

REDD: Something to dread

or the way ahead?

Joint Visayas-Mindanao Consultative Workshop on Exploring Forest Carbon Revenues for Philippine Forest-based Communities

7-8 July 2009, Mindanao Training Resource Center, Bajada, Davao City

Organized by NTFP Exchange Programme for South and Southeast Asia, ULAN, Kalahan Educational Foundation, Inc., IDIS, GOM, FPE, Asisi Foundation, Anthrowatch, PFEC, WISE, Inc.

Supported by Nature and Poverty.net

WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS



Prepared by:

Allan V. Villanueva

Workshop Documentor

7/14/2009

Executive Summary

The REDD consultative workshop delved into three-pronged approaches: carbon sequestration; biodiversity conservation; and, payment for environmental services.

Participants were educated about the basics of climate change, land use, and forest.

The history of and developments in REDD and CoDe-REDD perspective were presented including the perceived “pros” and “cons.”

Concrete cases in the Philippines (in Kalahan), Cambodia, and Indonesia were shared.

The workshop solicited the views of the participants on the REDD and their recommendations in the context of Mindanao/Visayas realities.

These workshop outputs were then presented to DENR Usec. Atty. Lucille Sering who committed that the REDD will be part of the technical working group of the Climate Change Office.

The core of the workshop discussions revolved around the importance of forests in curbing greenhouse gas emissions, incentives, carbon credits, and mechanisms.

It is indeed a daunting challenge. All stakeholders need to work together.

Focus should not be on incentives, and the mechanism should just be an added value.

Whether or not there is money, reforestation should continue.

After the national anthem and tri-sectoral invocation led by Christian, Muslim, and Lumad participants, the conference facilitator, Mr. Ed Caharian, introduced the workshop participants from various peoples organizations (POs), non-government organizations (NGOs), local government units (LGUs), and academe coming from Visayas and Mindanao (please see attached attendance sheet).

I. Opening Ceremonies

A. Welcome Address

Ms. Lia Jasmin M. Esquillo
GOM Coordinator

Go Organic Mindanao (GOM) Coordinator Ms. Lia Jasmin M. Esquillo welcomed all workshop participants and thanked all the groups that have helped organize the event.

“I’m glad that you came. Your presence signifies the importance of tackling the problem of climate change,” Ms. Esquillo remarked.

She pointed out that although “we do not have scientific knowledge on climate change,” we already see and feel its effects, such as droughts and floodings. For example, Davao City—which did not experience floodings in the past—has experienced terrible floodings the past two weeks. Farming communities are already affected by climate change.

Ms. Esquillo highlighted the importance of forests in mitigating climate change, adding that the REDD (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation) initiative already has made significant inroads at the international level.

At the local front, she said that REDD is not yet known and, hence, the workshop can be a good start by getting inputs from the ground.

She then wished the participants to have a productive exchange of ideas which can serve as vital inputs for the local REDD initiative.

B. Consultative Workshop Overview

Ms. Ester Batangan

NTFP-EP Project Coordinator

Twenty percent (20%) of carbon emission comes from forest degradation. In international negotiations, the role of forests has been deemed important in mitigating climate change. Hence, the important role of REDD in addressing the issue.

The forest cover of the Philippines has declined over the years. Its fast deterioration happened during the Marcos regime due to illegal logging.

The Philippines has the best policies (e.g., CBFM, CADT, etc.). It also has a very good legal and policy framework. To strengthen these, the indigenous peoples (IP) communities need to be given the right compensation for taking care of our forests, e.g., by providing them livelihood and economic opportunities for their areas. The Lumad communities need to be tapped because of their indigenous knowledge on environmental protection.

Protecting our forests is not new since we have been working for this for several decades. Nonetheless, this has become an urgent issue because we already feel the effects of climate change.

Other countries are already ahead in the REDD initiative. The Philippines is trying to catch up by conducting regional consultations with various stakeholders in the country.

These consultations seek to determine how to mainstream the REDD as a climate change mitigating measure. We discuss with civil-society partners and solicit their support for collective initiative/action.

The activity is in line with the information, education, and communication (EIC) campaign to educate and consult all stakeholders.

The following are the objectives of the consultative workshop:

1. Present an overview of Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) as a mitigating measure of climate change;
2. Share lessons learned from the forest carbon and REDD-ready projects already implemented;
3. Stimulate exchange of views and perspectives on a community-initiated REDD as a climate change mitigating measure; and,
4. Draw out initial recommendations for future courses of action.

The output of the series of consultations will be included in the negotiating text of the Philippines for the Copenhagen meeting on climate change in December 2009.

DENR Usec. Lucile Sering will attend the closing ceremony of this consultation workshop tomorrow. The output of this activity will be presented to her.

II. Basics of Climate Change

Prof. Cheryl Talde

University of the Philippines - Mindanao

The following are the basics of climate:

1. Definition of climate (i.e., pattern over a long period of time) vs. weather (i.e., pattern in brief period of time);
2. Elements of climate: including temperature and precipitation;
3. Factors affecting climate: latitude, terrain, ice or snow cover, water bodies, and currents;
4. Low pressure means warm water evaporates;
5. Cold air have tighter molecules and tends to go down (wind patterns);
6. Inter-Tropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ) refers to the direction of cold air and warm air;
7. The heat that comes from the sun causes the change in temperature;
8. The movement of the Earth is sometimes near or far from the sun and its rotation is tilted, causing changes in temperature;
9. The rugged topography of the Earth also affects the climate;
10. The Philippines has a tropical (marine) climate and rainy and dry seasons;
11. Due to abundant sunlight, trees have broader leaves in tropical countries like the Philippines;
12. The Earth has a dynamic system with two sources of heat: its core (3,950K) and the sun;
13. Atmosphere refers to the layers of gases surrounding the Earth;
14. Historically, atmospheric composition has changed overtime in terms of composition and dominant process/features;
15. Out present atmosphere is a living atmosphere; and,
16. Life has contributed, modified, and increased oxygen concentration in the atmosphere.

The scientific explanations behind climate change and global warming are:

1. The Earth's present habitability is an interplay of physical events, evolution of life itself, and behavior of certain gases (i.e., greenhouse gas);
2. The Greenhouse Gas has a "glass-like" effect, absorbing, reflecting, and radiating heat, thereby making Earth livable.
3. Climate change refers to the variation in the Earth's global climate or in regional climates over time, caused by internal process (e.g., volcano eruption); external process (i.e., sun); and, human activities (i.e., anthropogenic);
4. The UNFCCC definitions: "climate variability" (is due to natural causation) vs. "climate change" (is due to human causation);
5. Humans have begun modifying concentration of certain gases through anthropogenic activities;
6. Models of climate change:
 - Dynamics of Earth-Sun Orbital Relationship
 - Milankovitch Cycle Theory of Climatic History
 - Due to the inclination of the Earth, climate change can happen every 40,000 years
 - Equinox can happen every 21,000
 - As CO₂ increases, temperature increases
 - Earth experiences longer episodes of coldness every 100,000 years
 - Earth is now in its inter-glacial period
 - Other factors cooling the Earth are atmospheric conditions
 - The Earth is now in the 11,000 to 12,000 years (i.e., glacial retreat, warmer temperature, high photosynthetic activities)
7. Global warming is also caused by human-induced or "anthropogenic" activities, such as burning of fossil fuels;
8. Burning of fossil fuels started during the industrial revolution, causing significant increase in global temperature overtime;
9. China is the fastest industrializing country that emits a significant amount of CO₂;
10. CO₂, Methane, and CFCs ruin the ozone layer causing rise in global temperature;
11. Greenhouse effect traps more heat, causing faster rate of evaporation and precipitation;
12. This results in droughts, typhoons, and floodings, rising sea level (due to glacial retreat), and stress in marine life (due to increased pH level);
13. Change in climate (e.g., rainfall pattern) can have negative impact on food production (e.g., lower rice production affecting over 2 billion people dependent on rice as staple food); and,
14. Forests are important in mitigating climate change.

Prof. Talde ended her presentation by challenging the participants to look into the issue of climate change seriously.

Anthropogenic or human-induced activities will continue to cause climate change and may cause extinction of life—unless something serious is done immediately.

She noted the global trends and changes in agricultural production—rise and decline—and the detrimental environmental effects of chemical use in agricultural production.

She posed the following questions: Why of impending ice age? Are we willing to accept that there will be change? Are we ready for the change? Are we ready to have the right attitude change?

We need to be critical in whatever we do and our steps should mean mapping out the right directions, Prof. Talde challenged the workshop participants.

“Our next steps should be grounded on sound science and evidence,” she concluded.

III. Climate Change, Land Use and Forests

Mr. Romeo Acosta

Consultant, Asian Development Bank

The REDD is presently not included in the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) of the Kyoto Protocol.

Under the Kyoto protocol, developed countries can finance projects in developing countries that can help offset their CO₂ emission.

The logic is simple: it is much cheaper for industrialized countries to invest in mitigation program in developing countries than to adopt measures that will affect their industrialization.

There is now a big debate: industrialized countries can pollute and pay developing countries to offset their CO₂ emission.

For the first commitment period (until 2012), the COP decided that only REFORESTATION and AFFORESTATION will be included in the CDM.

At present, there are only three (3) projects approved in the entire world. Projects cannot be approved for denuded forests that have natural re-growth process.

Definition of emission, deforestation, and degradation follows:

1. *Emission* – release of carbon and greenhouse gases (GHG);
2. *Deforestation* – permanent conversion of forest to non-forest and the long-term reduction of forest crown cover to less than 10%; and,
3. *Degradation* – the temporary reduction in biomass due to extraction, e.g., timber harvesting, fuelwood gathering, natural disasters.

The contested definition of a forest is: “at least half a hectare with thick vegetation and canopy closure.”

It is OK to use wood than plastic since plastic comes from petroleum, while wood can be harvested and replaced through sustainable activities, i.e., replanting.

The three (3) different views on the approaches are: (1) deforestation only; (2) deforestation and degradation; and, (3) REDD + sustainable forest management.

In terms of implementing mechanisms, there are groups calling for higher reduction of emissions under the Kyoto Protocol. Others are pushing for the institution of a separate protocol during the Copenhagen gathering in December.

Contentious issues that need to be sorted out by 2009 include:

1. Uncertainties related to baselines, monitoring of carbon-stock changes, and measurement;
2. National or project-level approaches;
3. Issues of leakage, permanence, and risks; and,
4. Reporting and verification.

To address these issues, there should be capacity-building, technical assistance, and technology transfer.

The status of the country’s forest cover follows:

- 6.5% in 1988 to 7.2% in 2003;
- Increase is due to changes in definition of forest (i.e., funders have different definitions);
- Closed-canopy forest has gone down (degradation);
- Open-canopy forest has increased;
- The quality of forest is deteriorating;
- The Philippines is losing 204 hectares per year;
- There is re-growth in certain areas due to tree-planting by small-holder farmers;
- The rate of deforestation is probably decreasing due to tree-planting by small-holder farmers and gazetting of protected areas; and,
- The forest that is emerging is “not the forest that we like.”

The following are the experiences in Bukidnon and Lanao del Sur:

1. The land use in Bukidnon has drastically changed because of the increase by 494% from 1988 to 2008 in the number of pineapple and banana plantations. The trend in the province is the conversion of forests into cornlands and then later into pineapple and banana plantations.
2. On the other hand, in Lanao del Sur, the land use has changed through both conversion and degradation. There is a general decline in forest cover (open-canopy and closed-canopy), and an increase in non-forest croplands from 1998 to 2003.

Other issues include quarrying and mining, logging, subsistence farming (e.g., charcoal making), conversion of forest lands into non-forest croplands (e.g., orange/citrus farms), and development of roads leading to upland areas to encourage planting of high-value crops.

Committing to REDD or REDD++ will entail firming of policies, laws, and enforcement in land use management:

- Conversion of agricultural lands into non-agricultural uses;
- Clarifying the limits of ownership rights, especially of forested private lands (Who owns the carbon stored in the forests? Who decides on the fate of this carbon?); and,
- Reclassification of forestlands into alienable or disposable category, or into other non-forest categories.

There is a need to address driving forces of deforestation and degradation:

AREAS	CONCERNS
In forest management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perverse incentives, e.g., in the conversion of inadequately-stocked forest (degraded forest) to tree plantations [although this is intended to increase timber stocks faster than the natural processes of succession and forest re-growth]
In forest law enforcement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significantly reducing, if not eliminating, illegal logging, and associated trade, and indiscriminate forestland conversion • Effectively implementing forest rules and regulations in legitimate forestry operations
In agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-value crops and export-focused crops encroaching on forested lands (e.g., CAR,

AREAS	CONCERNS
	Bukidnon, South Cotabato)
In agrarian reform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conversion of forested lands in CARP areas to agriculture and non-forest
In rural infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening up new roads and improving existing ones facilitate the movement to forested lands previously inaccessible or difficult to access
In trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressing the possible (and probable) increased scarcity of supply of wood and other forest-based raw materials, including fuelwood
In bioenergy development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversion of forested lands to bioenergy crops such as oil palm, Jathropa, coconut, sugar cane

Committing to REDD++ should mean evaluating the impacts of REDD policies and projects on forest dependent communities and indigenous peoples to ensure that (a) they are not unreasonably displaced; (b) their livelihoods, or their traditional relationships with forests, are not unduly curtailed; and, (c) that benefits should filter down to them.

IV. Climate Change and REDD

Ms. Yasmin Arquiza

The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), signed by 192 countries during the Earth Summit in Brazil in 1992, aims to reduce human-induced greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through implementation of mitigation and adaptation measures among countries.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has come up with four (4) reports on climate change: 1990, 1995, 2001, and 2007. These studies confirm that 20% of GHG emissions in the 1990s are mainly caused by deforestation and degradation. Hence, protection of forests is the best solution to address the problem of climate change.

In 1997, 184 countries (except the US) signed the Kyoto Protocol in Japan. A total of thirty-six (36) industrialized countries agreed to reduce their GHG emissions from 2008 to 2012 to an average of 5% of their 1990 emission level. Only Japan has a concrete target under this protocol.

The said protocol created carbon as a new product in the market. It allows emissions trading, joint implementation, and Clean Development Mechanism (CDM).

Countries that have lower GHG emission may be funded by the CDM fund to implement projects to achieve the Kyoto target. The Philippines has twenty-five (25) projects registered with the DENR (as of December 2008), but only three (3) projects have been funded so far.

Costa Rica and Papua New Guinea (“rainforest nations”) came up with the REDD proposal in 2005 as a result of the ITCC study that validated the negative impact of deforestation and degradation on climate change.

The REDD proposal seeks to allow all countries to engage in carbon trading so that funding will be made available for the protection and conservation of their forests.

A Bali Action Plan was developed in 2007 emphasizing the need to look into the needs of indigenous peoples and forest peoples; funds needed for the protection of forests over a long period of time; and, activities for sustainable forest management.

Discussions on REDD started in May 2006, particularly with regard to capacity-building for forest peoples so they can become active partners in taking care of forests. REDD is expected to be ratified by member countries in Copenhagen in December 2009 as part of their post-Kyoto commitment.

The following are the developments in the country:

- Joined UNFCCC in 1994 and signed the Kyoto Protocol in 2003;
- Formed an Inter-Agency Committee on Climate Change (IACCC) in 1991 with DENR as chair;
- Put up the Presidential Task Force on Climate Change (PTFCC) in February 2007;
- Established the Office of the Presidential Adviser on Climate Change (PACC) in August 2008 (task of which is to come up with policies on climate change and to be the country’s representative to the UNFCCC);
- Does not have any official position yet with regard to REDD; and,
- Signed the ASEAN Common Position during the Workshop on ASEAN Regional Knowledge Network on Forests and Climate Change on 30-31 October 2008.

In 1999, the Philippines first submitted its report on carbon inventory based on 1994 data. It is now preparing its second report based on 2000 data for the upcoming Copenhagen meeting in December.

In general, the country can be considered a “carbon sink,” i.e., it has more carbon sequestration than GHG emissions due to presence of its forests.

The following are the problems encountered in forest-mapping in the country: unreliable data; lack of capacity to document; and lack of research data.

The GTZ granted DENR Php 182.5 million to implement the following projects starting 2009: information, education, and communication (IEC) campaigns on climate change; reforestation; and, biodiversity conservation.

The following are the problems identified on REDD:

- Some sectors do not want to sell the services of local communities;
- Logging companies may be given incentives even though they actually destroy our forests (i.e., perverse incentives);
- Amount of “carbon credits” that can be traded in the REDD market;
- Varying views on causes of deforestation and degradation; and,
- Industrialized countries may continue to pollute, knowing that they can compensate other countries to sequester their GHG emissions.

On the other hand, the following are the identified benefits of REDD:

- Bigger support from government for protection of forests;
- International support for biodiversity; and,
- More opportunities for IP communities and protection of forests.

The CoDe REDD initiative can advance if there is:

- Respect for the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and their free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC);
- Non-displacement of forest people;
- Equitable sharing of benefits;
- Transparency in finances;
- Better management (and no corruption); and,
- Community participation of forest people.

The local communities need to have the right information about the REDD and on negotiations pertaining to climate change. They should also be capacitated to monitor and report forest issues, and be given the opportunity to join debates on REDD because any decisions made will have a direct bearing on their lives.

OPEN FORUM

Jerry Dela Cerna, Davao Oriental – Other living things (like forests, rivers, and corals) are just silent while we are debating on the topic of climate change. I think we have to ask where the problem is coming from. How should political leaders address the

problem? What direction are we taking amidst the clamoring of NGOs and the passivity of government agencies? I suggest we empower the barangays to protect the environment. We can do this through co-management. Although the people in the communities are culprits of environmental destruction, they can also become strategic partners in environmental protection if we educate them properly. Political leaders who are serious about the issue should be involved. Usually, the topic of LGUs is on land utilization. They lack discussions on sustainability and climate change. There is therefore a need to mainstream the topic among them.

Romeo Acosta – Things are happening very slowly due to hesitance at various levels. The government is apprehensive in giving authority to communities. On the other hand, LGUs are saying, *“Ibigay nyo sa amin yung capability-building—but give us the fund.”* Definitely, there is a need for capacity-building at the community level. Communities should have a say and should also become beneficiaries of resources. The Local Government Code is not actively pursued. The framework is there, but there are problems in political development. Other countries have already copied our model and learned from us. There is a need for more active advocacy as well as budget for community forest management. The IP communities should also assert more about their right to control their resources because they are the first who will be affected if these are gone. They should show that they can be responsible caretakers of these resources.

* * * * *

Datu, Makilala – I’m an IP stakeholder from a CADT area in Makilala—part of the Mt. Apo Nature Park. I was invited by KAPWA. It is good to know that carbon can be marketed. But there are many projects of government in IP communities that are not seriously pursued. If this REDD can help, we have *“bantay bukid”* in our ancestral domain. I hope that this will be materialized. What is the process in compensating the Lumads for protecting our forests?

Yazmin Arquiza – Pastor Rice will share with us tomorrow how to market carbon. It is a complicated process and there is a need for the community to understand the documents very well. Our fear is there might be too many consultants and the initiative will not redound to the benefit of the people. Hence, there is a need to evaluate proposals seriously and to get the support of lawyers to analyze technical terms. IP communities should watch out and need to have strong partnership with other groups so that they will not be exploited.

Prof. Cheryl Talde – Indigenous peoples should have the right consciousness and should learn to change their attitude so that they can assert their rights properly.

* * * * *

Ven, Zamboanga – Will REDD conflict with or enhance the CBFM of our cooperative?

Romeo Acosta – There are still a lot of things that can happen regarding its implementation. Countries are still figuring out what to do.

Maybe, you can first start by asking yourselves how you can sell water coming from your area for use downstream. How do you charge environmental fee? If you can already effectively implement this on the ground, then we can already talk about carbon trading. “Water-trading” through payment of environmental fees is local, while “carbon-trading” is global and much more difficult to implement.

For CBFM beneficiaries, the area is yours for as long as you do not destroy it. You can in fact charge environmental fees for taking care of your area. Obviously, there are still many things that need to be done. For example, can your CBFM control the problem of illegal loggers? *“Hanggang ngayon, maraming pa ring mga CBFM areas ang ninanakawan,”* Mr. Acosta pointed out.

There are a lot of potentials for carbon trading. But the question remains: If your community will take care of your forest, will the income benefit your people or only the government?

* * * * *

Myron, Bukidnon – Ordinary people do not understand carbon credit. They are more concerned about their survival. But when you tell them about food, they will know. Why not first establish the boundaries of protected forests, and then educate people about the need to protect these areas?

Romeo Acosta – The trend in Bukidnon is conversion from forestland to cornfields then to pineapple and banana plantations. But in other areas, the experience is direct conversion into plantations. We need to seriously examine the problem of deforestation and degradation. The view of policymakers is “export-oriented.” But this development strategy also ruins the environment.

On paper and law, forestlands are demarcated, but in practice, these lines are not respected.

LGUs therefore should take a bigger role in enforcement. There is a need to clarify the roles of DENR and LGUs. LGUs should not rely on the DENR and should play a more active role in taking care of their forests.

* * * * *

Nonoy – Are there available case studies showing the positive impact of REDD on local communities? How should REDD be pursued? Project level or national level?

Romeo Acosta – At present, the Philippines does not have any position on whether REDD should be pursued at a project-based level or national level. The government should determine its position during the negotiation. There must also be some pressure for the government to develop a national REDD strategy—accepted and concurred by all sectors—so that we will know what directions we are taking. Policies are easier to pursue if there is a national strategy that will guide local communities.

Yasmin Arquiza – There are available carbon studies with ECRAFT (?).

* * * * *

Crissy – There is huge funding for REDD. In fact, other countries are already way ahead the Philippines. If we don't develop strategies, we won't be able to access these funds. Other NGOs are saying, *"Kung hindi mag-benefit and community sa REDD at kung hindi makakatulong sa biodiversity conservation, huwag na lang. Isuli na lang ang pera."* There is a need to show some pilot cases and models. Tomorrow, we will discuss the experiences of Cambodia and Indonesia. It is never too late. We can draw lessons from them on benefit-sharing.

Pastor Rice – Based on experience, it is better to entrust the initiative to responsible people's organizations (POs). We refuse to entrust it through the NIPAS system. The politics of barangays is also causing destructions that are not good for the environment. Barangays lack sustainability. Barangay policies keep on changing. Its officials are also changing. While peoples' organizations have more continuity. In our area, the PO is already thirty-seven (37) years old. Yet, it keeps delivering on its mission despite the fact that only one of its founders is left.

Remy, Agusan del Sur – We don't need REDD because we already have a lot of policies. For example, we have policies on total log ban, but sad to say, no one has been put behind bars for violating it. If we just implement our policies well, we won't have any problems. We don't need a reward system. If we encourage people to plant trees just for the money, what will happen if money runs out? Do you think they will continue to plant trees? We just have to make the people understand the importance of the environment so that they will act. I don't believe in reward system. It will distort the values of people.

Community Organizer, Surigao – We have a lot of good laws but they are hardly implemented. For example, in our area, the DENR person approving the cutting of trees is not physically present in our area, and there is no way for him to monitor. The end result is: over-logging of trees and floodings. We should give more teeth to our laws.

Juland – We need to understand that forest is more than just carbon. There is “ecological death” in developed countries. The question is: what can we do to mitigate these risks? We have to strengthen the voices of the communities in the South countries. It is not just about the money. Those responsible should also be made accountable. The REDD++ presents an opportunity for us to take advantage of.

Chy – We should look at possibilities with a broader perspective. The indigenous knowledge of the Lumads and their wisdom on how to protect our environment should be valued. I agree that living things are silent yet vital stakeholders. Hence, we should put premium of biodiversity conservation.

Tom – I’ve noticed the trend of increasing “open-canopy” and decreasing “closed-canopy” forests. I believe that the agro-industrial policy of the government (e.g., expansion of banana and pineapple plantations) is a big driver of environmental degradation. Small-holder agriculture is still the best way to address the problem of food security and degradation—and this can be pushed as an agenda during the negotiation.

* * * * *

Yasmin Arquiza – These inputs are indeed very useful and can be included in the consolidated report coming from the Visayas and Mindanao regions.

Romeo Acosta – We have to adopt an inter-agency and inter-sectoral approach to effectively address the problem.

* * * * *

Boy – There are many issues in our ancestral domain in North Cotabato. There is an apparent conflict in jurisdiction between the DENR and the LGU with regard to the implementation of policies. For example, we have a CADT issued by the NCIP, but its implementation is by the DENR and the LGU. How do we resolve this conflict? There is conflict between NIPAS and CADT. Concerning the use of water coming from our ancestral domain by the Metro Kidapawan Water District, we still do not receive any income from it. What can REDD do? What can DENR do to help us? The FPIC is not being followed by the DENR.

Romeo Acosta – A jurisprudence is needed to implement that. The IPRA was enacted in 1997 but we already have policies on water utilization as early as the 1950s. In principle, the state believes that the ancestral domain belongs to the Lumads but the resources belong to it.

Yasmin Arquiza – Based on the CADT experience of Palawan, benefits are derived from tourism. Every area has unique experiences. Local communities just need to assert their rights, and they can get it.

* * * * *

Henry – Is there a good CBFM model with best practices and good working relationships among stakeholders? If yes, can REDD facilitate the field visit of participants to this area?

Yasmin Arquiza – The initiative is not yet final. There are some pilot projects in other countries that will be discussed by Crissy tomorrow.

V. Presentation of REDD Indicative Map

Mr. Bruce Young

Mr. Bruce Young presented several maps showing the bird, biopriority sites, and protected areas in the country.

He showed the locations of CBFM, CADC, and CADT as well as the current threats due to socio-economic pressures, logging TLAs (2001 data), plantations for biofuel (2007 data), and mining application tenement. There are eighty plus (80+) CADT areas and one hundred eighty-one (181) CADC areas in the country.

He then requested the participants to provide him data on other threats in their respective areas so that these can be reflected on the maps he is preparing.

Wrap-up/Synthesis of Day 1

Mr. Armando C. Pacudan

Regional Operations Manager, Foundation for Philippine Environment

Mr. Pacudan synthesized the discussions for the day as follows:

- Overview: what is the basis; why the REDD consultation; what has been done so far; who are the organizers;
- Three-pronged approaches: carbon sequestration; biodiversity conservation; payment for environmental services;
- Basics of climate change: understanding the science; climate vis-à-vis weather; climate trends;
- Climate change, land use and forest: defining reforestation, afforestation, deforestation and degradation; state of forests & land uses; REDD++; critique;
- Climate change and REDD: UNFCCC, Kyoto Protocol; comments and critique of REDD; incentive mechanism;
- Questions, concerns, and apprehensions on REDD; and,
- REDD indicative map: bird and bio-priority areas; land tenure instruments; threats.

The core of the discussion revolves around the importance of forests in curbing GHG emissions, and the incentives, carbon credits, and mechanisms.

It is a challenge and all stakeholders need to work together.

Focus should not be on incentives. The mechanism is just an added value. “Whether or not there is money, reforestation should continue,” Mr. Pacudan pointed out succinctly.

Instructions for Small Group Discussion 1

Before ending the Day 1 workshop, Mr. Ed Caharian informed the participants that they will be divided into groups the following day to answer the following workshop questions:

1. Based on the presentations, what is your understanding of REDD?
2. What is your view on REDD? Can this help us? Why or why not?

08 July 2009 (Wednesday) - Day 2

Recap

REDD secretariat Juland and Abi summarized the Day 1 workshop by showing the participants photos taken during the event. After the photo presentation, they started with a quiz bee to “warm up” the participants. Below are the ten (10) quiz bee questions:

1. Ano ang pagkakaiba ng climate at weather?
A. Climate – kalagayan ng panahon OVER LONG PERIOD OF TIME
Weather – kalagayan ng panahon hanggang dalawang linggo
2. Sa title ng presentation ni Prof. Cheryl Talde, ano ang dalawang cause ng climate change? **A. Natural and Man-made (anthropogenic)**
3. Ano ang ibig sabihin ng REDD? **A. Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation**
4. Ano ang dalawang + + na idinagdag sa REDD? **A. SFM at PAs**
5. Ayon sa presentation ni Ester, nasa ilang porsyento na lang daw ang natitirang gubat sa bansa? **A. 19-24%**
6. Magbigay ng isa sa mga ibig sabihin ng CoDe REDD? **A. Community Development through REDD/ Communities Developing REDD/ Conservation and Development through REDD**
7. Sino ang Presidential Adviser on Climate Change? **A. Sec. Heherson Alvarez**
8. Ano ang deforestation? **A. PERMANENT conversion of forestland to non-forest land use**
9. Ayon sa presentation ni Bruce, magbigay ng dalawang banta sa kagubatan / forest cover? **A. Socio-economic pressure, logging TLAs, biofuels, mining**
10. Ano ang pagkakaiba ng mitigation at adaptation?

REDD Key Messages

Mr. Tom Villarin

Executive Director, SIMCARRD

SIMCARRD Executive Director Mr. Tom Villarin provided the following key messages on REDD:

- Increased release of GHG from burning of fossil fuels (e.g., coal, oil, etc.) for energy use, industrial uses, unsustainable transportation;
- Effect of changing weather patterns is causing the extinction of species, droughts, floods, risking life on Earth;
- In 1992, the UNFCCC was adopted and 192 countries agreed to work together to stabilize GHG emissions into the atmosphere to prevent adverse climate changes from human activities;
- In 1997, Kyoto Protocol was ratified by 184 countries (except the US): 37 countries have binding targets to reduce GHG emissions at an average of 5% below 1990 levels (2008 to 2012);
- Addressing deforestation and land use change (which is responsible for 20% of GHGs) was not included in the Kyoto agreement;
- In 2005, a proposal was made in UNFCCC to include efforts to reduce deforestation and degradation in developing countries in the next climate agreement (after 2012):
 - Polluters pay through carbon trading
 - Developing countries with forests are saying that they should be paid for absorbing carbon emitted by industrialized countries
- Measure to provide positive incentives to developing countries to slow down their rate of deforestation and forest degradation to reduce emissions of GHGs;
- Industrialized countries make financial transfers to developing countries to compensate them;
- REDD “buys time” for other technological changes (e.g., green technologies) that reduce emissions from other sources (e.g., fossil fuels) at low cost;
- REDD can provide financing for forest management;
- REDD payments can be the compensation for communities for the forest management they already do and forest management they want to do but they cannot do for lack of resources;
- REDD can help or harm communities;
- If safeguards, proper policies, and measures are not put into place:
 - Payments may end up inequitably in the hands of government, corporation, and carbon traders;
 - REDD may mean restricted access (Protected Area style).
- We still have time to shape the REDD agenda. Do we take the REDD agenda forward?

The output of the consultative workshops will serve as inputs for the panel negotiations. REDD is about biodiversity preservation and conservation. Measures need to be adopted to mitigate the effects of climate change. If there is a need to pay the services of the forest peoples for taking care of our forests, then it should be pursued. What we are doing now is part of agenda-building at the local level to help build our national REDD agenda.

I. Small Group Discussion 1: “REDD and ME”: My Thoughts on REDD

Plenary Reporting

a. Group 1 – Western/Eastern Mindanao

Our understanding of REDD:

- A strategy to combat global warming;
- A program to clean our air and to protect our environment; and,
- An initiative to minimize the destruction of our environment that causes climate change.

Perceived positive effects:

- Can help if the program is directly managed by the community to further enhance the participation of local stakeholders;
- Can help if the government can improve its support on CADT implementation;
- Can help if sustainable agriculture is included in the program;
- Can develop community resource-based enterprise for livelihood;
- Basic sector can be included in the program implementation;
- Concrete policy that can easily be understood by partners in the local communities;
- Community-based approach; and,
- Should be REDD++.

Perceived negative effects:

- If the community does not understand the program and not consulted;
- If there are no free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC), and no information, education, and communication (IEC) campaigns;
- Will change the perspective of the people on the forest (from forest as “source of life” to forest as “money”); and,
- If the implementation of existing programs and projects are not changed.

b. Group 2 – Northern Mindanao

Our understanding of REDD:

- Another version of forest protection to address climate change;
- REDD is not “Green”—new and should be understood by all;
- Global issue affecting everyone;

- Need to study REDD thoroughly;
- Forest biodiversity protection;
- Educating IPs about climate change and about the effects of their actions as forest residents;
- Focus might just be on money;
- Opportunity to preserve the forests while POs and communities can earn;
- Possible conflicts in terms of area claims;
- Strategy to combat climate change;
- Green technology and carbon dioxide and monoxide emissions;
- Protection and conservation;
- Addresses global issue: climate change;
- Listening to the lectures;
- Claims/ownerships might prejudice the IPs;
- If fund-based, IPs might be exploited since money will be the culture;
- IP view of forests is not only ecological services but also culture;
- Can create conflicts in ancestral domains if only the head claimants are tapped; need to balance; some datus can be bribed;
- REDD can sponsor environmental protection and biodiversity conservation; need to identify boundaries; REDD is an industry or product; and,
- What are the mechanics for open- and closed-canopy forests? If open-canopy, for how many years?

Can REDD help or not:

- Can help but there are various bureaucratic levels/ layers / steps before reaching the community;
- Can help reduce GHG emissions;
- If we don't understand REDD and its framework, it can lead to corruption by government and head claimants;
- \$600M from Norway;
- Important role of forest dwellers;
- Should be 50%-50% benefit-sharing;
- Forest dwellers should be educated;
- FPIC and consensus-building among IPs are very important;

Define the roles of stakeholders:

- Forest dwellers/owners or community;
- LGUs / barangays;
- Government agencies: DENR and NCIP;
- NGOs;
- Role of government in revenue allocation; and,
- Academe to disseminate info (esp. on climate change) using LGU resources.

Principles:

- Sharing agreement (bottom-up approach); and,
- Decision-making level: IPs should not just affirm what has been negotiated and signed by the national government; they should be actively involved in the process.

Recommendations:

- Include discussion of role of oceans, seas, rivers, lakes, creeks in mitigating climate change; and,
- Instead of payment scheme, explore giving rewards/incentives to IP communities that conserve forestlands with ancestral domains.

c. Group 3 – Central Mindanao

Our understanding of REDD:

- Mere incentive mechanism;
- Movement for reducing emission of GHGs;
- Guide and methods in managing our natural resources;
- REDD will result in the unification of different stakeholders in biodiversity conservation; and,
- Awaken the consciousness of the community to preserve the forests.

Perceived benefits:

- Biodiversity conservation;
- Lessen environmental risks/problem;
- Alternative livelihood (as source of income); and,
- Increased awareness in mitigating environmental problem.

Perceived negative effects:

- Cannot reduce emissions as it will only lead to the disadvantage of the developing countries (break-even point: industrialized countries emit GHGs, while developing countries absorb their emissions); and,
- Can cause corruption among local and national officials.

Recommendation:

- “Carbon trading” should be community-based and implemented in areas where forests are found.

d. Group 4 – Visayas

Our understanding of REDD:

- An effort to include forest deforestation, degradation, and protection as part of the carbon issue (sinks);
- REDD = PROTECTION of existing forests; and,
- Prioritize protected areas.

REDD is helpful:

- We can protect our forests;
- Through this, we will not just protect our forests, but also address issues, like biodiversity, water, etc.;
- Forests as “carbon sinks” and not as sources of carbon emission; and,
- Community will be benefited and it is important to educate the people now.

Issues:

- Moral issue / perverse incentives;
- We have to concentrate our action on the protection of our forests;
- How can we effectively reforest when we cannot even protect our little remaining forests?
- Is REDD a “financial support”? Donation? Payment? Obligatory payment?
- Mechanisms / money should not be directly given to communities; instead, incentives should be in the form of help (e.g., livelihood); and,
- Sustainability of obligations.

e. Group 5 – Southern Mindanao

Our understanding of REDD:

- Vague: where do we start?
- Platform to address the problem of GHG emissions;
- Global action for the protection of rainforests for our survival;
- Opportunity for biodiversity conservation;
- Can help strengthen existing policies;
- Taxation;
- Market economy: Who dictates the price of carbon? Who determines quality of carbon?
- This is a nice idea but what are the hidden agenda behind this scheme?
- Global responsibility and recognition of interconnectivity;
- Opportunity for equitable response to climate change; and,
- Global encouragement for citizens to plant trees.

What is our view on REDD:

- Means to an end (option);
- Advocacy;
- Good concept;
- Revenues from REDD can be used to advance policy;

- Redundancy;
- Social responsibility;
- Apolitical / amoral;
- Reduction of source (sustainability);
- Support group (developing countries);
- Industrialized countries are polluting while developing countries are the ones “cleaning up”;
- Taxes for the environment, e.g., we should explore charging “green taxes” for vehicles; and,
- How much is the value if we plant one million trees?

Perceived benefits:

- Payment can be maximized;
- Proper environmental valuation;
- Proper implementation of forest land use plan (zoning);
- Total devolution of forest management;
- LGU can properly implement policy on forest conservation; and,
- Community-based and participatory.

Perceived negative effects:

- Cannot help;
- No clear policy;
- No follow-up on policy implications;
- Non-implementation of policies; and,
- Developing countries with forests are paid to sequester carbon emissions by industrialized countries.

II. Forest Carbon, the KEF Experience

Pastor Delbert Rice

Executive Director, Kalahan Educational Foundation, Inc. (KEF)

MOA # 1 was signed in 1974 recognizing the rights of the Ikalahan community over their land and resources. The agreement seeks to protect the watersheds and to provide livelihood for the indigenous peoples.

Environmental sustainability and ecological balance are given importance.

The youth are trained to study their roots for cultural continuity. Respect for the indigenous culture is fostered.

Community-based enterprises have also been established and the locals are encouraged to plan.

Our forests in Kalahan sequester carbon but we are not being paid.

So, we have blocked 10,000 hectares of our production forests into homogenous blocks and mapped them. We have established sample plots in each of the blocks and measured the diameter of trees in each sample plot.

This enables us to compute the amount of carbon sequestered by our forests. We have documented the amount of carbon sequestered by our forests since 1994 and the rate is increasing as our forests mature. It is now more than 10,000 tons of carbon per year.

We are trying to sell the carbon credits in the volunteer market. An agent is helping us prepare the documents to sell our carbon credits. We are planting 900 hectares of scattered grasslands for the CDM.

We believe that our community should be paid for its environmental services so that we can escape poverty, afford to protect and expand our forests, restore the wildlife, provide health services and appropriate education to our Ikahalan people.

The following are the prerequisites for forest people to be able to sustainably manage the forests: land tenure; cultural continuity; biodiversity; economic diversity; holistic planning; and ecological attitude.

Open Forum

Edwin – How do you measure carbon credits? What is the formula?

Pastor Delbert Rice – There is a technical formula to compute carbon sequestration of a forest. This can be done by measuring the diameter, height, and biomass of trees in a forest. Carbon sequestration is also computed by tree species and size.

* * * * *

Jerry – What are the techniques in propagating trees?

Pastor Delbert Rice – There are various techniques. For some hard wood like Almasiga, we can use a seed bed and give it partial sunlight. For Lawaan, we can use a nurse tree and plant the climax species. Every species has its own technique of propagating. Foresters can help figure out how to propagate these trees. We learn by doing.

* * * * *

Ven – Regarding your wildlife sanctuary, how come your community has not protected it? In making lumber products, do you have supporting documents? Are these lumber products coming from your CBFM area?

Pastor Delbert Rice – The Kalahan area has been an ancestral domain for over 150 years. Back in the 1970s, there was no ancestral domain law. When the first agreement expired, ancestral domain has already been recognized.

When I moved in Kalahan in 1965, there were no more wildlife and the area was barren. The main reason was: independence was granted and foresters came and claimed that the indigenous people are squatters of public land. The area was overhunted. But now, some wildlife are already coming back.

At present, we have a hunting season. The barangay is the custodian of bullets and knows who have guns for hunting.

We also have CADT. Because of this, we are not required to get DENR permit for as long as logs are consumed by the community and we are able to replace them sustainably.

We are at present negotiating for a resource utilization agreement that will allow the use of lumber not only by our community but also by others. Logging is outlawed, but cutting is allowed; provided, we replace the trees sustainably through tree planting.

We do not need any permit. In order to have CADT, you must have Ancestral Sustainable Management System that details how you plan to handle your forest. We will object if it goes through DENR for approval. There should be a clause for automatic approval if it is not acted upon by DENR on time.

* * * * *

Juliet – Do you also have an inventory of flora and fauna in your area?

Pastor Delbert Rice – We need more help for our flora and fauna. We've found 255 kinds of orchids, 270 species of birds (some not yet registered), and 2000+ plant species. But we have not yet touched on the ferns. We are watching for things, such as medicinal plants, that have economic value. We have entered into research agreements with schools to study these; provided that they will give us access to their research results.

* * * * *

Nonoy – What is the system for the payment of environmental services? Is there a provision for renewable energy?

Pastor Delbert Rice – Whatever income we get will go to the people’s organization. This will be used to provide social services (particularly health services) and for the salary of community doctors and teachers. We are still meeting with the barangays and sitios to get inputs on how to do this. There should be equitable sharing. Local initiatives to plant trees should also be properly accounted for. Details will have to be worked out yet.

III. Experiences of Implementing REDD in Cambodia and Indonesia

Ma. Cristina S. Guerrero
NTFP-EP Deputy Director

NTFP-EP Deputy Director Ma. Cristina S. Guerrero discussed the experiences of implementing REDD in Cambodia and Indonesia.

In the case of Indonesia, she delved into the issue of deforestation; the links to climate change; some of the impacts; the role of palm oil; REDD project objectives; forest cover in Kabupaten Ketapang; REDD pilot project in Sungai Putri; conservation values; project proposal of the Flora and Fauna International and Macquarie Capital Securities; oil palm plantation location permits; environmental threats; forest carbon measurement; peat measurement; estimate of carbon sequestered or conserved; potential revenues; social aspects and consultation; and, Indonesia’s comprehensive legal framework on REDD.

She likewise discussed some observations and concerns in Indonesia:

- Lack of details in project implementation mechanics may lead to confusion;
- Bundling of two or more REDD projects into a single unit is allowed; and,
- Government levy is to be addressed in a separate legislation.

Thereafter, Ms. Guerrero discussed the Cambodian REDD initiative, highlighting the forest cover change in the country; REDD CF Project; legal framework of REDD; background; project area; process of implementation; expected output; and, community negotiation.

The following are the lessons learned in Cambodia:

- Decide division of benefits early on;
- Fully engage govt. PM backing is critical to counteract drivers;
- Anticipate delays and prepare sufficient funds; and,

- Technical requirements are high.

In general, the process is centralized in Cambodia. Revenues are centralized and its utilization are clear, i.e., REDD revenues will be channeled to improve forest quality, to maximize benefits flows to local participating communities, and to study potential sites for future REDD projects.

Ms. Guerrero concluded her presentation with the following points:

- Other REDD countries have clear responsible agencies, approval processes, have support of national government, are aligning with international processes;
- Fund management and decision making is very centralized with national government, support from national government made with strong lobby, not participatory processes, though NGOs are trying to ensure community incomes are secured/high;
- Participation of community in REDD is weak, not by design (but by NGO sensitivity); Indonesian REDD regulation still does not recognize community land as eligible;
- The Philippines may have a better legal framework for communities to benefit from REDD; but we need to act fast and we need to learn from the experiences of other countries;
- We need to propel the national government into engaging on the development of a national strategy and framework (CoDE REDD);
- We need to develop pilots of different kinds of models; and,
- Need to build our capacity and understanding of REDD.

In closing, she urged the workshop participants to help in building a national strategy for the country.

IV. The CoDe-REDD Perspective

Marlea Munez
WISE, Inc.

The recent trend in addressing the problem is “institutional” because of the implications on responsibility and accountability.

REDD means “Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation.”

It also means resource management, economic development, development of organizations, and deference to rights.

Issues of transparency and corruption (by government, POs, and NGOs) can be addressed through capacity-building.

The advocacy concerns everyone.

We aim to include the CoDe REDD advocacy in the Copenhagen negotiations in December.

There is a growing interest to pay the ecosystem services of forest peoples for protecting our forests. Hence, we join the voices of many forest peoples all over the world in calling for a pro-community and pro-conservation REDD.

We believe in the following principles: forest conservation, biodiversity protection, sustainable forest management; land use planning; long-term forest protection; regulatory frameworks; local communities should not be given a heavy burden; need to address the drivers of deforestation; enforcement of environmental laws; and, information dissemination.

The scope of REDD includes countries with low levels of deforestation and degradation.

Indigenous, traditional, and community-based forest management practices that contribute to REDD objectives should be rewarded.

We can start small with project-based approach and later scale up to sub-national and national levels.

The basic gap at present is the lack of data on forest inventory. We can start small while there is no national government strategy yet.

In terms of biodiversity and ecosystem, forests have other values other than “carbon” sequestration. It is OK to cut trees because there is also carbon retention in wood used for domestic and industrial and commercial purposes. Old trees also need to be replaced because they have lesser capacity to absorb carbon. Communities can plan for sustainable cutting of trees by replacing trees that are cut down.

There should be incentives for the retention of carbon in natural forests.

Forests will re-grow in three to five years’ time. Since we are in a tropical country, denuded forest areas will re-grow—just don’t touch them for some time.

Community participation should be multi-stakeholders and multi-levels.

We should put a premium on: rights and indigenous peoples and local communities; rights-based agreement; gender equity and women rights; and, indigenous knowledge systems and practices among forest-dependent communities.

There is a need to clarify and institutionalize community rights to and ownership of forest carbon among stakeholders with existing and valid rights to forest resources. Equitable benefits sharing mechanisms adhering to social justice should be developed.

In terms of financing, we should consider the following:

- Provide stable funds for effective capacity-building and preparedness activities prior to and during REDD implementation;
- Unless CDM is overhauled, REDD financing should be implemented through a different mechanism;
- Diversify funding for REDD using market-based and fund-based sources;
- Provide opportunities for forest communities to participate in the development, direction-setting and management of fund-based mechanisms for REDD; and,
- Institute safeguards for market mechanisms in generating REDD funds.

We do not want “perverse incentives.”

“Ayaw rin natin na magtatamad ang mga bansa. Every country should clean their own backyard,” Ms. Munez emphasized.

Ms. Munez ended her presentation by urging everyone to join the REDD movement.

Open Forum

Ping Peria – If we can call for a stop in the expansion of plantations, can this be included in the REDD? If yes, can we quantify the value? Does the carbon market operate like a stock market? Is the market regulated? How is the price determined? I hope the Copenhagen negotiations can raise the price of carbon since the current rate is only \$2. Also, at present, it is much cheaper for companies to engage in polluting activities.

Marlea Munez – There are market-based and fund-based schemes. “Merong voluntary carbon trading. Maraming agreements na hindi open. Wala pang nangyayari sa Pilipinas

sa trading. For fund-based scheme, affected na tayo kase wala pa tayong national strategy.”

Crissy Guerrero – We need to look into carbon trading, capacity-building, markets, standards, and certification. At present, the carbon market is voluntary. We should look beyond carbon. REDD projects should pass the standards. “Kung ipatigil ang expansion ng plantation sa Indonesia, merong share ang mga tao sa income. Puedeng ma-credit in principle. Puede nating pag-aralan yung model ng Aceh on logging moratorium. Regarding price, CDM and other markets pay \$8 to \$12. We should look at the premium and make sure na hindi ma-undervalue. We also need to educate all stakeholders about standards and make a strong argument for it.”

* * * * *

Chy – There is a challenge for community-based participation in the country. We are more democratized. What are our safeguard mechanisms? It should be multi-stakeholder since we have institutional mechanisms. We can partner with people who believe in the advocacy. Also, communities should be given capacity to monitor their forests. Tenurial instruments are very important. We have the legal framework for IPs but the process is also costly. While we believe in IPRA, let us not be bogged down by too much bureaucracy. We should adopt an integrated approach and communities should gain at the end of the day.

* * * * *

Marlea Munez – We need to have concrete survey data so that we can pilot.

* * * * *

Juliet – So what are the next steps? What should the people do here?

* * * * *

Marlea Munez – What’s in it for you? Wala pa tayong national strategy. We would like to develop one based on inputs from all stakeholders. We will process and analyze the data for national strategy preparation. Dapat mapa-oo natin ang DENR USEc.

* * * * *

Jun – How do we pilot? What will be our role? We are willing to participate if given a chance.

Crissy Guerrero – We are conducting this consultative workshop for awareness building and to get inputs for national and international strategies. We are also requesting your

help in identifying other threats to be included in the map presented yesterday by Bruce.

Marlea Munez – “Merong areas na ready na for funding. Meron din dapat pang gawan ng proposals for pilot areas. Dapat sabay-sabay natin gawin. Gawin ng plano para sa piloting.”

* * * * *

Participant from Iloilo – We need to limit land use so that we can have an impact.

V. Small Group Discussion: “REDD Potentials in Mindanao & Visayas Context: Outstanding Issues, Concerns, and Future Courses of Action”

The workshop facilitator requested the five (5) workshop groups to answer the following questions and present their results in the plenary:

1. Based on the issues, concerns, and recommendations raised during SGD 1, which of these should be prioritized? How are you going to pursue these in the context of Mindanao/Visayas realities? Identify top three (3) priorities.
2. Using the CSO statement, please give your comments and recommendations to further enhance it.
3. Indicative map validation: Based on the indicative maps presented, are there existing and potential threats that are not reflected in the maps? [Please write the following: threats, contact persons, and contact details in a piece of paper and post it on the map.]

TOP 3 PRIORITY ISSUES/CONCERNS

a. Group 1 – Western/Eastern Mindanao

Top 3 Priorities:

1. Concrete policy that can easily be understood by the target partner communities;
2. Can help if the program will be directly managed by the community to sustain their participatory management; and,
3. Proper implementation of forest land use plan (zoning).

CSO statement: no comment

Recommendations: Conduct consultation and information drive in provincial and regional level (REDO)

Agusan del Sur- Agusan Marsh

- CSO
- AMDA
- PAMB

Surigao del Norte

- LNDA
- SIPLAS

b. Group 2 – Northern Mindanao

Top 3 Priorities:

1. IPs, CADTs and CBFMs

- Collaboration (rebuilding trust) between forest communities with government and private sector (multi-stakeholder and multi-level) and other concerned groups;
- Attune local and national initiatives to REDD;
- Advocate for trust fund to expedite tenure for forest dwellers and communities;
- Expedite issuance tenure to open access areas (CADT and CBFM); and,
- Promote IP governance to increase negotiation/bargaining power of IPs (aside from enabling LGUs, civil society).

2. Information, Education, and Communication (IEC) campaigns on REDD

- Prioritize IP forest/farming communities in information-dissemination and campaign activities (through tri-media and other creative means; series of trainings; pamphlets; posters)

Examples:

- > Re-echo the workshop—the IPs, LGUs, MPDOs, academe, DENR, DA, NCIP, plantation companies, and church
- > From this consultation, shape the TWG/WG for REDD
- > Working group for the region to patch up the gaps along the process

- Tap NTFP to re-echo the REDD (e.g., Northern Mindanao Stakeholders Consultation workshop on REDD in August 2009)

3. Capacity-Building

- Capacitate LGUs to legislate policies to support REDD process;
- Incentive-based (i.e., tax holidays, additional project funds) to reward conservation and groups undertaking mitigation measures;
- Document best practices and lessons learned;
- Build the capability of communities on resource inventory or carbon computation; environmental accounting; carbon trading; strategic planning for REDD;
- Integrate Climate Change-REDD mechanism into frameworks and CLUP, MDP, and ADSDPP; and,
- Revive indigenous structures and institutions.

Comments on CSO statement:

- Par 2, Last Sentence : Change “forestry” to “environmental” laws
- Par 3, 1st Sentence: Change “forestry” experts to “environmental experts and advocates”

c. Group 3 – Central Mindanao

Top 3 Priorities:

1. Strengthen community-based participatory approach about REDD++ including community resource-based enterprise or livelihood;
2. Support of the government on the issues of tenurial arrangement (i.e., CADT) through implementation of LGU policies on forest conservation; and,
3. Proper environmental valuation of ecosystem services including “carbon trading” issue.

Comments on CSO statement:

- *not clear in addressing poverty reduction and social services in the forest community (i.e., REDD revenues should address these issues)
- Point # 3 – General principles – promote and enforce (as it should be stated)
- Point # 3 – Scope – inclusion of CLOA and PACBARMA as REDD pilot areas
- Point # 5 – General Principles – the issue on taxation and tariff policies (?)

- General principles (inclusion) – implement ecological agriculture as a system of farming near the forest areas (in harmony with the environment)
- Preamble – exotic species should not be allowed; planting only of endemic species in denuded areas

d. Group 4 – Visayas

Top 3 Priorities:

PRIORITY CONCERNS/ISSUES	HOW TO PURSUE/RECOMMENDATIONS
I. Fast-track formulation of a national strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. REDD awareness among stakeholders 2. Create a “road map” – components of enabling mechanisms up to the local levels (includes planning, tasking)
II. Capacity-building	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training of stakeholders on the ff: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accounting of carbon and timber inventory - Financing agreement - Survey and mapping - Resource use, access, and distribution
III. Resolve the issue on carbon ownership	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Negotiation among stakeholders and other involved agencies 2. Come up with a written agreement on carbon ownership and equitable distribution of benefits

Comments on CSO statement: Shorten the preamble without losing the substance

e. Group 5 – Southern Mindanao

Top 3 Priorities:

1. Proper implementation of forest land use plan;
2. Community-based participatory forest management (devolution of forest management); and,
3. Proper implementation of policy on forest conservation.

Comments on CSO statement:

- General Principles:
 - Item 2 – ...economic development towards rural industrialization (renewable energy use and agri)
 - Item 4 – ...and on-the-ground delineation of boundaries
 - Item 5 – taxation should be progressive taxation

- Additional:
 - Promote use of renewable energy
 - Devolution of forest management and resources (include in IRA budget for forest, river, and municipal water protection)

- Scope:
 - Include areas with existing MOUs and MOAs among barangays, community, POs, and private individuals
 - Enact national laws (taxation for polluters); Clean Air Act only benefits LTO and emission tests (i.e., it has become a business); law should benefit forest

The consolidated list of threatened areas identified by the workshop participants follows:

THREATS	SIZE	AREA	CONTACT PERSONS
Highland banana plantation within the proximity of forest area	More or less 800 hectares and expanding	Arakan, North Cotabato	Edgar Araña green_amm02004@yahoo.com 0921-447-3025
Encroachment of Dole plantation into CADT areas	About 4 hectares	Barangay Buhay, Makilala, North Cotabato	Datu Jaime Odo 0921-734-0520
Expansion of	About 500 hectares	Kapatagan, Digos	Rick Paulmitan

THREATS	SIZE	AREA	CONTACT PERSONS
banana plantation	and expanding	City, Davao del Sur	0921-213-5877
Establishment of military camp (AFP) in CADT/protected area	About 10 hectares	Kapatagan, Digos City, Davao del Sur	Rick Paulmitan 0921-213-5877
Present mining application particularly in CARAGA region	No data on size; but believed to be large	CARAGA region	Jojie Asis jojieasis@yahoo.com 0926-457-3153
National roads traversing forest area		Arakan, North Cotabato	Juliet C. Bangi 0918-264-0713
Expansion of banana plantations		Idtig, Paglat, Maguindanao	Amrallah Abdulwahab 0905-906-6193
Road network "East-West" road cutting across Panay mountains		Panay	Melvin Purzuelo 0916-250-7401
Illegal fishing, mining, degraded forest to rubber plantation and agro forest; illegal poaching of trees			Venancio Cuyno 0921-536-4988
Slash and burn		Surigao del Sur	Rechie Tuldanes 0910-222-1555
Logging operation (legal and illegal)		Davao Oriental	Yul Baltazar enrodavaooriental@yahoo.com
Encroachment of oil palm, Jatropha plantation into buffer zones		Arakan, North Cotabato	Edgar Araña green_amm02004@yahoo.com 0921-447-3025
Mining hubs of the region		Davao Oriental and Com Val	Yul Baltazar Doris Valdesco enrodavaooriental@yahoo.com
Mt. Himiguitan Range as Protected area (entry to the World Natural Heritage) – extend perimeters to include the base of the mountain		Davao Oriental and Com Val	Board Member Tina Yu enrodavaooriental@yahoo.com
The need to co-manage/protect Sumlog watershed area (critical watershed) – threatened by Lupon-Banay Banay		ComVal Davao Oriental	Yul Baltazar PENRO, CENRO, ENRO enrodavaooriental@yahoo.com

THREATS	SIZE	AREA	CONTACT PERSONS
ricefields and by mining in ComVal			
Targeted for agribusiness plantation by SMC (oil palm, cassava, corn, banana, etc.)		5 municipalities of Davao del Norte: San Isidro, Talaingod, Kapalong, Asuncion, etc.	Betty More katakus@gmail.com
Mangrove cutting due to fishpond conversion		Negros Occidental	Edwin Abanil (034) 432-2922

VI. DENR Response

Usec. Atty. Lucille Sering

The reason why we have CDM is because of the industry emission of GHGs.

These GHG emissions can be traced to our lifestyle.

At present, carbon trading is strong on voluntary market, which gives lesser compensation compared to CDM.

REDD is a better alternative for forest people to have better compensation for their effort to preserve our forests. It puts a high premium on their environmental services.

REDD gives importance to planting of more trees. It is high time that we put value on our trees. We need to put a balance and think beyond economics. We must have strong partnership with the communities, particularly the indigenous peoples.

There should be a strong regulatory framework and incentive for REDD to be worthwhile. We have to consider what will be our benefits in exchange for not touching our forests.

Morality in protecting our forest is a must, and we should look at the bigger picture. We can start by being part of the REDD movement. Consultations like these are important.

We have all projects in DENR, but sad to say, we cannot be successful in drafting a strategy if this strategy is not translated into budget. Money is definitely needed to intervene.

We have P1.5 billion for climate change initiatives in DENR. Of course, there are politicians who will claim their share. Next year, there will be no money left. So we need to prioritize as soon as possible.

The impact of the civil society groups is already being felt at the top. CSO is very strong. Laws are being enacted because of CSO initiatives, and DENR has a hard time catching up.

We need to pursue mitigation and adaptation measures to address the problem of climate change.

A Climate Change Office has recently been established. REDD will be part of its technical working group.

The issue of climate change is a depressing topic, but consultations like these inspire us to learn and act.

What is important is we adopt a bottom-up approach in addressing the problem.

Open Forum

Tom Villarín – There is a need to address the conflicting government policies in relation to REDD. For example, the government lifted the ban on the expansion of plantation agriculture. There is no more limit as to the size/hectarage of banana plantations. One million hectares are being targeted for agro-industrial plantations. Agricultural areas and forestlands are already being encroached. How can these be addressed in terms of policy? Is DENR linking up with the DA in land utilization? What about the issue of mining? What should be prioritized when it comes to policies?

Usec. Lucille Sering – Definitely, there is a need to revisit these policies. DENR should issue ECC to monitor. Congress should amend the conflicting laws. Collaboration is one of the strategies under the natural adaptation framework of the government in addressing the problem of climate change. We involve various agencies. We cannot detach from each other. An interagency committee has been formed.

It is very important that we plant trees. We also have to identify the needs of those who will be affected if deforestation is halted. There should be a good mix or balance. Let's have REDD; we have to do it.

In Manila, awareness of climate change is heightened due to the worsening problem of floodings.

The recent global financial crisis was due to human greed. Prices of minerals went down. REDD is therefore a good opportunity for us to trade carbon to protect our environment. We prioritize and work for the protection of our environment and for the survival of the next generation—and we get to earn! REDD can be one of the solutions.

Awareness-building is important so people can be moved into action. The CSOs are the biggest sources of data on forest management because their efforts come from the heart. Their efforts help counter the weakness of governance in the country.

As to plantations, we should have a holistic framework. REDD should address the problem of forest degradation. If money (through CDM) is the solution, then bring it on.

* * * * *

Jerry – There are maps of our forests. But on the ground these areas have already been encroached. There should be sharing of responsibilities. If the barangay is very willing to manage the forests, then MOA between it and DENR should be sealed. The overly bureaucratic processes impede the desire of barangays to help. The DENR processes are circuitous. Time is ticking fast and the climate change problem is already worsening. It is high time that the responsibility be given to the barangays as direct stakeholders on the ground.

Usec. Lucille Sering – The reality is that DENR is one of the lowest budgeted departments of the government. We definitely need collaboration.

There are several laws that overlap. Even the mining law and NIPAS are contested. There is a need for a change. But we also have to follow the laws. We can come up with creative solutions, no matter how fragmented. Let us not be hindered by these legal obstacles.

The interests of IPs are irreconcilable with the interests of business.

We need your support. DENR is restructuring and downsizing its workforce. We only have one (1) forest ranger for every 5,000 hectares. We need all the help that we can get. We believe that devolution of authority is the key to addressing the problem.

For your barangay, it is perhaps just a matter of sitting down with your DENR RD to come up with creative solutions.

* * * * *

Ven – In our CBFM area in Zamboanga Sibugay, we tap “*bantay lasang*” to help take care of our forests. Since they are more familiar with the terrain of our forests, they

should be the ones who should be paid. Also, I'm asking why clearance is being issued to small-scale miners to operate within our CBFM area. At present, there are thirty-seven (37) approved small-scale mining operators in our area.

Usec. Lucille Sering – Issuance of permits to small-scale operators is within the jurisdiction of your governor. You can still protest it. The problem really is in coordination and the mindset of offices (e.g., mindset of MGB is to look for mines). If you can identify these areas, please give them to me so I can help address this concern.

In principle, minerals are owned by the state. We know that there is a general preference for mining. Conflicts in policies therefore need to be reviewed, harmonized, and rationalized.

Wrapping up / Consultation Evaluation

Mr. Ed Caharian, the workshop facilitator, requested all participants to fill out the evaluation form.

He then invited the participants to revisit the four (4) identified objectives of the workshop.

The participants agreed that these objectives have been met.

VII. Closing Remarks

Ma. Cristina S. Guerrero
NTFP-EP Deputy Director

We have heard a good response from the DENR undersecretary particularly in the area of adaptation strategy.

We are happy to note that the REDD will be part of the technical working group.

As discussed, we need good regulatory frameworks to effectively connect the community to buyers.

I would like to thank the GOM as the lead organizer of this event here in Davao.

I would also like to thank all the participants for actively participating in the discussions and providing critical comments.

Your inputs are invaluable as they will serve as vital inputs for the formulation of our national strategy.

This is not just about the money. This is about strengthening our community.

Closing Prayer

Pastor Delbert Rice led the workshop group in concluding the activity with a closing prayer.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

FORM NO.	THE CONSULTATION HAS HELPED ME...	THINGS/WAYS THAT HAVE NOT HELPED AND THAT NEED TO BE IMPROVED
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “informative”• “consultative”• “it helps concretize local plans and strategy”• “sharing experiences and reading materials”	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shows the need for people to participate• REDD aims to save address the problem	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Possible displacement of IPs and prohibition of entry to forests

FORM NO.	THE CONSULTATION HAS HELPED ME...	THINGS/WAYS THAT HAVE NOT HELPED AND THAT NEED TO BE IMPROVED
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> of climate change • Continue the preservation of forests • Improve the livelihood of IPs and CBFM holders 	
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “basics of climate change” • “climate change and land use of forests” • “CoDe REDD perspective” • “forest carbon experience in the Philippines and abroad” 	
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REDD provides broader perspective on climate change as a global issue • “issues of indigenous people with regard to REDD advocacy” • “REDD as a movement that must be pursued by government, NGOs, POs, and communities” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Include more tribal leaders in the discussion”
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “REDD++” • “importance of forest and its relationship with climate change” • “biodiversity conservation” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “proper environmental valuation of ecosystem services” • “clear policy on carbon trading”
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “new information and knowledge” • New opportunity for forest protection • “future coordination” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REDD is still vague; dependent on global meeting • Need to look into REDD models
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New opportunities for projects that can help the communities and protect the environment • A model of community management as presented by Pastor Delbert • Understanding of carbon trading 	
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helped me understand CoDe REDD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear on how to compute carbon sequestration of a tree • Need to conduct a case study (probably by interns) on the amount of carbon that a tree can sequester and corresponding payment • Conduct next meeting at Kalahan for actual site visit • We need to be trained technically on how to compute
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “REDD concept: strengths and weaknesses” • “status of REDD in the Philippines” • “DENR definition of forest cover” 	
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “climate change” • “global warming” • That we need to take care of our forests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aircon is so cold • Fast delivery of inputs • Technical terms were not translated into Bisaya / IP terms
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “climate change adaptation and mitigation” • “REDD++” • “CoDe REDD” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REDD++ : concrete policies that should emanate from the communities • Seminar-workshop on how to compute

FORM NO.	THE CONSULTATION HAS HELPED ME...	THINGS/WAYS THAT HAVE NOT HELPED AND THAT NEED TO BE IMPROVED
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “climate and weather” • “biodiversity conservation” 	
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “climate change” • “REDD and its concept” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation understood by all • Need to involve all LGUs, groups, networks in all provinces working on environmental protection
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “global warming” • “climate change” • “CoDe REDD” • Why we need to protect the environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks representation by province and region
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “climate change” • “reforestation, deforestation, afforestation” • What is REDD • Importance of forest in protecting Mother Earth and human survival 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very short time • Need to represent all stakeholders during consultation
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “REDD: its purposes and objectives vis-à-vis climate change” • “the morality of the CDM was somewhat clarified” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “a draft national strategy could have been presented for comments/ discussion by the group”
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “REDD” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be TNA
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “REDD: its rationale and initiatives” • “group discussions helped a lot; I was able to reflect and express myself and hear the reflections of other participants” • “recapping the activities and deepening through different ways including the ‘quiz bee’ style” • “participants coming from different sectors in the society” • “inputs from speakers helped a lot because they were excellent and credible” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “invite people from the church sector” • “more IP participation in consultation”
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “climate changes” • “awareness for exploring carbon” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “about REDD especially engagement between community”
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “very useful forum” • Good mix of participants but need to increase number • “more REDD information campaign” 	
20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “REDD = Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation” • “UNFCCC support; capability building; improvements of infrastructure; technology transfer and exchange of knowledge and experience for developing countries” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation should go down to the level of communities • Bring recorded data from community (CADT, CBFM, etc.)
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “REDD++” • Climate change; difference between 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “carbon valuation, measurements, methods”

FORM NO.	THE CONSULTATION HAS HELPED ME...	THINGS/WAYS THAT HAVE NOT HELPED AND THAT NEED TO BE IMPROVED
	climate and weather • CSO statement as a working paper to engage with CoDe REDD++	
22	• “global warming” • “climate change”	• Very short time and fast presentation • Process was good
23	• “climate change” • “REDD” • “community development”	• Need to conduct more consultations to improve plan • “community building” • Explain REDD to DENR and LGUs
24	• Understanding our situation • Nature and its condition	
25	• “REDD processes and concepts” • “urgency of REDD”	• More sharing of local experiences/ presentations (community-based examples)
26	• Big problem in our environment; CoDe REDD; our obligation	• Continuous education and initiatives to control global warming
27	• “REDD in general: meaning, process, pros & cons”	• Lacks time to share experiences of participants regarding situation in their respective areas • Needs national situationer on the condition of Philippine forests
28	• “CoDe REDD: what is it all about; principles, relevance, issues, concerns, status”	• “need to improve time management”
29	• Providing information to stakeholders, especially because it is difficult to convince the community to pursue REDD program	
30	• Understanding of REDD; selling of carbon and protecting the remaining forests	
	• CBFM manager will receive incentive for sustainable forest management and livelihood • Can also help conserve biodiversity and protect the environment; clean air, clean water • Learned from the experiences presented; more EICs needed	• Should be accompanied by action • Needs close supervision among DENR, NGOs, LGUs, and POs regarding status of projects
31	• “REDD – included in the current Clean Development mechanism of the Kyoto protocol; industrial processes” • “resource management; economic development; development of organization; reference to rights; REDD can provide needed financing for forest management; sustainable”	• Can help if program is sustainable; cannot help if they will not provide financial support in developing our association; support will help us with our forest management program
32	• “CoDe REDD” • “IP rights in CoDe REDD” • “carbon trading”	• “suggestion – follow-up training re carbon inventory”

