Grant Agreement no.: 226310

Project acronym: REDD-ALERT

Project title: Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation through Alternative Landuses in Rainforests of the Tropics

Funding Scheme: Collaborative Project

Deliverable reference: D.7.2.

Deliverable title: Annual Project Meetings

Due date of deliverable: Month 2, 14 and 26.

Actual submission date: June 2010.

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: Macaulay Land Use Research Institute (MLURI), UK

Project co-funded by the European Commission with the Seventh Framework Programme (2009-13)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	X
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Service)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Service)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Service)	

Deliverable reference: D.7.2.

Deliverable title: Annual Project Meetings

Deliverable evidence: Minutes of the meeting

* *

The first Project meeting of the REDD-ALERT (Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Degradation through Alternative Land Uses in Rainforests of the Tropics) Project was organised in Indonesia from 23-31 May 2009. Twenty participants representing the 12 partners from Indonesia, Holland, Germany, Belgium, Vietnam, Cameroon, Peru, Columbia, Kenya and the UK attended. The minutes of the meeting of the meeting have been attached bellow for the details.

REDD-ALERT Kickoff Workshop
ICRAF, Bogor, Indonesia
May 25-29, 2009

Programme

Day	Date	Activity
1	Mon, May 25	Bogor: stakeholder meeting at national scale
2	Tue, May 26	Jambi, meeting in the afternoon
3	Wed, May 27	Peat area visit, transfer to M Bungo
4	Thrs, May 28	½ day field visit, ½ day meeting
5	Fri, May 29	Transfer to Singkarak, ½ day field
6	Sat, May 30	Wrap up meeting, fly out
		Modelling workshop

List of potential attendees

S No	Name	Organisation	email
1.	Robin Matthews	MLURI	r.matthews@macaulay.ac.uk
2.	Meine van Noordwijk	ICRAF	M.VANNOORDWIJK@CGIAR.ORG
3.	Sonya Dewi	ICRAF	S.DEWI@CGIAR.ORG
4.	Vanessa Meadu	ICRAF	V.Meadu@CGIAR.ORG
5.	Eric Lambin	UCL	eric.lambin@uclouvain.be
6.	Edzo Veldkamp	UGOE	eveldka@gwdg.de
7.	Constanze Haug	VUE	constanze.haug@ivm.vu.nl
8.	Lou Verchot	CIFOR	L.Verchot@cgiar.org
9.	Glen Hyman?	CIAT	
10.	Valentina Robiglio	IITA	
11.	Fahmuddin Agus	ISRI	F.AGUS@CGIAR.ORG
12.	AN Other	ISRI	
13.	Miguel Barandiaran	INRA	mbarandiaran@inia.gob.pe
14.	V T Phuong	RCFEE	phuong.vt@rcfee.org.vn
15.	Martin Tchienkoua		mtchienko@yahoo.com
16.	Kristell Hergoulich	CIFOR	
17.	Herry Purnomo	CIFOR	H.PURNOMO@CGIAR.ORG
18.	Grace Villamor	CIFOR	

Workshop summary
The kick-off workshop of the REDD-ALERT (Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Degradation through Alternative Land Uses in Rainforests of the Tropics) project was organised in Indonesia from May 23-31. Twenty participants representing the 12 partners from Indonesia, Holland, Germany, Belgium, Vietnam, Cameroon, Peru, Columbia, Kenya and the UK attended.

The REDD-ALERT project aims to look at ways in which funds from global carbon markets and other sources can be used to help reduce tropical deforestation rates, and at the same time benefit the livelihoods of local people. Deforestation contributes nearly 20% of global anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions, and was identified in the Stern Report in 2006 as a relatively cheap and cost-effective way of achieving reductions. The challenge, however, is to

do this without adversely affecting the livelihoods of people living in and around tropical forests.

The week started with the project launch at the campus of the headquarters of CIFOR (Centre for International Forestry Research) and ICRAF (World Agroforestry Centre) in Bogor, near Jakarta, to which national level stakeholders in REDD were invited along with staff from both organisations. Following the opening by Dr Frances Seymour, the Director General of CIFOR, Robin gave an overview of the project, which was followed by a description of each of the work-packages by the respective coordinators. This generated a lively discussion on the pros and cons of REDD.

The project team then travelled to the island of Sumatra for a mix of project planning meetings, field visits, and further interactions with stakeholders at the provincial and local levels. Beginning in the city of Jambi, and travelling from one side of Sumatra to the other ending in Padang, the participants visited peatland forests converted to oil palm plantations, jungle rubber agroforestry systems, community-based sustainable forest management initiatives, and tree planting schemes for the voluntary carbon market. Under the enthusiastic guidance of Dr Meine van Noordwijk, the Global Science Advisor of ICRAF, a good insight was gained of the realities and challenges of implementing REDD on the ground. In particular, the complexity of land tenure and access rights to forests became apparent, as well as the ambiguity of how a forest is actually defined – currently land can be designated as a forest even if there are no trees on it following clearing, provided that there is an intention to replant at some time in the future! Discussion was also had on the best way to represent REDD issues to local people – for example, talking about the amount of carbon stored is probably not the best way to convince them of its benefits, whereas talking about sustainable forest management and the benefits that the community might gain of improved water quality, flood control, and forest products may carry more weight.

The team also learnt that the debate on clearing tropical forest for biofuels, particularly on peatlands, was not as simple as first seems. While that has undoubtedly occurred on several occasions, in many cases the land was cleared years previously for paper pulp production, and has only recently been converted to oil palm for biofuel production. To whom then should the deforestation be attributed – the paper pulp company, or the biofuel company? Often the latter argue that they are, in fact, restoring carbon stocks by planting oil palm, and are, therefore, the 'good guys' and should be rewarded for it!

All in all, the meeting was a good opportunity for the project team to meet and get to know one another, and to learn about the issues involved, and the systems and people on the ground whose livelihoods will potentially be affected by any REDD decisions made at the international level.

<u>Notes from the meeting</u>

Day I: Monday, 25 May 2009.

<u>Notes from inauguration session (morning session)</u>
- Need background information on each of the field sites.
- Four different scales: global, national, regional, local – what scales should we focus on?
- How much should we be linked to the negotiating process?
- ALREDDI: 3000 plots across Indonesia – C stock assessment for Tier 3 accounting - need to see about potential in other study countries.
- Need presentation template – logo.
- Indonesia: forest classifications: protected, plantation (production), peatland, oil palm.
- Opportunity costs map for Cameroon?

<u>Notes from national stakeholder's meetings (afternoon session)</u>
- Links between land tenure and conservation.
- Uncertainties – land cover, C densities. Uncertainty in national level emissions in Indonesia? - from 0.5 to 3 Gt/y.
- Local people's rights.
- Non-CO_2 gases and fire: Are they really significant? On peatlands they may be significant – but estimates are very variable, so need clarification. Need to focus on fertilised systems. Cumulative N_2O emissions over a land use change lifetime may be significant rather than just comparing annual values.
- Resilience of forests – not correlated with carbon storage?
- Rural migration – will this be affected by the economic downturn?
- Integration – project meetings, website.
- Inclusion of carbon market cowboys, private entrepreneurs in the models. Necessary to make things work. Need to engage with them somehow. Who to represent them in the models.
- Current land use systems are often poverty-creating systems. Not fair, efficient, or sustainable, even at the moment.
- Land use tenure – lot of work has been going on by CIFOR, ICRAF. Need to build on this. How to incorporate this in the model? Is this something that Innocent can focus on?
- Sharpen up research questions.
- Conserving peat forests. Costs involved?
- Link to negotiators. Our role is to get the figures, mechanisms right.
- REDD+: not only deforestation, but also wider ecosystem services – water, biodiversity, livelihoods, soil fertility management.
- Tax: Government not clear yet whether/how to tax. Who will be taxed? Tax deductions.
- Fairness: Conversion, conservation?
- Where should benefits go – 30% for C reduction, 30% for sustainable livelihoods, 30% for transaction costs.
- National benefits, sub-national implementation.
- Vietnam – 2 years for piloting – also focus on water siltation.
- Corruption? How to deal?
- Start with rewards rather than price?

<u>Meine:</u>
- Is the price right?

- Is there a right price?
- What's the price of a right?
- Who has the right to set a price?
- Is there a left price?

Day II: Tuesday, 26 May 2009.

Stakeholder meeting
- Provincial government, University of Jambi, NGO – land use planning at the provincial level.
- C trading – Singapore trader. Dorgee Sam. Cowboys. [Need to incorporate this into a schematic diagram].
- Province takes a share of 10%.
- District governments want to bypass provincial governments.
- Production forestry (forest for logging) – in same classification as plantation forestry.
- Selective logging – remove large trees, then clear smaller trees (for paper pulp), then replant in *Acacia mangium*.
- Watershed protection forest – not supposed to be mining companies, but some are getting concessions.
- Rapid carbon appraisal - - village has already estimated C – waiting to join a REDD scheme.
- Community forest is area of 'common land'. In Cameroon, community forestry land is an area granted by the government.
- Look up work on tenure done at ICRAF.
- Several versions of maps showing land ownership – each have some validity. Rapid tools to try and resolve some of these.
- Peat more than 3m depth is supposed to be protected, but often is not.

WP5 meeting (afternoon session)
- Present: RBM, Grace, Phuong, Herry
- Vietnam: Collecting National Forest Inventory data.
- Indonesia:
- Evaluation of models: LUDAS, CLUES, PALM, FALLOW, CORMAS.
- Review of Tier 2/3 AFOLU approaches in 4 main case study areas:
  - Current state of affairs, where that country is going – Tier 2/3?
  - CO2FIX, FORCAM models.
  - Focus on current constraints – data availability, algorithms, etc. Need to read up on IPCC methodology.
  - Each country review data availability – need an inventory of what data is available.

Chat with Constanze, Martin
- Potential research questions.
- Sensitivity of system (i.e. benefit distribution) to C price – dynamic MACC commodity prices (MACC from ASB).
- Comparison with global CGE models (Onno Kuik).
- Constance to send a preliminary list of interventions.
- Martin – better data for opportunity costs.
- Better information on land use change.

Talk with Glenn Hyman:
- Douglas White: household data for 1990s, benchmark site.
- Glenn has been working on GIS data – space as a proxy. Can identify when villages were established.
- INIA – good on soils, have done biomass measurements. Should have weather data.
- Glenn wants to work on forest transition curve, but at local level. Talked about dynamics in Peru – e.g. Shining Path.

Herry:
- Used CORMAS: Forest Economics & Policy paper. Mathematical modelling paper.
- STELLA: Participatory modelling in Papua.
- Value chains: Environmental Modelling.
- Contact Australian working on ABM in East Kalimantan. C trading.

Day III: Wednesday, 27 May 2009.

Field trip to oil palm plantations (morning session)
- Coastal peats
- Oil palm 40 t C/ha
- C density: 30-70 kg/m^3 in peat. Bulk density: 0.2-0.3 g/cc.
- Oil palm plantation: smallholder up to 2ha each.
- Canals for both transportation and drainage.
- Subsidence – 2cm in three months.
- 10x emission rates than from other conversions from forest.
- No plans for natural regeneration.
- Australian project to regenerate mega-rice projects.

Day IV: Thursday, 28 May 2009.

Conservation village (morning session)
- Need to translate REDD C benefits into something else meaningful at the local level, e.g. sustainable forest management → improvement of the environment → livelihood benefit, not in terms of C.
- Vietnam: Pay $13/ha for forest conservation (200,000 bhat).

Meeting with stakeholders (afternoon session)
- Two scales:
  - Direct benefit of people living in the area – health, education, training.
  - General development – e.g. land rehabilitation of degraded areas.
- In Cameroon: logging companies pay tax – 50% goes to government, 50% is distributed as benefits to communities living nearby.

Meeting
- Scale issues – what scale to use in WP1, WP2, WP3.
- Get website sorted for data sharing
- Need to consider biofuel vs. food issue: Indonesia: oil palm; Vietnam: Jatropha; Cameroon: palm oil; Peru: Jatropha, palm oil
- Workshop with Eric/Valentina to sort out decision-making rules. Mobility of people.

- Should we consider effect of national agents on global decisions?
- Lou: research vs. advocacy. Debate on what a forest is/isn't. How do we feed into the UNFCCC process? How do we talk to key players?
- Conference calling: Moratec.
- Do we need a review of forest conservation schemes that have worked? e.g. Vietnam, Costa Rica?

Day V: Friday, 29 May 2009.

Operational issues
1. Internal and external communication

Website
- Internal: for posting documents, discussions, news updates, administrative things.
  - We are exploring platforms (i.e. Macaulay website, D-Groups) and will report back.
  - Preferences for receiving emails (frequency?) vs. having it all online?
- External: project description, link to partner pages, news about the project.
- How do we include partners who may not have reliable internet access?

Conference calls
- Via skype?
- On a schedule or ad-hoc? Frequency?
- WP Teams and regions

Policy Outreach – closely linked with external communication
- WP4 and WP6 to work with VM to strategize

ASB network –
- Opportunity to disseminate relevant news on ASB blog and e-news. What is appropriate content?

Other:
- Group feedback:
  - Checking discussion forums is complex and time consuming.
  - Need FTP capabilities.
  - All external news should go on ASB site/newsletter.
  - Conference calls: try Maratech.
    - Project management team should have conf calls every 6 months.
    - Rest case-by-case.

- Links with EU? Be friendly

2. Software licensing and other equipment needs

3. Time management/structure
   - One chapter per Workplan? Schedule?

Status of work packages

WP1
 General approach: comparative analysis.

Issues to address
- Forest quality.
- Stakeholders.
- Scales – provincial level is a problem.

Research Question
"What factors determine effectiveness of land use planning policies on reducing deforestation?"

Data needs:
Census Data.
Remote Sensing – links to WP2.

Task
National teams to identify census data within 1 month.

WP2
1) Quantify deforestation and land use change rates.
2) Estimate carbon stocks and changes.
3) Opportunity costs.
4) Evaluating cost-effectiveness/monitoring systems of GHGs (e.g. Tier 3 or Tier 2).

Gaps
- Still need to determine who will do what.
- Opportunity cost work.
  - Include soil C.
  - Input to WP5.
  - Baseline.
  - Opportunity cost work needs to be expanded for Cameroon (Jim at IITA).
  - Could be done by a student at INRA?
  - Peru: Glenn to discuss with Doug White.
  - Spatial Variation.
- Land use layers → WP4 (national level).
- C Stocks – expand work on C Stocks → different soils and land covers.
  - Vietnam – good data on Soil C, T"ypoe.
  - JICA already doing allometric research in 2010 (Central highlands).
- Still need to determine a Vietnam study site.
- Need to also decide on extent of Cameroon site.

WP3
1) Improve a/c methods; Peats in Indonesia.
   - All GHGs.
   - Subsistence rates.
   - Oil palm, acacia.
   - Fertilized oil palm (mineral).

- Separating auto/heterotropic respiration (peats).

2) Better a/c of CO_2 from land use systems changes (Indonesia).
   - Rubber, oil palm, acacia.
   - Cameroon: S&B, Cacao forests; chromosequence.
   - Peru: pasture, maize/beans.
→ still to discuss with Glen and Valentina.

3) Regional predictors.

Need
   - Soil map of each region, land use map.
   - Site selection (Cameroon).
   - Look into possibility of Soil C work in Vietnam.
   - Feedback from soil biogeochemical cycles on decision making?
   - Test indicators in Vietnam??

WP4
Key components:
Institutional analysis.
   1) Identify obstacles for global forest governance.
      - Mapping institutions.
      - REDD architecture.
      - Suggestion: from viewpoints of the four countries; negotiator perspectives.
   2) National level.
      - Forest policies in the four countries.
      - Literature review, interview.
      - Data from landscape mosaics project (Cam, Indo) (Carol Colfer).

   3) Case studies at national level.
      - State of policy implementation.
      - Input and support from partners.
        o Data, survey, translation, access to stakeholders.

Research question: mapping stakeholder preferences and perceptions.
"What makes a successful REDD policy?" At different scales (guiding principles, values and definition of forest).

"Forest" – need to always clarify the meaning in the context – via a survey in four countries of LEK, MEK, PEK.

Links: WP1, 5, 6, ASB Netowrk, Landscape Mosaics.

Day VI: Saturday, 30 May 2009.

Wrap-up meeting (morning session)
- Project brochure in different languages – 100 words from each WPC.
- Finalise logo – IAN website for images.
- Check on Mid-Term Review – where, when.

- Sort out timing of Annual Project Meetings.

Action/Decision Points:
1. Complete EU Grant agreement forms.
2. WP leaders should finalize workplans with their teams by end of June, and share with rest of REDD-Alert members.
   - Robin will circulate standardized Workplan template from Macaulay Institute so we can use a common format.
3. Contact people for advisory committee including developing country representatives
   - Marcus Colchester – Interamerican Development Bank.
   - Yemi Katerere – UN-REDD.
   - Benoit Bosquet – WB-FCPF.
   - Carmenza Robledo.
   - Jurgen Blazer.
   - Luico Pedroni (independent consultant).
   - Thelma Krug - Rainforest Alliance.
   - Brent Swallow.
   - Margaret Skutsch.
   - UNFCCC Designated National authorities.

Suggestions:
   - Include people who have reach beyond this team.
   - People who can give us advice on how to focus and link in with other initiatives.

4. Meetings – if WPs are coordinating meetings, Robin needs to know, as they could potentially be combined with other Work Package team meetings
5. Software Licensing – some colleagues are using illegal software and this might be a concern to the EU. Team members should go to their institutes to try to get licenses.
6. Time Management/Structure – see gap chart in proposal and see whether it's still realistic. Particularly note when your WP needs outputs from other WPs and see whether the timing works.
7. Data gaps/needs – building a meta-table of what data each WP has available and what data they need from the other WPs. Robin will send out a form to fill in by end of June.
8. Project Brochure – WP coordinators to submit a 150 word summary and submit pictures online. Vanessa and Robin to coordinate writing and layout; national level reps to coordinate translation. Submit info to Vanessa and Robin by mid June
9. Meeting schedules – options:
   a. Coincide with December UNFCCC meetings
      December 2009 –Copenhagen (or Amsterdam).
   b. Coincide with June UNFCC meetings in Bonn.
   c. Have meetings in-country.

   We have budget for 2 more meetings plus a conference at the end of the project.

10) Logo – replace the tree with a rainforest species.

Glimpse of Project meeting and field visit, Indonesia, May 2009.