

International Conference on the impact of REDD+ for HFLD countries



Report prepared by Lisa Best

14 - 15 May 2014

Paramaribo, Suriname



CONSERVATION
INTERNATIONAL



NIMOS



WWF



GSF
Guiana Shield Facility



UNDP
Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Context and Objective

In the last couple of years REDD+ has gained momentum in the international climate policy arena.

Important milestones were among others:

- in 2007 in Bali at COP-13 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), where Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation was added to the climate change mitigation efforts on the international policy agenda;
- in 2010 in Cancun at COP-16 of the UNFCCC, the approach to REDD+, which elements to include and several safeguards were included in the Cancun Agreements. In addition, the importance of maintaining existing forests was formally recognized.

While REDD+ (RED) started out with the idea of reducing emissions from deforestation, the role of protecting intact forest has become increasingly important in contributing to the mitigation of climate change.

Countries with High Forest Cover and Low Deforestation rates, or HFLD countries, are considered to be a unique in that aspect. HFLD countries have more than 50% forest cover and an annual deforestation rate which is lower than the global average of 0.22%.

HFLD countries can be seen as custodians not only of large stocks of carbon, but also of different ecosystem goods and services that intact forests provide, of indigenous and tribal communities living in the forests and of a rich biodiversity.

As one of several HFLD countries, Suriname took the initiative to organize and host a two-day international REDD+ conference for HFLD countries on 14 and 15 May 2014.

The objectives of the conference were to:

- Exchange experiences and learn how to make national REDD+ systems more robust and credible in order to attain benefits in the international arena;
- increase collaboration among the HFLD countries, creating a platform to discuss strategies to maximize benefits from REDD+ and strategies to form an unified block in negotiations;
- increase understanding of REDD+ as a tool for sustainable development; and
- maintain the existing national and international momentum for REDD+.

While HFLD countries have high forest cover and low deforestation rates in common, each country has its own unique context and may be in a different phase of implementing REDD+.

The Conference provided an opportunity for countries to share experiences and start looking into the best approach for making a case in the international policy arena.

Contents

Context and Objective	2
Programme	4
Participants	6
Session 1 – Reference Emission Levels (REL)/Reference Levels (RL)	9
Presentation by ms. Danae Maniatis – UNDP.....	9
Presentation by ms. Gitanjali Chandarpal - Guyana	9
Presentation by ms. Yanira Pop - Belize.....	10
Summary of the Panel discussion: <i>Best practices and options for HFLD countries to develop a REL/RL</i>	11
Session 2 – Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV)	14
Presentation by ms. Danae Maniatis - UNDP.....	14
Presentation by mr. Rene Somopawiro – Suriname.....	14
Presentation by ms. Hansradji Sukdheo – Guyana	15
Summary of the Panel discussion: <i>Building blocks of an MRV system for HFLD countries</i>	16
Session 3 – Finance and benefit sharing mechanisms	18
Presentation by mr. John Goedschalk – Suriname	18
Session 4 – Community engagement, Participation and Grievance	20
Presentation by mr. Ugyen Penjor – Bhutan	20
Presentation by ms. Hannah Martinez – Belize	21
Presentation by mr. Cedric Nelom – Suriname.....	22
Presentation by ms. Jennifer Laughlin – UNDP.....	23
Summary of the Panel discussion: <i>Challenges and opportunities in community engagement for REDD+</i>	24
Session 5 – REDD+ as a tool for sustainable development	26
Presentation by mr. Kinzang Gyeltshen – Bhutan	26
Presentation by mr. Cedric Nelom – Suriname.....	26
Presentation by mr. Pierre-Yves Guedez – UNDP.....	27
Summary of the Panel discussion: <i>How can REDD+ be used as a tool for sustainable development?</i>	28
Conclusion and way forward	30

1st INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE IMPACTS OF REDD+ FOR
HIGH FOREST LOW DEFORESTATION COUNTRIES (HFLD)
14 – 15 MAY 2014, PARAMARIBO, SURINAME

Day 1 - Wednesday 14 May 2014

- 8.30 - 9.00 Registration and entry
9.00 - 9.40 Opening and welcome
9.40 - 10.10 *Coffee break*

Theme 1: Monitoring, Reporting and Verification

- 10.10 - 10.35 Presentation 1 – Danae Maniatis, UNDP
10.35 - 11.00 Presentation 2 – Rene Somopawiro, Suriname
11.00 - 11.25 Presentation 3 – Jagdish Singh, Guyana
11.25 - 12.05 Panel discussion “Building blocks of an MRV system for HFLD countries”.
Moderated by Mark Wright, WWF Guianas
12.05 - 13.05 *Lunch*

Theme 2: Reference Emission Levels/ Reference Levels

- 13.05 - 13.30 Presentation 4 – Danae Maniatis, UNDP
13.30 - 13.55 Presentation 5 – Yanira Pop, Belize
13.55 - 14.20 Presentation 6 – Gitanjali Chandarpal, Guyana
14.20 - 15.00 Panel discussion “Best practices and options for HFLD countries to develop a REL/RL”.
Moderated by Rene Somopawiro, Foundation for Forest Management and Production Control
15.00 - 15.20 *Coffee break*

Theme 3: Finance and benefit sharing mechanisms

- 15.20 - 15.45 Presentation 7 – John Goedschalk, Suriname
15.45 - 16.10 Question round
16.10 - 16.30 Wrap-up and closing day 1

Day 2 - Thursday 15 May 2014

8.00 - 8.30 Registration and entry

8.30 - 8.40 Short review of day 1

Theme 4: Community engagement, grievance and participation

8.40 - 9.05 Presentation 8 – Ugyen Penjor, Bhutan

9.05 - 9.30 Presentation 9 – Hannah Martinez, Belize

9.30 - 9.55 Presentation 10 – Cedric Nelom, Suriname

9.55 - 10.20 Presentation 11 – Jennifer Laughlin, UNDP

10.20 - 11.00 Panel discussion “Challenges and opportunities in community engagement”
Moderated by Lisa Best, NIMOS-REDD+

11.00 - 11.20 *Coffee break*

11.20 - 11.45 Presentation 12 - Pierre-Yves Guedez, UNDP

11.45 - 12.10 Question round

12.10 - 13.10 *Lunch*

Theme 5: REDD+ as a tool for sustainable development

13.10 - 13.35 Presentation 13 – Kingzang Gyeltshen, Bhutan

13.35 - 14.00 Presentation 14 – Cedric Nelom, Suriname

14.00 - 14.40 Panel discussion “How can REDD+ be used as a tool for sustainable development?”
Moderated by Patrick Chesney, Guiana Shield Facility

14.40 - 15.00 *Coffee break*

15.00 - 15.30 Wrap-up and closing of the conference

Participants

Name	Organisation	Country
Abendanon, Raisa (student)	Anton de Kom University of Suriname	Suriname
Aboikoni-Linga, Moejinga	Ministry of Regional Development	Suriname
Agwense, Marijke	Foundation Fund for Development of the Interior (FOB)	Suriname
Ajamaka, Pantakoe	Wayana community of Apetina	Suriname
Alexis, Armstrong	UNDP Suriname	Suriname
Aloema, V.	Stichting Uurari - OIS	Suriname
Aloema, S.	Conservation International Suriname	Suriname
Aroepa, Arnold	Wayana community of Apetina	Suriname
Babb, Jolanda	Foundation Fund for Development of the Interior (FOB)	Suriname
Berrenstein, Heidi	Climate Compatible Development Unit	Suriname
Boedhoe	Anton de Kom University of Suriname	Suriname
Bong A Jan, Rachele	Attune Team	Suriname
Cassata, J	French Embassy in Suriname	Suriname
Dana	SPBO	Suriname
Djani, Johan	Representative of the Chief of Aucaners	Suriname
Donoe, Natascha	Association of Saramacca Authorities (VSG)	Suriname
Drakenstein, Bryan	UNDP Suriname	Suriname
Elliot, Harry	Cabinet of the Chief of the Kwinti	Suriname
Elmont, Jonel	Representative of the Chief of the Matawai	Suriname
Emanuel, Nathalie	SEMIF	Suriname
Esajas, Hesdy	National Forest Service (LBB)	Suriname
Essenboom, Mayra	Centre for Agricultural Research Suriname (CELOS)	Suriname
Fernandes,	Central Bank of Suriname	Suriname
Finisie, James	Saramacca community of Wakibasii	Suriname
France, Cylene	Foundation Fund for Development of the Interior (FOB)	Suriname
Gezius, H.	Hematurant	Suriname
Goedschalk, John	Conservation International Suriname	Suriname
Haarloo, Jamille	Centre for Agricultural Research Suriname	Suriname
Held, Muriel		Suriname
Jaggan, S.	National Institute for Environment and Development Suriname	Suriname
Jona, Gunther	Captain of Erowarte	Suriname
Johanna	Indigenous community member	Suriname
Jubithana, Loreen	Association of Indigenous Leaders in Suriname (VIDS)	Suriname
Khodabux, H	Freelance advisor Projekta	Suriname
Khoenkhoen, Anuradha	UNDP Suriname	Suriname
Koster, Wilgo	SMIS/ Stibula	Suriname
Krabbe, Sara	Foundation for Forest Management and Production Control (SBB)	Suriname
Lachmising, Karin	Attune Team	Suriname
Lakhisaran, B.	Foundation for Forest Management and Production Control (SBB)	Suriname
Liauw Agnie, Stanley	Organisation of Indigenous peoples Suriname (OIS)	Suriname
Lieuw, Tanja	GEF-Small Grants Program	Suriname
Lo A Njoe,	Bureau Intellectuele Eigendom	Suriname

Makosi, Ronald	Captain of indigenous community	Suriname
Malikoe,	Basja of indigenous community	Suriname
Marjanom, Gunovaino	National Herbarium	Suriname
Misiekaba, Andre	GEF-SGP National Steering Committee	Suriname
Muller, Suzanne	Amazone Party Suriname	Suriname
Naarendorp, Ellen	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Suriname
Ooft, Max	Association of Indigenous Leaders Suriname (VIDS)	Suriname
Paansa, B.	GMD	Suriname
Panka, Seth		Suriname
Pantahoe, Ajamaka		Suriname
Parahoe, Minu	Amazon Conservation Team Suriname	Suriname
Pelenapin, Ipomadi	Captain of indigenous community	Suriname
Petrusi, Stiefen	Association of Saramacca Authorities (VSG)	Suriname
Pinas, Mujenca	Ministry of Regional Development	Suriname
Playfair, Clair	Individual	Suriname
Playfair, Maureen	Centre for Agricultural Research Suriname (CELOS)	Suriname
Ramdin, Madhawi	Tropenbos International Suriname	Suriname
Razab-Sekh, G. (student)	Anton de Kom University of Suriname	Suriname
Reshoede	Community of Kwamalasamutu	Suriname
Rozenhout, Wesley	Entrepreneurs of Small-scale Gold Miners	Suriname
Ruyschaert, Sofie	WWF Guianas	Suriname
Saeri, T.	ILACO Suriname NV	Suriname
Sahibdin, Sheesha (student)	Anton de Kom University of Suriname	Suriname
Salarbaks, Bibie	Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management	Suriname
Sallons, Nuravni S. (student)	Anton de Kom University of Suriname	Suriname
Sakimin, Claudine	Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management	Suriname
Samoe, Schelts	Community of Kuluwak	Suriname
Sastro, Cheryl	National Women's Movement	Suriname
Satnarain, Usha	Anton de Kom University of Suriname	Suriname
Sewgobind-Ramanand, R.	Foundation for Forest Management and Production Control (SBB)	Suriname
Situnka,P	Community of Apetina	Suriname
Smith, G.	Attune Team	Suriname
Somopawiro, Rene		Suriname
Svensson, Sara	ONF International	Suriname
Taus, R	Centre for Agricultural Research Suriname	Suriname
Tawadi, Pildas	Interpreter of the Trio Chief	Suriname
Tawadi, Jestelien	Secretary of the Chief	Suriname
Tokoe, Josien	Organisation of Indigenous peoples in Suriname	Suriname
Van Den Bosch, J.	Captain / Association of Indigenous Leaders in Suriname (VIDS)	Suriname
Van Oosterum, A.	EFM Magazine	Suriname
Veira, Randall		Suriname
Velanti, Andre	Representative of the Chief of the Aucaners	Suriname
Vreedzaam, Arie	GEF-Small Grants Program	Suriname
Vreedzaam, Jennifer	PK/ Kumbasi	Suriname
Vreedzaam, Henriette	Sanomoroesa	Suriname
Watamaleo, Grace	Captain	Suriname

Wijnerman, R.	Foundation for Forest Management and Production Control (SBB)	Suriname
Wijngaarde, L.E.	APS	Suriname
Williams, Etta	Community of Apoera	Suriname
Wirht, W	Green Heart Foundation	Suriname
Wright, Mark	WWF Guianas	Suriname
Yakaoeno,	Bureau Intellectuele Eigendom	Suriname
Name	Organisation	Country
Arturo, Jose	UNDP	
Calmel, Marie	ONF International	French Guiana
Chandarpal, Gitanjali	Office of Climate Change	Guyana
Chenet, Nicolas	ONF International	France
Chesney, Patrick	Guiana Shield Facility	Guyana
Collins, Yolande	UNDP Guyana	Guyana
Guedez, Pierre-Yves	UNDP	Panama
Gyeltshen, Kinzang	Department of Forest and Park Services	Bhutan
Laughlin, Jennifer	UNDP	USA
Maniatis, Danae	UNDP	Switzerland
Martinez, Hannah	Forest Department	Belize
Penjor, Ugyen	Department of Forest and Park Services	Bhutan
Pop, Yanira	Forest Department	Belize
Sukdheo, Hansradji	Guyana Forestry Commission	Guyana

Day 1 – Welcome remarks

To start the conference, the MC invites ms. Hannah Martinez from Belize and ms. Haidy Berenstein from Suriname’s Bureau for National Security, to provide opening remarks.

Due to a late arrival of one of the speakers, the session on Reference Emission Levels/Reference Levels was moved up, followed by the session on Monitoring, Reporting and Verification.

Session 1 – Reference Emission Levels (REL)/Reference Levels (RL)

The objective of this session was to present and discuss best practices and options for HFLD countries to develop a REL/RL.

Presentation by ms. Danae Maniatis – UNDP

During the first presentation it was explained how the UNFCCC provides guidance for developing a REL/RL through several decision taken at different Conferences of Parties. The decisions state the different elements to be included in developing the REL/RL, that there should be consistency with the National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS). In addition, due to existing experience within the Kyoto Protocol and UNFCCC on developing Forest Management Reference Levels, support can be provided to countries’ capacity for developing a REL/RL for REDD+.

Finally, it was emphasized that countries, including HFLD countries, have the option of using a step-wise approach for developing their REL/RL.

Questions and Remarks	Response
Life in the city and life in the interior (of Suriname) are different. The different definitions of forest for people living in the city and people living in/with the forests should be taken into account.	
The Forest Management Reference Level (FMRL) needs to be aligned with the Greenhouse Gas Inventory. Will developing countries also engaged in the REDD+ process continue to submit National Communications in conjunction with the mentioned information on FMRL, or will one replace the other?	The terms ‘FRL’ and ‘FREL’ are used by the REDD+ process for developing countries. The term ‘FMRL’ is used for developed countries under the Kyoto Protocol. The National Communications, written every four years, will continue. Hence, the RL’s that are submitted will not replace the GHG-I or the National Communications submitted to the UNFCCC Secretariat.

Presentation by ms. Gitanjali Chandarpal - Office of Climate Change, President’s Office, Guyana

The presentation elaborated on Guyana’s Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS), which is partially funded through REDD+ payments and aims to transform Guyana’s economy, moving towards a low-carbon national development, enabling a climate resilient economy.

Through a bilateral agreement with Norway, Guyana has developed an interim REDD+ mechanism in which Guyana is rewarded for keeping deforestation below an agreed RL and for avoiding increased forest

degradation. The two countries have worked together in creating the building blocks of an interim mechanism for REDD+.

For the RL, it was opted to use a “*combined Reference Level*” which combines Guyana’s 2000-2009 mean deforestation rate (0.03%) and the 2005-2009 mean deforestation rate in developing countries (0.52%). This methodology, using remote sensing, field measurements and available data, results in a provisional RL of 0.275%.

The combined approach can serve as a demonstration model for HFLD countries and that Guyana’s REDD+ model will be adjusted over time.

Questions and Remarks	Response
How much of the received USD 115M received from Norway will go directly to the indigenous communities and how will these funds be used to benefit these communities?	The committee of multi-stakeholder meetings set-up to help guide Guyana’s low carbon development includes leaders from indigenous communities that can provide comments and suggestions on how to spend the money. One of the initiatives under the Norway agreement is an Amerindian Development Fund that aims to support building capacity in indigenous communities to create their development plan.
The agreement between Guyana and Norway was signed in 2009, a relative long time ago. With the required stepwise approach and regular updates, does Guyana plan to update the RL agreed to 5 years ago?	The Norway agreement will end next year. Guyana will continue to use the REDD mechanism and include the new developments under the UNFCCC. If there is a mechanism set up especially for HFLD countries in terms of incentive mechanism, there is room for adjustments. The technical Joint Concept Note is also being updated according to changes. The website can provide further guidance through a number of technical documents.
What do you think about the RL that is set up? Is it appropriate for Guyana or does it need to be adjusted?	It is important to take the national circumstances into account. So far this has been working since Guyana received funding. Through this conference this is certainly a topic that can be further elaborated on.
With regard to the Combined Reference Level, what were the indicators used, based on your geographical, cultural and socio-economical differences with Norway? For example, there are different drivers for deforestation and degradation and how do you compare Norway to Guyana?	The CRL was more tailored to Guyana’s national circumstances. Although Guyana receives funding from Norway, the experiences and the drivers (such mining and logging) are taken into consideration. How these activities will evolve over time is taken into play. Guyana does want to engage in development, but in a sustainable manner. The weighting did consider all these elements and the MRV system helped to guide this process.

Presentation by ms. Yanira Pop - Belize Forest Department, Belize

The presentation explained Belize’s historical development of land use and monitoring of land cover and land use. Belize thus has an ideal reference period for estimating historical deforestation and degradation trends, particularly considering an archive of reliable and robust Landsat images on historical forest cover trends since the 1980s. A new study of Belize’s forest cover for the period 1980 to present shows that forest cover has been reduced from 74% to 61% of its national territory.

Belize is planning to determine a baseline for forest emissions from 1980 to present, by comparing 1980 forest carbon stock estimates and present forest carbon stock from recent forest inventory data. In addition, Belize is planning to collect additional data for estimating a degradation baseline.

Ms Pop indicates that additional remote sensing data is required, in particular in non-forest cover types such as agriculture, though Belize has been able to obtain high resolution RapidEye images for forest classification.

Ms Pop further indicates that there is a lack of human capacity in terms of qualified and available personnel.

Currently, Belize is in the process of determining a baseline for setting-up a national RL, looking to work with rapid eye images and establishing permanent sample plots.

Questions and Remarks	Response
<p>What kind of role does your indigenous population have with regard to establishing the RL or the MRV process?</p>	<p>The largest population of indigenous people lives in the south of Belize. There is direct engagement through the establishments of the plots and also the re-measurements of the plots. The leaders are also engaged in identifying plant species and providing advice, setting up permanent sampling plots etc. At the same time at the higher level the Maya leaders form part of a committee that focuses on the direct involvement of the Maya in this process.</p>
<p>You are using data from the plots to inform your RL. Do you think this will result in some bias? There are no activities in certain areas, however, in the other forests in your country there might be activities. This may lead to an overestimation; how will you address this issue?</p>	<p>A new study is starting, calculating the deforestation rates. In addition, Belize is trying to involve the agricultural sector to determine the land change in the agricultural sector. Studies are conducted in other areas and the results from these studies will be compared with the data of the permanent sample plots. There are certain areas, such as protected areas, that are 36% of the national territory without any knowledge of the present carbon stock. A study is starting in that area as well. All of that different information will be used with the objective to prevent getting a biased percentage for the country.</p>

Summary of the Panel discussion: *Best practices and options for HFLD countries to develop a REL/RL* – Moderated by Rene Somopawiro

The panel consisted of the three presenters: Danae Maniatis (UNDP), Gitanjali Chandarpal (Guyana) and Yanira Pop (Belize). Key questions and points raised during the discussion were with regard to:

- Definitions of natural forests and plantations (non-natural forests) in Belize and the incorporation of biodiversity – Mark Wright, WWF Guianas.
 - Response by Belize: There is forest in the protected areas and forest in the reserves. There are no plantations and will therefore not be a component that would directly have any influence. Agricultural areas will be considered to calculate the rate of deforestation and the degradation at certain points. The inclusion of agricultural plots is being considered as a sub definition of the forest.

- Response by UNDP: The definition of forest for developing countries is up to the countries. The IPCC draws differences between forest land use types (forestry land, agricultural land etc.). Within the land use types the countries define the forest and then that forest can be primary forest, secondary forest etc. However, countries are often encouraged to use consistent definitions of forest.
 - Response by Guyana (Hansradji Sukdheo): In there is no plantation forest, we have primary forest. There is only one definition: A forest is any area that is more than a hectare, with trees that reach the minimum height of 5 meters and has a cover of 30%. This is the definition being used for all REDD+ programs in the country.
- Whether or not to include abandoned non-forest land (in Suriname), which will transform into forest, in the establishment and calculations of the RLs.– Maureen Playfair, CELOS
 - Response by Guyana (Hansradji Sukdheo): In Guyana this is not applicable since the area that is marked for agriculture is permanent. However, the RL do take into account areas that have been undergoing sustainable forest management, because there will be changes in that area.
 - Response by UNDP: How a country establishes its RL, depends on the scope of the activities that you choose as a country that you wish to include, based on your drivers of deforestation and national circumstances. E.g. one of the REDD+ activities is enhancement of carbon stocks. If this is an important activity in the country (e.g. on abandoned forest land) and choose to take this into account, then it should be considered in establishing the RL.
 - Response by Belize (Hannah Martinez): There is a known definition of forest in Belize, though not entirely accepted, taking into account the different uses and users of the forest. For example, in Belize there are indigenous groups with a rotational way of (agricultural) land use, where a group will stay in a certain area for 2 years, the area is allowed to re-generate and 2-4 years down the line it is cut down. Belize is trying to promote that persons remain in one piece of land/plot and apply sustainable agricultural production where rotation can be done within the same plot. It is a risk to consider those regenerating areas as forest, but they cannot be excluded because it provides environmental services such as sequestration of carbon.
- What will prevent HFLD countries from removing their forest and decreasing the deforestation to just the minimum (threshold) values and how this will be considered by international conventions – Patrick Chesney, GSF
 - Response by Guyana: At the national level this would include stronger policies, public awareness and giving the different communities information regarding sustainable forest management and use of the national resources. At international level the protocols the different countries signed to that should be in accordance with the policies at national level, will help prevent deforestation and help counteract climate change. For developing countries this is tough, because they are just starting to develop. Guyana has done studies to look at what would happen if it would cut the entire forest in 2008. Guyana's REDD+ mechanism aims to continue to move along a sustainable development path.
 - Response by Belize: Belize makes use of occurring natural events affecting the people, such as long periods of rain, to make people understand that the forests are important and that keeping forests means to reduce the percentage of deforestation.

- The need for more information on different ways the forests are being used, (e.g. rotational or non-rotational forms of land use) in order to think about the next generations as well. – Henriette Vreedzaam, member of indigenous community.
- The common problem of issuing concessions in areas where communities live, displacement and existing platforms to tackle these problems.– Wesley Rozenhout, representative small-scale gold miners in Suriname.
 - Response by Guyana: The forest is a home to a lot of different people and offers a lot of ecosystem services to the world and its communities. At international level there are different forums that address ensuring that any REDD mechanism that is set up doesn't negatively effect communities and their livelihood. At national level there are safeguards countries have to follow that result from international regulations. E.g. Guyana needs to follow a number of rules under the agreement with Norway before it can move forward with certain processes.
 - Response by Belize: In Belize a forest is much more than trees and the country tries to work with communities to implement REDD+. As there is a component that directly addresses this issue, they are engaged at field level, but also at high government level.
- Whether Guyana will submit the combined reference level to the UNFCCC, whether they will welcome the approach and whether other countries would consider using the same approach taking national circumstances into account – Marie Calmel, ONF International
 - Response by Guyana: Guyana will submit the technical work for consideration at the UN –level for the submissions that will be required. As the UN process evolves and Guyana continues with its technical work in this area, the RL and the approach will be adjusted accordingly. Once a UNFCCC method for HFLD countries is developed, this method will be used, including the national circumstances.
 - Response by UNDP: Initiatives of Guyana and Belize provide information and experience on how countries are approaching this subject. It is a 'learning by doing' process. International guidance on RL's is as good as complete and has incorporated concerns from HFLD countries into those decision texts. The UNFCCC Secretariat welcomes the initiative of Guyana, especially because of its transparency. Any necessary adjustments or concerns from the technical assessment would be addressed in an open discussion with Guyana and solutions would be sought to improve the process.

Session 2 – Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV)

The objective of this session was to identify and discuss the main building blocks of an MRV system.

Presentation by ms. Danae Maniatis - UNDP

Insights were provided into the UNFCCC guidance on National Forest Monitoring Systems (NFMS) and on MRV. Significant progress has been made in terms of guidance for establishing a NFMS. Particularly with regard to approaches for estimating forest-related greenhouse gas emissions, forest carbon stocks and forest area changes.

The purpose of a NFMS for REDD+ is two-fold: 1) to monitor outcomes of REDD+ activities and 2) to measure and report on the performance of activities in terms of greenhouse gas emission reductions. Additionally, the NFMS can also provide relevant information on how safeguards are addressed and respected.

Approaches for monitoring the outcome of REDD+ activities include satellite remote sensing and GIS; and community monitoring to validate satellite data and incorporate local knowledge.

For monitoring carbon and CO₂ emission reductions, remote sensing can be used as well. Through a national forest inventory and a greenhouse gas inventory, emissions from forest-related activities can be estimated.

It is important that the NFMS is consistent with the established forest REL/RL and that data and information are submitted through biennial update reports to the UNFCCC.

The presentation concludes with an example from the Democratic Republic of Congo, where an online, web-based GIS portal has been created for monitoring forests.

Presentation by mr. Rene Somopawiro – Foundation for Forest Management and Production Control (SBB), Suriname

The presentation highlights the relevant UNFCCC decisions with regard to NFMS. It is emphasized that the MRV system needs to be developed, considering each country's own national circumstances.

National choices should consider among others cost-accuracy trade-offs, methodology and level of detail in national forest inventory, suitable institutional arrangements and how to consider social and environmental safeguards.

Suriname will establish a NFMS that includes an MRV function. It will make use of remote sensing to gather activity data and field data for determining emission factors and estimating emissions. In addition, SBB is already closely monitoring logging activities using their log tracking system and GIS.

Progress in Suriname includes the production of a forest cover map for 2010; setting up a Forest Cover Monitoring Unit with support from the ACTO project; and producing a historical deforestation map for the period 2000 – 2013. Additionally, Suriname has completed a forest carbon stock assessment project in 2012 with the purpose of testing a methodology, building capacity and gaining experience. Lastly, a pilot project for a national forest inventory is being finalized, which forms the basis for a comprehensive, multipurpose forest inventory.

Suriname's NFMS will be central to international reporting obligations (e.g. UNFCCC and FAO), but also to national policy formulation (e.g. land use planning, Sustainable Forest Management), and policy implementation and law enforcements. Continued capacity building, collaboration and data sharing, political commitment, stakeholder involvement and participation are essential in this process.

Questions and Remarks	Response
<p>Stakeholder involvement is important, in particular the maroons and indigenous people. However, when I speak with them, it seems as if they don't understand what REDD+ exactly is. The program needs to find people that understand the culture and language necessary to make them understand the REDD+ process. Although meetings with the maroons and indigenous people were held, it is important to verify whether the REDD+ process was understood.</p>	<p>When the REDD+ process started, there was a need to communicate with the maroons and the indigenous people in a manner that would ensure that they understood what was being discussed. Necessary efforts were made. During workshops and training sessions 'REDD+ Assistants' were trained to help bring the message to their people in a way that they would understand. Also, various villages were visited. However, Suriname acknowledges that not all villages were visited. Additionally, there is a mechanism in the process called the Major Groups Collective. However, it appears from people's comments that the actions undertaken in this regard might have been insufficient.</p>
<p>Is the commercial sector is involved? Are there any other commercial companies in the room? It would be good to involve the commercial sector more since they probably have a lot of information available.</p>	<p>The commercial sector is involved. However, comments were received from the timber sector that they have been insufficiently involved. NIMOS was then notified to ensure that they are provided with all the information and that they are invited to all the meetings. It was made clear that REDD+ is a process for sustainable forest management and not to prohibit logging.</p>

Presentation by ms. Hansradji Sukdheo – Guyana Forestry Commission, Guyana

Guyana started working on the MRV system in 2009, with the development of a roadmap for establishing a full MRV system. This roadmap has been revised in March 2014.

The purpose of Guyana's MRV system is to monitor, report and verify forest carbon emissions resulting from deforestation and forest degradation.

Progress on forest area change assessment includes: determining the total forested area; setting a change baseline; implementing a degradation process; 100% country coverage with RapidEye satellite leading to improved accuracy in forest area; and reporting over the period 2012. Findings include an increase in total annual deforestation and a reduction of the area of degradation. Mining remains the largest driver of deforestation.

Following these activities, an accuracy assessment has been performed by Durham University.

The forest carbon monitoring aims to measure and monitor forest carbon, and to link the carbon stock data to forest area assessment. Guyana's approach to sampling is done through random selection of grids to establish plots. The approach uses three-phases of respectively high-, medium- and low- forest potential for future change, both in more and in less accessible strata.

Challenges in establishing and running an MRV system are cloud cover in satellite data, technical capacity building in key REDD+ areas and overall operational costs. Nevertheless, the experience has provided lessons learned for Guyana, including: opting for a cross-sectoral approach, sustainability as a benefit through capacity building, and setting priorities and choosing for effective implementation strategies.

Guyana will shortly be completing the 4th year Forest Area Assessment and continuing implementation of activities according to the MRV roadmap.

Summary of the Panel discussion: *Building blocks of an MRV system for HFLD countries* – Moderated by Mark Wright

The panel consisted of the three presenters: Danae Maniatis (UNDP), Rene Somopawiro (Suriname) and Hansradji Sukdheo (Guyana). Key questions and points raised during the discussion were with regard to:

- The progress in Bhutan with regard to REL/RL and NFMS: Bhutan is in the Readiness phase and the R-PP phase. Bhutan has a division under the Department of Forest that is the focal point for REDD+ activities that will be implemented throughout the country. A forest inventory has been ongoing since 2012 and has covered approximately 6 out of the 20 districts. Weather conditions pose a challenge. There are a number of projects that are implemented in phases such as forest mapping in collaboration with the US Forest Service and four officers have to date been trained to monitor changes in the forest. Furthermore, a land use project was carried out in 1995 to provide a general idea of forest coverage and land use pattern. There is a National Environment Commission, an agency working under the Government of Bhutan, that functions as the official agency to collect the data regarding measurements in Bhutan and to communicate these to the UNFCCC. – Ugyen Penjor
- The issue at stake: protecting the earth or money; using the money to protect the people living in the forests; and other parties setting a good example themselves. – Stiefen Petrusi, member of Saramacca maroon community and of Association of Saramacca Authorities
 - Response by Suriname: The REDD+ process is not just about the money. If there are no forests, then human life will eventually no longer be possible on Earth. However, money and knowledge are necessary to develop in a sustainable manner and protect the forest. REDD+ will be a tool to achieve this. Communication between all parties remains crucial.
- Cost-effectiveness: since MRV activities are expensive, possibilities to include multi-purpose activities should be considered (e.g. natural resource inventory). – Maureen Playfair, CELOS
 - Response by UNDP: Often, a phased approach can be used to conduct the activities. Different technical parties can support a country. Depending on the objective of the country it is a possibility to integrate other variables into the forest inventory or into the monitoring activities. Most countries conduct a multi-resource forest inventory and look at the aspects of logging potential, non-timber products etc. and often combine this with socio-economic data. Though REDD+ should be viewed as a catalyst, countries should beware to not include too many elements and variables in the system that would make it difficult to implement and cause the system to collapse.
 - Response by Guyana: When taking inventory from the forest, it is time vs. money. An increase in the amount of information from the forest will increase the necessary amount of time and this will increase the costs involved. People therefore determine the necessary information that can be taken in a minimum amount of time. Additionally, concession holders can also be approached to provide data that is required from a certain area within their concession. If there is no methodology or aim, and it is not clear what to do with it, collecting a lot of information serves no purpose.

- Important issues stressed since the beginning of REDD+ in Suriname (communication, collaborative problem solving) that are being neglected, e.g. by acknowledging the need to protect the environment and biodiversity, but not acknowledging the rights and protection of those rights of indigenous and tribal peoples as a human being.

Session 3 – Finance and benefit sharing mechanisms

The objective of this theme was to present and discuss potential options of REDD+ financing and benefit sharing mechanisms for HFLD countries.

Presentation by mr. John Goedschalk – Conservation International Suriname, Suriname

Climate change is an urgent issue for which deforestation accounts for just less than one fifth of global Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

At the most recent Conference of the Parties of the UNFCCC in Warsaw, a framework for REDD+ was drafted. This framework states among others that support should be coordinated, because often funds promised by industrialized countries do not actually reach developing countries. It also states that an online information hub will be created on results based finance.

When it comes to climate finance, there is almost no demand for REDD+ credits in the world. However, at international climate negotiations in Paris in 2015 a new climate agreement will be formulated, and it is each developing- and particularly HFLD country's responsibility to ensure inclusion of a REDD+ mechanism. For HFLD countries, RL's are an important element that could significantly help to link HFLD countries to finance.

A conclusion that can be drawn from a report by McKinsey, is that annual emission reductions from forests can contribute about 20% to total necessary annual emission reductions while costing only 5% of total costs for reducing emissions.

Currently, financing is not going where it needs to go. While this does not mean that REDD+ has failed, issues remain such as actually obtaining promised funds, and bridging the period between 2015 and 2020 when a new climate agreement should come into effect.

If money would eventually become available, it should take adequate benefit sharing into consideration in order to be sustainable. An example is provided from Conservation International's project in Peru, where conservation agreements with local population were used to promote sustainable land use in a protected area suffering from deforestation mainly due to unsustainable coffee production. Conservation International served as a broker between local communities and the carbon market.

Because there is no working international market for REDD+, practical design elements to consider include paying as much attention to disincentives as incentives and with regard to benefit sharing, consider existing programs that can be strengthened or amplified.

Questions and Remarks	Response
With regard of the Peru project: do you need to work at a certain scale (a minimum) to make the project worth starting?	This depends on the project design and the area you want to cover. In the Peru project an MRV system was in place to measure the deforestation and carbon stocks. In this case it was working and there are verified credits, but if the control measures had not been effective it might not have worked. Because of upfront investments, a certain scale is needed to make the project feasible and attract the necessary investments, since a lot of the funding is coming from the private sector.
Is the Conservation Agreement Mechanism similar to a PES scheme? Were the threats to biodiversity directly linked to the families that are participating or	The drivers were caused by the families. There was illegal logging and clearing of grounds to grow sun-grown coffee. The agreement is promoted and

<p>to external drivers?</p>	<p>supported shade-grown coffee. As a result they are more competitive, because they are able to sell at a better price than other farmers who still produce sun-grown coffee.</p> <p>It is a PES, because in the end the farmers are paid to help maintain the forest ecosystem that is sequestering the carbon.</p>
<p>Initially, the international community preferred a national approach to REDD+ instead of a project-based approach. Is your recommendation for countries as an interim measure to use the voluntary carbon market? And if yes, then how do you think countries will be able to adjust once the international finance is available and link this to a more national approach?</p>	<p>The voluntary carbon market is necessary to stimulate REDD+, at the very least to build political will. It can help to clarify for countries, what the national policies should look like. Projects should be designed in a way that they can align with national strategies and allow integration with a national approach in a later stage. Transition in a larger framework should be possible.</p>
<p>It is not clear, after this presentation, what this means for Suriname. Are the promised funds available for Suriname's REDD+ program or aren't they? Also, why should Conservation International or any other NGO function as a broker?</p>	<p>There is money for the readiness phase, there are no funds available for the credits. This doesn't impact Suriname at this point, because we are still in the readiness phase. The USD 3,8M is available, and is meant to support Suriname in its efforts to develop a national vision in the context of preparing for REDD+. However, it does affect a country such as Guyana, because they already have a lot of processes and systems in place.</p> <p>With regard to Conservation International functioning as broker; Any other institution can serve as a third party. However, a structured third party is necessary to serve as a broker between local communities and countries/institutions that are willing to provide funds.</p>
<p>Instead of just waiting on international funding, national funding can also be considered. A lot of countries are using their own GDP for the protection of the forest. When this message gets across to countries and potential donors, it might make countries more appealing for donors for investments.</p>	<p>There are countries where this is in fact the case and these are the countries with the most to offer. Suriname has a GDP of 5 billion, but not much of this is going to environmental protection. Suriname is a difficult place financially, particularly due to its dependence on the gold price.</p> <p>It is important to consider that when talking about REDD+, it will not always be possible to obtain contributions from international budgets.</p>

Day 2 – Evaluation and welcome

Guests are welcomed by the MC and are provided with a brief overview of the previous day of the conference.

Session 4 – Community engagement, Participation and Grievance

The objective of this theme was to share experiences, challenges and lessons learned with regard to community engagement, participation and establishing grievance mechanisms.

Presentation by mr. Ugyen Penjor – Department of Forests & Park Services, Bhutan

Bhutan has a population of about 733,004 persons and a total forest cover of about 80% and a total protected area of about 43%. The national forest management regimes in Bhutan consist of: Forest Management Units, Working Schemes, National Parks, Wildlife Sanctuaries, Strict Nature Reserves, Community Forest, Households involved in Community Forestry Management (CFM) and Private forest.

There are several policies and laws such as the Constitution and the National Forest Policy that state equitable access to natural resources, recognize community forests and make involvement of communities a necessity for all activities.

In Bhutan, a bottom-up approach is used for national planning. Every level, from sub-block, to block, to district level, has its representatives. Bhutan wants to use this same approach as a basis for planning, implementation and monitoring of REDD+. The consultation and participation process in Bhutan is ongoing and has specific aims for government sectors, district & local institutions, the National Land Commission, the private sector and local communities and NGO's.

In Bhutan, there is already a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) in place, which will form the basis for a REDD+ GRM with slight modifications. The current GRM consists of the sub-block administration, the block level administration, the district administration, the Ministry of Home and Culture Affairs, His Majesty's Secretariat. In addition, there are the Prime Minister's Grievance Cell and an Autonomous Anti-corruption Commission.

The way forward for Bhutan includes establishing a robust awareness and consultation mechanism, making people aware of their rights, developing a stakeholder engagement and participation plan, and because Bhutan is a Gross National Happiness-based society: creating harmony between development and people's satisfaction.

Questions and Remarks	Response
If REDD+ is about promoting sustainable development in the countries, how come REDD+ will create displaced communities as a result? Also, how can you talk about creating awareness about human rights in relation with displaced communities? How come there will be a negative impact on the communities?	It is not as much about a negative impact as it is about taking precautionary and preliminary measures, to anticipate and reduce any risks of REDD+ coming into place. E.g. Safeguard measures are being developed. Through creating awareness of this new system, we will prepare and inform people. Before REDD+ there was already a PES pilot in place from which lessons can be learned. The main objective is to make people aware of the trends in the world and the pro's and con's of activities.

How are REDD+ activities being monitored?	Bhutan is still in the readiness phase. Monitoring activities will involve representatives from the local communities. We would like community involvement at the highest scale.
How are the co-benefits arranged at community level. Is there a system in place for benefit sharing?	This involves a Chief Forest Officer at field level. It is very difficult to give everybody his/her fair share. The benefits received by the municipality for the services provided, includes providing the community with a school, clean drinking water and biogas production at local level. The payments made will also lead to, for instance, investments in building infrastructure or to help improve the service delivery level. Everyone at community level will benefit, but it is difficult to determine how everyone will benefit at an individual level.

Presentation by ms. Hannah Martinez – Forest Department Belize, Belize

The REDD+ process in Belize has been overshadowed by an ongoing struggle between the indigenous people and the Government. Belize has two larger indigenous groups: The Maya's (about 28,000), who are directly living in and impacted by the forest, and the Garífunas who are fishing communities living in the coastal areas. The ongoing struggle is on land rights between the Mayas and the Government of Belize. This started in 2007 when eight communities won a customary land rights case before the Supreme Court. The government however, maintained the right to approve on the use of the land and determine the boundaries. In 2008, the Government issued a permit to an oil company for exploration within the living area of the Mayas. This has lead to a legal proceeding for the cancelation of the permit. In 2010, twenty-two more communities won their land rights. The Government was prohibited of issuing concessions in the area concerned. This judgment was appealed by the Government in 2010. In 2013, the Court of Appeal affirmed the rights of the Maya people. However, the Court of Appeal removed the earlier judgment by the Supreme Court prohibiting Government interference in Maya land. As a consequence, both the Government and the Maya have cross-appealed the matter to the Caribbean Court of Justice.

In Belize, the consultation process aims at gathering, processing and incorporating stakeholder contributions. Efforts were to build a two-way communication and to develop a consultation and participation plan.

When it comes to REDD+, Belize aims to develop a separate Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) in a participatory manner. Other grievances will be addressed through the existing court system.

The FGRM will be developed in line with international principles and best practices.

Belize faces significant challenges in trying to engage with indigenous communities and is mostly met with aggression as a consequence of contradictory actions. For example, the first Ministry for Fishery and Indigenous Rights, established in 2010, was dissolved three months later because the minister was not indigenous.

The next steps in Belize include getting the R-PP approved in June 2014 and continuing the engagement and dialogue process by approaching community in general in order to help trickle down the information to the local community level.

Questions and Remarks	Response
There is a lack of trust between government and indigenous communities. Publicizing the results is an attempt to improve this. Where are the results publicized?	For example, the government tried to create a Ministry of Forestry, to create a space where the indigenous people have the opportunity to make their concerns known in a non-aggressive environment, but it was rejected. Actions by government and communities break the trust all over again. The results have not yet been publicized, since the mechanism has yet to be approved and accepted as a formal mechanism.
Does the Government consider the action of the Maya taking them to court as a bad thing?	It is not a bad thing, but the fact remains that the government of Belize continues to appeal. The general consensus is that all people in Belize work hard and they therefore are all entitled to the land. Everyone should be treated fairly and equally. With the rulings given, people will continue to live in uncertainty and the fight will be continued in the Caribbean court. This is not a good thing for the REDD+ initiative and this became clear when the R-PP was disapproved due to this continued fight.
Has Belize tried to evaluate in order to learn why they were met with aggression when trying to get the communities involved in the REDD+ program?	In general this was because the indigenous people don't agree with the government and they don't understand why the government continues to appeal. Also, the indigenous people didn't understand why they were engaged in one process (REDD+) and were not allowed to fully participate in others, such as mining and building.
What is the main reason that the Maya's and the Government ended up in court?	The main reason is that the lack of Free Prior and Informed Consent for activities not necessarily linked to REDD or REDD+.

Presentation by mr. Cedric Nelom – National Institute for Environment and Development Suriname

Suriname consists of a population of about 500,000 with a total forest cover of 94%. The forest is important to a diverse range of users and is therefore a breeding ground for conflict. At the same time it creates a perfect setting for dialogue.

The Readiness process in Suriname aims to be inclusive, participative, nation-wide, and research oriented.

During this process, Suriname will establish a REDD+ Steering committee, consisting of representatives from all groups of society plus the Government; a REDD+ Assistants Collective, consisting of self-selected members from indigenous and tribal communities to be trained for facilitating community dialogues; a Major Groups Collective, consisting of representatives from all 9 Major Groups as defined in Agenda 21.

During the readiness phase there will be a strong focus on capacity building and strengthening.

The development of a Grievance Mechanism in Suriname will take a three-tier approach, where by the Major Group will receive the grievances and complaints and try to resolve this. If this cannot be resolved, the matter will be taken to the Bureau for Contact with the People within the Office of the President, and from there on if it remains unresolved it will be taken to the Permanent Parliamentary Commission on Climate Change.

The National Institute for Environment and Development, as technical focal point, will be the coordinating body for REDD+ readiness in Suriname.

Presentation by ms. Jennifer Laughlin – UNDP

The UNDP has been doing a study in different countries on lessons learned from community engagement around the world. Experience from around the world shows that REDD+ is creating an open space for authentic dialogue. Inadequate engagement creates the risk of excluding communities from decision-making, of violating land and resource rights, of inequitable community benefit-sharing, of land grabbing and of potential conflicts. The Cancun Safeguards, taken up in the Cancun Agreement at the 16th Conference of the Parties, aim to minimize these risks.

Within the framework for engagement it is important to strengthen existing or traditional platforms for engagement and representation, to build capacities for self-selection and to conduct a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA). An important tool for engagement which is sometimes overlooked is basic stakeholder mapping and analysis.

Key challenges in engagement around the world are awareness raising and outreach, consultation (trust; how to consult?) and representation. One example provided is on Paraguay, where the Federation for the Self-Determination of indigenous Peoples (FAPI) is represented in different parts of the country's national REDD+ program structures.

Lessons learned around the world have led to key considerations when engaging with communities:

Creating enabling conditions for full and effective participation (trust, respect, stakeholder mapping, consultation protocols); Clarification of the scope of participation (manage expectations; making decisions); and Measuring participation in REDD+ decisions (representation and weight in committees).

The UN-REDD has developed guidelines on Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), which aim to contribute to effective and fair participation.

Grievance redress mechanisms (GRM), as opposed to stakeholder engagement, are at the reactive end of the engagement process. GRMs should be developed to be accessible, predictable, fair, legitimate, rights-compatible, transparent, and have sufficient capacity. It should not replace formal legal channels and should not address major complaints that are outside of its mandate.

The main purpose of a GRM is to identify, anticipate and resolve issues in a timely and cost-effective manner to eventually improve REDD+ outcomes and promote accountability. GRMs can also be a source of information and refer relevant complaints to an anti-corruption authority.

Lessons from around the world have shown that in establishing a GRM for REDD+ it is important to identify the sources of conflicts, to assess existing systems and to look into how these systems can be strengthened.

Three examples are illustrated from Cambodia, Honduras and Suriname, where the importance is highlighted of capacity strengthening to address natural resource conflicts, strengthen existing institutions and to apply preventive measures (e.g. FPIC) to reduce risk of new conflicts and future escalations. There is a need for clearly defined procedures and clarified roles and responsibilities, effective channels to refer disputes to higher levels and strengthening of in-country mediation capacity.

Summary of the Panel discussion: *Challenges and opportunities in community engagement for REDD+* – Moderated by Lisa Best

The panel consisted of: Ugyen Penjor (Bhutan), Hannah Martinez (Belize); Cedric Nelom (Suriname); Jennifer Laughlin (UNDP) and Mr. Max Ooft from the Association of Indigenous Leaders in Suriname (VIDS).

Key questions and points raised during the discussion were with regard to:

- How the REDD+ Assistants' Collective functions at the moment and how its representation is determined. Who is in the Major Groups Collective (MGC) and how the University of Suriname will be involved in REDD+ – Mujinga Linga, Ministry of Regional Development and student
 - Response by Suriname: There are currently 17 REDD+ assistants, which were self-selected by the traditional chiefs of a couple of tribes upon request from the government. This group will be expanded with assistants selected from remaining tribes to be trained for facilitating local dialogues with indigenous and maroon communities.
The MGC has been recently launched and it is up to the stakeholder groups to determine how they will be represented.
It is important to involve the university. Suriname has to look into which faculties and programs will be actively involved, such as the technical and legal programs.
- It is not either city or interior, the districts are important as well. For example the involvement of farmers/owners of plantations in Para has been advocated at previous meetings. There is a federation of farmers. – Errol Gezius
 - Response by Suriname: There is a group within the MGC, 'NGOs', which the federation might consider joining.
- How the process of successfully submitting the R-PP in Belize in June, has been solved now with regard to the land rights issues and whether there are lessons for Suriname – Tanja Lieuw, Small Grants Programme
 - Response by Belize: There is no solution yet. Land rights are not an issue which is separate from REDD+. Belize is hoping to learn from Suriname since they have successfully submitted after a couple of tries. It is recommended to continue strengthening the dialogue of REDD+ regardless of whether or not the land rights issue has been solved.
- Taking the Lo's into consideration with regard to engagement and involvement, e.g. when requesting traditional authorities for selecting REDD+ assistants. It is possible that both assistants are from the same Lo, while you should aim at involving different Lo's. If people don't feel they have been engaged, they will not collaborate. Involving associations is also important, for example the Federatie 12 +1 Lo's, of the Aucaners. – Andre Misiekaba
 - Response by Suriname: Any recommendations and assistance in providing such information is welcome. Representation should reflect the actual situation in the tribes.
- How and which path grievance will take from village level to arrive at the MGC and how the solution will be found and communicated back at village level. – Minu Parahu, Amazon Conservation Team

- Response by Suriname: The mechanism is not yet operational and needs to be completed. For now, an option is to use the REDD+ assistants for contacting communities in the interior on REDD+ related issues. The MGC is in the process of being established.
- First meeting basic needs of indigenous and tribal communities in the interior. In Apetina, an Amerindian village in the South of Suriname, teachers are needed, and a better airstrip for the planes. – Community member Wayana tribe in Apetina
 - Response by VIDS: Engagement is more than just talking with people. It is about ownership. You can have a nice program, reaching targets without communities actually being better off.
 - Response by moderator: This is exactly the aim of REDD+ in Suriname; to realize sustainable development for the interior communities and for Suriname as a country.
- The extent to which international norms and standards are considered in REDD+. REDD+ is not an instrument to solve land rights. These issues have to be sorted out legally and within the parliament. That is where the foundation can be laid to implement activities. REDD+ is a mechanism of activities that will influence the way Surinamese people, live. Human rights should be the basis for implementation. Inclusiveness is key in that aspect. REDD+, forest and land rights issues should be solved collaboratively. REDD+ should be a guide us towards the future. – Henriette Vreedzaam
 - Response by UNDP: There are many standards, guidelines and principles which are all relevant for REDD+. For example the Joint Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement. The UN- guidelines are all built upon Human Rights standards and they support countries to build upon them as well.
 - Response by VIDS: Land rights are an integral part of REDD+. You cannot avoid this discussion as eventually you will run into it. It is a key factor to success. Another key factor is ownership. If people lack certain basic services, engagement and ownership will be a challenge. Eventually, you will need compromise from both sides and mutual trust.
As REDD+ is a holistic thing, there must be a more holistic approach to it.
- Dissemination of information with regard to international lessons on FGRM and FPIC – John Goedschalk, Conservation International Suriname
 - Response by UNDP: That is certainly a possibility. Although there are not many HFLD country examples, DRC does offer some good lessons with regard to FPIC and GRM.

Session 5 – REDD+ as a tool for sustainable development

The objective of this theme was to present and discuss how REDD+ can contribute to sustainable development in HFLD countries.

Presentation by mr. Kinzang Gyeltshen – Department of Forest and Park Services, Bhutan

At the COP-15, Bhutan has pledged to be carbon neutral. The country is a member of the UN-REDD Programme since 2011 and its Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) was approved by the FCPF in December 2013.

Bhutan uses a Gross National Happiness as its multi-dimensional development approach to achieve a balance between material well-being and the spiritual, emotional and cultural needs of society. The four pillars of Gross National Happiness are: sustainable and equitable socio-economic development, preservation and promotion of culture, conservation of the environment and good governance.

In Bhutan it is foreseen that REDD+ will strengthen an existing Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) scheme in community forests and that it will engage a wide range of rural population and forest managers. In addition, REDD+ will improve the growing imbalance between demand and supply and address forest management issues in Forest Management Units. Furthermore, REDD+ rewards protected areas for prior conservation efforts; it cuts across different management regimes of forests and it promotes integrated water catchment management. It is important that the multiple benefits of REDD+ flow to the maximum number of people.

Bhutan already has some experience with benefit distribution mechanisms (BDM) from their pilot PES scheme in community forest and in the case of hydropower. The country will base the REDD+ BDM on this experience and on principles of timeliness, adequacy, flexibility, equity, efficiency and segregation.

Some lessons from Bhutan in this aspect are: being open to addressing sensitive governance issues, learning from existing BDMs, the mechanisms must be flexible and transparent, it must be adapted to local needs through pilot programs, FPIC must be made more effective and benefits for communities must be safeguarded. Several parameters, such as establishment of levels of benefit sharing, form of benefits and beneficiaries will need to be discussed in order to set up a BDM.

Though Bhutan is now entering into the readiness phase and has very limited capacity to meet REDD+ requirements, there is some experience on community forest PES. REDD+ is seen as a mechanism to ensure meeting the constitutional requirement of 60% forest cover and will support the pillars of Gross National Happiness.

Presentation by mr. Cedric Nelom – National Institute for Environment and Development Suriname

Suriname is a country in development which in the coming years shall realize national development for the prosperity and well-being of all Surinamese.

The traditional model of REDD+ discusses financial compensation for REDD+ activities such as reducing emissions, promoting conservation and carbon storage.

Suriname plans to use REDD+ as a mechanism for sustainable development: decreased growth in deforestation to support meeting the economic and development goals in general and specifically, such as GDP growth, opening up the interior (infrastructure), utilizing the Greenstone belt for mining, increasing production in forestry and agriculture.

Sustainable development balances on three pillars of economic growth, social development and environmental protection. Key factors to realize sustainable development are high-level commitment, participation, governance, coordination and coherence.

In REDD+ the social pillar will be supported through engagement and participation of the Major Groups, FPIC protocols and a GRM. The economic pillar will be supported by a Benefit Sharing Mechanism. The Environment pillar will be supported by sustainable forest management, nature conservation and strategic environmental and social assessment.

Questions and Remarks	Response
<p>Is the REDD+ model for Suriname a result of all the plans that have been made in Suriname? Often plans are made, but in the end they are not implemented. Will this also happen with these plans?</p> <p>Have issues such as indigenous people’s rights been addressed or will there be a national discussion with the objective to address these concerns?</p>	<p>NIMOS cannot guarantee that this is the way it will be implemented, as many others will be involved and asked for input. However, it is not recommended to no do anything. The tools should be given a chance.</p> <p>The necessary structures for the engagement of communities have never been properly set-up and this is what we want to do now.</p> <p>The Bureau Land Rights is in the process to the further look at issues related to FPIC. We are looking at ways to formalize the use of FPIC in Suriname. The indigenous people and maroon communities will be invited soon to participate in these discussions.</p>

Presentation by mr. Pierre-Yves Guedez – UNDP (with regard to financing opportunities for the R-PP)

Suriname has successfully submitted her R-PP in 2013 with a total budget of US\$ 16 million. Currently, US\$ 3.8 million has been committed by the FCPF. Some options to reduce the funding gap are the additional US\$ 5 million from the FCPF following a mid-term review; international organizations such as CI, WWF, ONF International; UN-REDD through a National Programme or the Global Environment Facility.

In implementing the activities from the R-PP will take time. It is important to keep in mind the absorption capacity and capacity to deliver tangible results and especially the pace of the participative processes.

While it is not necessary to secure all R-PP funds right away, it is important to start thinking about it already.

In that aspect, activities for international outreach and positioning of the country will pay a significant contribution.

Meanwhile, Suriname can focus on preparing a national REDD+ strategy and develop a REL/RL. These are the critical elements for organizing the entire REDD+ process at the national level and the entry point for discussing result-based payments with potential donors.

Suriname can build on the experience of other HFLD countries such as Guyana and DRC and make use of this potential network of countries to discuss a common approach for international events.

Finally, there is no clear cut between phase 1 (readiness) and phase 2 (implementation) in terms of mobilizing funds. The two phases may overlap or be reversed depending on what is possible for countries and what they want.

Questions and Remarks	Response
<p>Is there no international commitment for readiness funding? Why is this then not arranged yet for funding the R-PP?</p>	<p>The process is not easy, it takes time because REDD+ is complex and very broad. There are donors that are willing to provide funds.</p> <p>HFLD countries are important and deserve the focus of the international community. That is why the narrative must be created collectively and made attractive to make a case and attract donors.</p>
<p>Is it an idea to create a fund at the international level separate from the green climate fund, specifically for HFLD countries?</p>	<p>If this request comes from the HFLD countries themselves, UN-REDD will support this. However, it will add another layer of complexity at international level. If there is a mechanism that works for everybody, it will be more cost-effective for everyone involved.</p>
<p>Are five years enough to perform all legal adjustments? Who will be mobilizing the remaining necessary funds? There should be an ongoing process of helping people understand what REDD+ is about.</p>	<p>These are long-standing issues in all countries, though we cannot expect the project to solve everything in 5 years. It is up to the different groups in the country to get together and work on social issues. UNDP will do its best to support the national process and provide important lessons. For example in Ecuador, FPIC has been incorporated in the constitution, but the protocols for implementing it in practice were lacking. These protocols were developed in 2013. Despite tensions within the country, people were working together to write the protocols.</p> <p>Different groups can contribute to mobilizing funds. REDD+ itself is not meant to be something long-term. It is there so people understand why it is important to protect the forests. It is about changing a mindset. Once that has been established, training will not be necessary anymore.</p>
<p>Is there a shift in how REDD+ is viewed? As a form of PES?</p>	<p>REDD+ is a process to alter the global deforestation and slow it down in different countries. In some countries with sufficient funds and willingness, the countries might become self-sufficient. It might be a reality for Suriname that this type of international support should be more long-term.</p>

**Summary of the Panel discussion: *How can REDD+ be used as a tool for sustainable development?*
– Moderated by Patrick Chesney, Guiana Shield Facility**

The panel consists of the three presenters: Kinzang Gyeltshen (Bhutan), Cedric Nelom (Suriname), Pierre-Yves Guedez (UNDP). Key questions and points raised during the discussion were with regard to:

- The fact that 2015 will mark two big events: new millennium development goals will be set and a new climate agreement will be formulated. There are limited renewable resources to support human

development. Many of the countries with strong economies, have achieved this at the expense of renewable sources. And many of the countries that are now developing and have natural capital, will proceed in the path of the developed countries. It is important for HFLD countries to be present as a unified group at conferences and to look for new, innovative ways for financing. – Moderator

- The position of HFLD countries in the context of the Sustainable Development Conference and the COP-21 in 2015. Guyana will present a new framework and new Sustainable Development Goals. It is essential for HFLD countries to have clear positions, since everyone agrees that forests are important for the future and HFLD countries are unique and important in that aspect. There will also be a conference on new legally binding agreements on climate change. It is vital to keep the momentum in this regard and have a unified block as HFLD countries.– Gitanjali Chandarpal, Guyana
 - Response by Suriname: As HFLD countries, we should work on a strategy. The importance of keeping the communication going that has started here at this conference and to form a block at international negotiations. It is important to work on obtaining international funds and to get REDD+ from an HFLD perspective on the agenda.

- What else HFLD countries can do to protect the forests. It does not have to be something new, but that can have its advantages. It should be considered whether space could be created specifically for HFLD countries. The other option is that HFLD countries should move at the pace of other countries, but this is almost impossible. – John Goedschalk, Conservation International Suriname.
 - Response by UNDP: It is important to unite in raising awareness and stressing the uniqueness and how important it is to get specific treatment and ask for more personalized attention for the needs of these countries that can't follow the pace of other countries. It is worth it to look at options outside the UNFCCC and to see what options there are for HFLD countries to present their case. For example the Sustainable Development Conference, and the Green Climate Fund, or having talks with the EU who has promised funding support for among other protection of the environment. Another entry point is the private sector.

- The need for funds to provide the people in the forest the opportunity to show how they live there, to the people in the city. If there is commitment to the REDD+ process, it should be implemented adequately. Instead, foreigners keep getting concessions and no restrictions are ever formulated to reduce the numbers of cars in the city. The entire country should be responsible for forest conservation. – Stiefen Petrusi, Association of Saramacca Authorities
 - Response by Suriname: Sometimes people forget that it is about climate change and that we should not look at money, even though development is necessary. . It is important to not lose focus and the focus should be on climate change. Before REDD+ was introduced in Suriname, the Amerindians and Indigenous People were living in and using the forest in a sustainable manner. That is the message needs to get across through two-way communication

- The importance of having a political dialogue with all political parties so they can consider all of this information when making policies and national development plans. – Wilgo Coster

Conclusion and way forward

The first International Conference on REDD+ for HFLD countries in Suriname was concluded after two days of presentations and discussions. The main objective of the conference, to share experiences between HFLD countries and look into ways to make the case of HFLD countries more robust and credible, can be considered achieved.

Conclusions

The main conclusions of the conference are provided below.

Session	Main conclusions
1. Forest Reference Levels / Reference Emission Levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences in view and definitions should be taken into account when formulating national definitions • Significant guidance and technical assistance are available from the UNFCCC • A step-wise approach can be taken to develop a FRL; it is a 'learning by doing' process. One option for an interim FRL is the 'combined RL' • Non-forest areas (e.g. agricultural lands) should be taken into account when determining deforestation rates • The FRL is developed based on the scope of REDD+ activities • FRLs are a key element of REDD+ necessary for approaching donors
2. Monitoring, Reporting and Verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of the private sector in a NFMS should be made clear and their involvement should be promoted • A common challenge in countries in establishing a NFMS is time vs. money: since technology and field work are expensive inclusion of other elements for a multi-purpose forest inventory can be considered. However, too many elements can be difficult to implement. • National choices to be considered are among others cost-accuracy trade-offs, methodology, level of detail and definitions, wall-to-wall mapping versus focusing on hotspots for near real-time monitoring
3. Finance and benefit sharing mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a demand gap for REDD+ credits and thus a finance gap • The voluntary market should be used nevertheless to stimulate REDD+ and build political will • In trying to close the finance gap, countries can consider using national funding, though this is not always possible considering national political agenda's • Key in looking for funds is to create an attractive,

	<p>credible narrative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countries should consider looking into existing systems for benefit sharing should as Payment for Ecosystem Services and Conservation Agreements
4. Community engagement, participation and grievance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for more clarity with regard to the purpose of REDD+ • More information is necessary on different forest uses and on the process of REDD+ • Basic needs of communities should be met; the bottom-line is that they should at least be better off • Land rights are an unavoidable subject in REDD+. Efforts must be made to build mutual trust and compromises from both sides are necessary to solve the issue • Grievance mechanisms should not replace, but use existing systems where possible. Lessons learned and best practices from different countries should be shared.
5. REDD+ as a tool for sustainable development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REDD+ is a holistic policy mechanism and thus requires a more holistic approach • The REDD+ mechanism is meant to be temporary until there is a mind shift on how to use and protect the forests • Political dialogue is essential to ensure that REDD+ goals are embedded in national policies and development planning.

Way Forward

The Conference was concluded by the general director of NIMOS, Mr. Cedric Nelom. The conference presented a first opportunity to gain more insight in the challenges, opportunities, lessons and experiences of the REDD+ process in HFLD countries. From this point it is important to maintain the communication within the group of HFLD countries, including those that were not present, and see how they can form a block and make a strong case at international negotiations.

Recommendations for the way forward include:

- Creating a platform for sharing knowledge and experiences between HFLD countries for example through a series of international and national conferences;
- Keeping the momentum going and making information available both at international and national level;
- At a next conference organize a simultaneous separate session for indigenous and tribal peoples and create the opportunity for international exchange of experiences in that aspect as well;
- Looking into the ways that REDD+ can influence national circumstances in HFLD countries, such as land rights.
- And determining how international organizations can support HFLD countries to use REDD+ as a tool for sustainable development.

The information shared during the conference will be documented and shared with the other HFLD countries as well.

Closing remarks were provided by Mr. Armstrong Alexis Country Director of the UNDP Suriname, encouraging conference guests to turn their sparks into blazing fires and ensure they have the energy that can contribute to the protection of Mother Earth.

Participants are thanked for travelling from far outside- and deep inside of Suriname to attend the conference and provide their meaningful contributions and input.

