
Catalysing REDD+ at the national level: Summary of experience so far

Key message

There is increasing clarity about what REDD+ could look like at the national level, but experience so far indicates that there are a number of challenges that will need to be overcome to ensure that it is effective, efficient and equitable in the long term.

- 1 The basic elements of national REDD+ architecture have been well mapped out in research studies¹ and evolving policies (e.g. the [Forest Carbon Partnership Facility](#)).** They include four main functions, outlined in Table 1. These will be developed in three main phases of REDD+, including:
 - **Phase 1:** National REDD+ strategy development and capacity building.
 - **Phase 2:** Implementation of National REDD+ Policies and Measures, as set out in the REDD+ strategy, which will then be verified by proxy indicators (e.g. policies enacted; measures enforced; or proxies for forest carbon changes, such as forest cover change).
 - **Phase 3:** Full-Scale Implementation, where countries are compensated for reduced emissions and enhanced carbon stocks relative to agreed emissions reference levels.
- 2 Many countries have started to implement legal, institutional and policy reforms to catalyse the development of REDD+.** Most of these are involved in the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), covering 37 countries, or with UN-REDD, covering 9 countries, with the exception of Brazil, which is taking unilateral actions but with support from countries such as Norway. [Fifteen countries](#) have developed FCPF Readiness-Preparation Proposals (R-PP) in final or draft form (Argentina, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Kenya, Nepal, Madagascar, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Republic of Congo, Suriname, Tanzania). R-PPs are developed by countries in order to qualify to receive funding from the World Bank to develop REDD+ strategies. The World Bank has so far authorised grant allocations to Panama, Guyana, Indonesia, DRC, Ghana and Mexico. Brazil, Indonesia and DRC have the highest numbers of REDD+ demonstration activities, totalling 59 in 2009.²
- 3 There are few existing evaluations of national REDD+ development. The few studies that do exist illustrate a range of challenges that need to be overcome in future development³.** These are summarised below.

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.

Challenges with securing high level commitment for REDD+. In many countries, responsibility for managing the REDD+ process lies with forestry ministries, and cross-sectoral coordination committees have been formed.

- Forestry ministries rarely have a high political profile, which can make it challenging to promote REDD+.
- Differences can exist between ministries and between central and local government agencies.
- Tensions between state and non-state actors arise in many REDD+ programmes.

Table 1: Adapted from Vatn and Angelsen, 2009. “Options for national REDD+ architecture” in Angelsen, A (ed) Realising REDD+: National strategy and policy options. Bogor, CIFOR.

Functions of national REDD+ architecture	Examples of activities
Responsibility for the implementation and coordination of REDD+ activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing national strategy, including capacity building in areas linked to REDD+ (e.g. legal systems; national statistics); • Responsibility for strategy implementation and ensuring that this takes into account different stakeholder interests; • Aligning REDD+ strategy with broader policies; • Reviewing strategy and reporting internationally, where relevant.
Channelling international funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disbursing resources to approved policies/projects; • Establishing payments system including transaction registry and transparent and inclusive administrative processes; • Securing legitimate benefit sharing.
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing national standards; • Coordinating and harmonising MRV across sectors (e.g. energy sector) and scales; • Reporting to international agencies.
Verification and safeguards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring MRV conforms to international standards; • Overseeing social and environmental safeguards; • Implementing and overseeing grievance procedures.

Challenges with harmonisation, ownership and coordination of REDD+ activities and institutions.

- Harmonization of REDD+ policies with wider development policies is raised as a priority in many REDD+ plans. It is not yet clear to what extent harmonisation will occur in practice - nor what this actually means.
- Strong international drivers of interest in the REDD+ debate and the standardisation of REDD+ strategy development across countries raise questions as to what extent countries are shaping their own national REDD+ strategies (Peskestt and Brockhaus 2009).
- Policy coordination has been cited as an issue in REDD+ development in many countries. Coordination challenges include:
 - those between government departments for example, in terms of split responsibilities for dealing with forests and climate change, or agricultural and forestry ministries;
 - those within government departments for example, between production and conservation branches of forest ministries;
 - between national and regional governments;
 - between government, the private sector, and civil society;
 - those between different donors;
 - those with other international instruments (e.g. the CBD, UNCCD).

Challenges in developing policy responses to address deforestation drivers and ensure effectiveness, efficiency and equity.

- Less attention is given to policies that influence drivers outside the forest sector, such as agriculture and energy policies (Angelsen 2009; REDD-net 2009).
- Existing policies are used to achieve REDD+ objectives, but it is unclear how REDD+ will overcome some of the problems these policies have faced. For example, in Tanzania, participatory forest management is likely to be a key component of REDD+, but whilst this has been shown to have been effective in addressing deforestation, it has been less effective in equity terms.

Challenges with benefit sharing systems and participatory processes.

- In most countries, rules are still unclear surrounding how the benefits (and costs) of REDD+ will be shared.

Even in countries such as Indonesia, which has developed benefit sharing guidelines, studies suggest that detailed mechanisms for project implementation are unclear and can create confusion among project developers. Mechanisms for bundling projects in the same area also remain unclear.

- There is still a lack of clarity over rights to carbon in REDD+ in most countries. This will affect benefit sharing systems for REDD+. For example, the Guyana Forest Law does not, at this time, address the separation of rights to land, forests and the carbon sequestered in the forest⁴. Accordingly, there is the potential for competing claims by government, forest concession holders, and Guyana's indigenous people.

Challenges with developing effective MRV systems.

- An assessment of monitoring capabilities revealed that the majority of non-Annex I countries have limitations in their ability to provide a complete and accurate estimation of GHG-emissions and forest loss⁵. MRV systems are also likely to take a long time to develop in most cases, particularly in West and Central Africa.
- Enforcement of regulations relating to country systems for the MRV of greenhouse gases or other social/environmental issues, is also likely to be an issue because in many countries these are relatively weak. For instance Indonesia's R-PP recognises that enforcement of regulations in the past has been weak but does not outline any actions to improve enforcement⁶.

- 4 **There still appears to be confusion as to how lessons learnt from pilot activities will feed systematically into national REDD+ development.** This is partly due to the timing of different processes (as project pilots are occurring in parallel) but also due to the wide variety of approaches that are being used to pilot REDD+ and differences in how experience is being recorded.

Key publications on this issue

Baker & McKenzie (2009) Background analysis of REDD regulatory Frameworks, a report prepared for the Terrestrial Carbon Group and UN-REDD programme. Sidney, Baker & McKenzie. <http://www.terrestrialcarbon.org/site/DefaultSite/filesystem/documents/TCG-2009-Background-Analysis-of-REDD-Regulatory-Frameworks.pdf>

Costenbader, J. (2009) 'Legal frameworks for REDD: Design and Implementation at the national level', IUCN, Geneva, Switzerland.

Davis, C., Williams, A., Goers, L., Daviet, F. and Lupberger, S. 2010. 'Getting ready: a review of the World Bank FCPF Readiness Preparation Proposals', WRI.

Herold, M. (2009) 'An assessment of national forest monitoring capabilities in tropical non-Annex I countries: recommendations for capacity building', report prepared for the Prince's Rainforest Project.

Madeira, E (2009) REDD in Design: An assessment of planned first generation activities in Indonesia. Washington D.C., RFF. <http://www.rff.org/documents/RFF-DP-09-49.pdf>

Peskett and Brockhaus (2009) "When REDD goes national: a review of realities, opportunities and challenges" in Angelsen, A (ed) Realising REDD+: National strategy and policy options. Bogor, CIFOR. <http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/Knowledge/Publications/Detail?pid=2871>

REDD-net (2009) 'Participation and benefit sharing in REDD+ schemes: early observations from five countries', REDD-net global bulletin issue 1.

Vatn and Angelsen (2009) "Options for national REDD+ architecture" in Angelsen, A (ed) Realising REDD+: National strategy and policy options. Bogor, CIFOR. <http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/Knowledge/Publications/Detail?pid=2871>

Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S and Kongphan-apirak, M (2009) Emerging REDD+: A preliminary survey of demonstration and readiness activities. Bogor, CIFOR. <http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/Knowledge/Publications/Detail?pid=2869>

1 Angelsen, A. (Ed.) (2009). Realising REDD+. [National strategy and policy options](#). CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.

2 Sills et al. 2009. 'The evolving landscape of REDD+ projects', In; Angelsen, 2009

3 Peskett and Brockhaus, 2009, based on analysis of case studies in Cameroon, Tanzania, Bolivia, Indonesia and Vietnam; EDF, 2009. 'Brazil national and state REDD'; and Baker and Mckenzie, 2009, based on analysis of Brazil, Indonesia, Madagascar, Guyana and PNG

4 Costenbader, 2009

5 Herold, 2009

6 Davis et al, 2009. 'Getting ready: a review of the World Bank FCPF Readiness Preparation Proposals', WRI.