues regarding “Governance and Infrastructure” were identified, to wit: (1) weak enforcement; (2) illegal cutting of trees for fuelwood/charcoal; (3) poverty in the uplands; (4) low capacity; (5) potential for REDD as a re-centralizing force; and (6) stability of the policy environment. The following questions were discussed: (1) Is the development of a national REDD strategy important/necessary for the Philippines at this time?; (2) What are the important considerations in the development of a REDD strategy?; (3) What kind of REDD infrastructure (agencies, organizations, etc.) must be put into place to provide for efficient implementation of REDD projects?; and (4) What procedure and policies should be put into place to ensure effective REDD governance (reducing leakage, promoting permanence, etc.)?

As regards “Indigenous People and Community Rights”, the issues that were identified were generally classified as pertaining to capacity building, governance, scope/coverage, participation, and benefit sharing. Questions raised included the following: (1) Are existing laws and policies in the Philippines enough to uphold the rights of indigenous peoples and other communities within REDD projects? If not, what policies should be developed?; (2) How can communities gain better access over rights to carbon?; (3) What kind of mechanisms and procedures would ensure equitable benefit sharing?; (4) What other stakeholders other than communities should benefit from REDD and how?

Some Indicative Issues & Recommendations

This presentation was a synthesis of the various facets of REDD, from the choice of being REDD++, the definition of “forest”, to logistical concerns like gathering of baseline information and financial mechanisms for implementation, and more policy-related issues such as governance, mining laws, and the rights of indigenous peoples. In sum, the following recommendations were made: (1) Review existing policies to identify related provisions supportive to push REDD; (2) Use 2003 data on land use based on NAMRIA; (3) Provide guidelines on monitoring once REDD is in place; (4) Develop the capacity to conduct forest resource inventory at the local level; (5) Capacitate communities to be covered by REDD in carbon accounting; (6) Collaborate with other disciplines on data analysis; (7) Put in place right governance mechanism based on rights- based approach and right science; (8) Launch pilot projects to show REDD’s contribution to GHG reduction; (9) Government must shoulder the cost of protecting the forest and not leave it solely to forest dwellers; (10) Communities must not only participate but also have control on the process as well; (11) Capacity building for IPs must be customized; (12) Emphasis must be placed on the full and improved implementation of policies; (13) Development plans must be harmonized; (14) Ensure that REDD has concrete results to reduce GHG emission; (15) Protect biodiversity; and (16) Ensure the supremacy of human development rights.

WS2 was about identifying “What are our needs and how do we move forward?”

1. On the formulation of a National Strategy for REDD

The second objective was the establishment and implementation of a national strategy on REDD in the Philippines. The issue of the development of a REDD ++ framework/strategy was discussed, as well as financing (fund and market, purchase or investment, minimizing risk) and infrastructure (structure, simplified, decentralized, inclusive, capacitated- MRV). To address these issues, participants identified the following priority actions/targets: (1) Organize a group that will draft the strategy and work with DENR (REDD ++) at a pace not dependent on government (DENR to take charge of inviting other stakeholders); (2) CSO must prepare a draft and be ready to meet the group with all other stakeholders; and (3) Establish a cyber-based consultation on draft/s. Two (2) priority needs to implement action were identified. These were the need to get the DENR leadership to convene the group and designate a focal person per unit as well as the need to conduct further consultative sessions with other groups. The organizations that shall be involved in this process are CI, ICRAF, DENR, Haribon, CoDe REDD, (contact—NTFP-EP).

Three (3) other issues were discussed in relation to the second objective. These were: (1) policy revisit and development; (2) addressing drivers of deforestation; and (3) ongoing discussions on the definition of “forest” and forest for REDD eligibility. The identified priority action was the drafting of several policy papers covering outstanding issues (drivers of deforestation and definition of forest/REDD Eligibility, Carbon ownership), one that is based on a case study, and another one that is about property rights issues (ICRAF- initiated). Efforts must be focused on resource mobilization. Organizations that shall be involved in this process are ELAC, FDC, and DENR.

2. On Piloting

The third objective was the piloting of localized REDD projects. In relation to this, the following issues were discussed: local information dissemination and local advocacy on REDD (involvement of multiple stakeholders, LGU, community, private sector); further discussion of benefit sharing mechanisms (bottoms up approach, rights based and social justice approach); identification of REDD-able areas (populating the map); priorities in piloting such as PAs, watersheds, CBFM, CADT/ CADC, LGU- community; local ordinances; and baseline establishment for priority areas. The following criteria for REDD pilot sites were drafted: (1) forest cover; (2) threats of deforestation and degradation; (3) with tenure; (4) biodiversity IBA/KBA; (5) with LGU support; (6) community forest management system in place (organizational capacity); (7) peace and order; and (8) protected area. For immediate implementation, there is a need to cull baseline information, maps, and funding support. Several potential sites were identified. These were: (1) Mantalingahan, (Palawan); (b) Kimangkil (Bukidnon/Misamis Or.); (3) Kalahan CADT (Nueva Vizcaya); (4) Ilong-Ilong/Diwata (Surigao del Sur); (5) Sablayan (Occ. Mindoro); (6) Makilala CADT (North Cotabato); (7) Southern Sierra Madre; (8) Mt. Kitanglad; (9) .

Zambales Mountains; (10) Mt. Labo (Camarines Norte); and (11) Silago (Southern Leyte).

3. On Capacity Building

Finally, the fourth objective pertains to capacity building of REDD players in the Philippines. The issues discussed in relations to this are: (1) forest inventory; (2) carbon accounting; (3) standards; (4) MRV; (5) exploration of accreditation; (6) PDD development; and (7) financing.

Six (6) priority action targets were identified and for each of these, specific topics and organizations were identified.

The first priority action target pertains to forest-dependent communities, CADT holders, CBFM holders, POs, etc. The following topics were identified, including the respective concerned organizations: (1) Basic REDD awareness-raising Sustainable Forest Management (IWGIA (?), NTFP-EP); (2) Negotiating skills (KEF, ICRAF); (3) Forest inventory (MedNet, IWGIA (?)); (4) Carbon monitoring (KEF, ICRAF); (5) MRV (KEF, ICRAF); and (6) Law enforcement (ULAN).

The second priority action target is the LGU. The following topics were identified, including the respective concerned organizations: (1) Basic REDD awareness-raising (IWGIA (?), NTFP-EP); (2) Sustainable forest management (KEF, ICRAF); (3) Law enforcement (ULAN); (4) GIS, remote sensing (ESSC); (5) Standards (ELTI and ICRAF); (6) PDD (ELTI & ICRAF); and (7) Financing (ELTI & ICRAF).

The third priority action target is the CSOs. The following topics were identified, including the respective concerned organizations: (1) Basic REDD awareness-raising (IWGIA (?), NTFP-EP); (2) Negotiating skills for the POs (MedNet); (3) Standards (ELTI and ICRAF); (4) PDD (ELTI and ICRAF); (5) Financing (ELTI and ICRAF); and Social marketing for REDD (ELTI and ICRAF).

The fourth priority action target is the local DENR. The following topics were identified, including the respective concerned organizations: (1) Basic REDD awareness-raising (IWGIA (?), NTFP-EP); (2) Sustainable forest management (KEF, ICRAF, Haribon, CBFM Consortium, SFF*, and CFNR); and (3) Law enforcement (ULAN, ELAC).

The fifth priority action target is the national government, particularly the NCIP and DENR. The identified topic for this target is Basic REDD awareness-raising (IWGIA (?), NTFP-EP, TEBTEBBA).

Finally, the sixth priority action target is the PAMB. The topics identified were Basic REDD awareness-raising (IWGIA (?), NTFP-EP) and Sustainable forest management (KEF, ICRAF, Haribon, CBFM Consortium, SFF*, CFNR, Romy Acosta, Victor Ramos).

Other comments were also identified regarding capacity building. Briefly, these were: (1) the need to stay away from the dichotomy between conservation groups and

market-driven groups; (2) the need to identify the specific education needs of different audiences; (3) that some issues can be addressed without considering the carbon market, ie, Costa Rica; (4) that accreditation is a costly process; (5) the difference between capacity building for understanding standards and capacity building for setting the standards; (5) that sustainable forest management can be discussed without the need for mentioning REDD; (6) the need for social marketing for REDD and the establishment of a REDD-marketing office to make resource mobilization and resource use more efficient; (7) the need to strengthen those who will be included in the core team for REDD coordination; and (8) the existence of a disparity between buyers and sellers, ie, on the level of information needed to make good negotiations.

MOVING FORWARD

Generally, three (3) activities were identified by the participant. These were Consultations and Awareness-building, National REDD Strategy Working Group Formation (CLUB REDD), and Submission to UNFCCC. The following table was prepared for easy reference as regards the schedule of activities and other pertinent details regarding them:

Activity	Schedule	Who/Venue
Consultations and Awareness-building		
REDD Consultations and Info awareness (discuss piloting and capacity building plans) – Mindanao	May / June ?	IDIS and JPSAC Marbel can co-organize (3 rd or 4 th week of June)
REDD Consultations and Info awareness (discuss piloting and capacity building plans) – Luzon and Visayas	May / June ?	Visayas (Leyte)– 2 nd week of June Palawan – 4 th week of June or 1 st week of July Luzon and Mindoro – 3 rd week of May
National REDD Strategy Working Group Formation (CLUB REDD)		
Letter to DENR Sec and FMB Dir. from CoDE REDD ++ to request for meeting to discuss working group on REDD (with constant follow-up)	May 4?	NTFP-EP
Submission to UNFCCC		
Meeting for redrafting	May 7 ?	NTFP-EP office
Draft Final	May 15?	
Submission and presentation to PACC / IACCC	May 18-25?	c/o Ron
Post-Bonn discussion	June 15-19	?