
REDD+ targets: what is currently on the table?

Key message

A number of developing countries with large tropical forests have proposed voluntary REDD+ targets that could make a significant contribution towards global emissions reduction targets. The development and implementation of strategies to achieve these targets is likely to require international support.

- 1 Fifteen developed countries and the European Union have submitted emission reductions targets to the UNFCCC and associated themselves with the Copenhagen Accord.** Comparative studies reveal that these pledges could potentially account for reductions in global emissions of 12% to 19% (5-9 Gt) from 1990 levels by 2020. The actual level of emission reductions will depend on whether countries aim for their higher or lower reduction pledges.
- 2 Although most developed countries are yet to provide detailed plans on how the emission reductions targets will be reached, some of them have stated that their national targets could be met in part through international offsets, including REDD+.** For instance, up to one third of Norway's emissions reductions may be met through international mechanisms and the country is already contributing with funding to the Amazon Fund, Guyana's REDD+ Investment Fund and the Congo Basin Fund. Draft U.S. climate legislation also includes larger-scale use of REDD+ offsets.
- 3 Some developing countries have announced voluntary emissions reductions targets.** Only a few countries have disaggregated REDD+ within these targets. However, these include the significant rainforest countries of Brazil, Indonesia, Guyana and Papua New Guinea (Table 1).
- 4 For countries that have stated GHG emissions reduction targets, they differ in how they have been expressed, making comparison difficult.**
 - **Baseline definitions:** countries have framed their targets in three ways: as reductions below actual levels in a recent year, as reductions below hypothetical "business as usual" (BAU) levels in a future year, or as carbon neutrality targets.
 - **Use of different base years:** Where countries have expressed reductions against a reference level in a recent year, they often use different base years, depending on the latest source of reliable data. Emissions data availability and quality is generally low among most developing countries.
 - **Calculation of 'business as usual' emissions:** Most countries have expressed their emission reduction targets against business-as-usual (BAU) scenarios for which no standardised methodologies have been agreed and whose robustness have not been rigorously examined. For instance, Guyana's BAU is defined as the state of affairs should the country have pursued an economically rational plan, while Brazil and Papua New Guinea use economic forecasts for 2020 and 2030 respectively.
- 5 Some countries have expressed quantified targets in terms of area of forest to be protected or planted (Table 2).** Some developing countries have

Disclaimer

This infosheet has been funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and published by the REDD-net programme, supported by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD). The findings, views and recommendations contained in the research are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the funders. Research was carried out in March to June 2010.

Table 1: Summary of emissions targets proposed by developing countries, including aggregate national targets (bold) and targets for forests where available (in plain text).

Emission reductions	Reductions relative to baseline					Reductions relative to recent level			Publicly stated target			
	Reduction	Baseline	Target	Reduction rel. to recent level	Recent level	Country ¹	Targeted change rel. to BAU	Year		Emissions under BAU (MT-CO ₂ e)	Year	Emissions at target date (MT-CO ₂ e)
Brazil	36.1-38.9%	BAU	2703	2020	1651-1727	14.6-18.3%	2005	2022.3	Aggregate			
Brazil - forests	24%	BAU	1084	2020	4152	63.5%	2005	1139.3	Reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation by 24.7% compared to business as usual in 2020			
Guyana	1500Mt CO ₂ e (cumulative)	BAU	N/A	2020			1994	1.4	Target is expressed as cumulative emissions from avoided deforestation			
Indonesia	26%	BAU	2600-2800	2020	1924-2072	9.9-16.3%	2005	2300	Aggregate emissions.			
Indonesia - forests	13.3%	BAU	1330-1432	2020	650-700	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Indonesia - peat	9.5%	BAU	950-1023	2020	602-649	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Papua New Guinea	50%	BAU	99-141	2030	49.5-70.5	14%	2010	82-99	Decrease GHG emissions by at least 50% by 2030 and become carbon neutral by 2050			
Papua New Guinea - forestry	21.9-25.4%	BAU	53-64	2030	26-31.5	37.0-49.9%	2010	50-52	Forestry			
Peru	100%	BAU	N/A	2020	N/A	47%	2000	N/A	Zero net deforestation by 2020, reducing emissions from deforestation by 47% from 2000.			

Mexico	30%	BAU	9003	2020	630	11.9%	2006	715	The only detailed target for REDD+ is for the 2008-2012 period, including: stabilisation of agric. frontier; placing 50% of national natural protected areas under REDD scheme; and 0.5 Mt CO ₂ e of forest carbon credits in the carbon markets.
Costa Rica	100%	N/A		2021		100%	2005	9	Reduce economy wide emissions by 100% by 2021 (carbon neutral).

Footnotes

- 1 Bold text denotes aggregate emissions targets. Plain text denotes targets specifically for forest or peat land emissions.
- 2 Brazil's forest target remains the same for its upper and lower aggregate targets
- 3 Based on estimated value in climate action tracker: <http://www.climateactiontracker.org/country.php?id=1318>

expressed their interest to incorporate REDD+ into their nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs), but have not provided quantified GHG emissions reduction targets or area based targets.

- 6 **Developing country pledges are often contingent on the availability of international funds for REDD+.**
- 7 **Most developing countries have not outlined in detail how they plan to meet their REDD+ targets.** Fifteen countries have submitted Readiness Preparation Proposals to the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility. These include an initial plan of how they will implement REDD+ but they are not necessarily linked to quantitative reduction targets. Brazil (not included in this group) has also put forward a plan for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation.

Table 1: Quantified area and activity based targets submitted to the Copenhagen Accord by non-Annex 1 countries

Country	Target
Central African Republic	Increase forest cover from 11% in 2005 to 25% in 2050
Ethiopia	Reduction in emissions from deforestation and forest degradation by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable management of 28,736.7 km² of natural high forest areas. • Sustainable management of 4390.96 km² of deciduous forest. • Sustainable management of 60,360 km² of national parks¹.
Gabon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase internationally certified sustainable management forest areas of 2 million ha in 2010 by 6 million ha by 2020 with own funds and by 4 million more if international funds are available. • Increase forest area under sustainable management of 3.5 million ha in 2010 by 3.5 million ha by 2020 and by 5 million ha more if international funds are available. • Increase the forested areas under development* from 9 million ha to 12 million ha.
Mauritania	Increase forest cover from 3.2% in 2009 to 9% in 2050
Morocco	Reforest 1 million ha by 2030
Sierra Leone	Maintain forests to at least 3.4 million ha by 2015
Togo	Increase forest cover from 7% in 2005 to 30% in 2050

Notes

- 1 These figures are assumed to be up to 2020, based on the introduction to Ethiopia's letter of submission to the Copenhagen Accord.

Key publications on this issue

Project Catalyst (2010) '[Taking stock - the emission levels implied by the pledges to the Copenhagen Accord](#)', Project Catalyst, Brussels, Belgium.

Fransen, T. (2009) '[Summary of GHG Reduction Pledges Put Forward by Developing Countries](#)', World Resources Institute, Washington D.C.

Baker, Antonia (2010) Interpreting Emission Pledges: the need for a Common Accounting Framework <http://www.climatestrategies.org/our-reports/category/59/237.html>

Stern, N. and Taylor, C. (2010) '[What do the Appendices to the Copenhagen Accord tell us about global greenhouse gas emissions and the prospects for avoiding a rise in global average temperature of more than 2°C?](#)', Policy paper, March 2010, Centre for Climate Change Economics and Policy Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment in collaboration with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

-
- 1 Targets are defined here as quantified greenhouse gas reduction or removal objectives to be achieved in a given time frame and against a defined reference, unless otherwise stated
 - 2 Kelly, L and Bradley, R. 2010. 'Comparability of Annex I Emission Reduction Pledges', WRI working paper; Project Catalyst, 2010
 - 3 Fransen, 2009
 - 4 Bold text denotes aggregate emissions targets. Plain text denotes targets specifically for forest or peat land emissions.
 - 5 Brazil's forest target remains the same for its upper and lower aggregate targets
 - 6 Based on estimated value in climate action tracker: <http://www.climateactiontracker.org/country.php?id=1318>
 - 7 These figures are assumed to be up to 2020, based on the introduction to Ethiopia's letter of submission to the Copenhagen Accord.