

---

**WRITESHOP ON THE REDUCING EMISSIONS FROM DEFORESTATION  
AND FOREST DEGRADATION STRATEGIC PLANNING**

**Writeshop Report**

**Submitted by**

International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR)  
Regional Center for Asia  
Km. 39 E. Aguinaldo Highway  
4118 Silang, Cavite , Philippines  
Telefax +63 46 414 3417/ 4141420  
Website: [www.iirr.org](http://www.iirr.org)



## I. Introduction

Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries or REDD is an effort to create a financial value for the carbon stored in forests, offering incentives for developing countries to reduce emissions from forested lands and invest in low-carbon paths to sustainable development. In the Philippines, Non-Timber Forest Products Exchange Program (NTFP-EP) is facilitating the formation of CoDe REDD Philippines. The latter recognizes the importance of exploring the potentials of sustainable income streams for forest-based communities through the REDD scheme. It has conducted various consultations nationwide including a workshop last November in formulating the national strategy for REDD. NTFP-EP plans to finalize the strategy by employing a writeshop methodology to take it a step further towards a consultative crafting of the first strategic plan of REDD in the Philippines.

### The Writeshop Process

The writeshop is a participatory process of writing and editing. The International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) pioneered the use of the writeshop to engage development practitioners and partners in a participatory process of documenting experiences in development work and creating popular printed materials. It has led to the production of + 50 titles for over 15 years in over 30 workshops. IIRR produces these publications on a non-copyrighted basis in partnership with various donor organizations, UN agencies, NGOs and foundations.

The 2 ½ days activity to draft the national strategy on REDD was participated by 53 representatives from the DENR and other government agencies (20), academe and research group (6), Non-Government Organizations (19), community (3), local government units (1), REDD experts (4). IIRR provided a running documentation of the writeshop. The activity was held in Baras, Rizal, Philippines last March 17-19, 2010.

### Objective and Scope

The writeshop is one of the activities organized by NTFP-EP to prepare the National REDD Plus Strategy and to provide a platform for different stakeholders to discuss, critique and give comments on the draft outputs. Specifically, this activity aims the following:

- Seek clarity on the articulation of REDD Plus and its processes
- Develop drafts of each section (9) for integration
- Gather suggestions for the introduction of the final strategic plan document
- Agree on the next steps to finalize the REDD strategic plan document

## II. Summary of Activities and Methodology

The writeshop started with the introduction of participating institutions, organizers and support organizations. In the welcome remarks of Ms. Cristina Guerrero of the NTFP-EP, she briefly presented the historical background and rationale for this activity.

The group also acknowledged the presence of Mr. Laurence Ang, representative of the Philippine Climate Change Commission, and Mr. Jacob Phelps, an intern of NTFP-EP who is currently doing studies on the various REDD initiatives in several countries in Asia. He served as one of the resource persons for the formulation of the National REDD Strategy Paper and will finalize the draft that come out of the writeshop.

After the opening session, the over-all moderator for the day, Ms. Marlea Munez of WISE, presented to the body the main objectives and scope of the writeshop. This was followed by a short presentation on the writeshop as a collective process of producing various forms of printed materials for education, information and advocacy. The writeshop methodology would inspire and guide the two and a half day process of coming up with the National REDD PLUS Strategy Paper. The schedule was then presented and affirmed by the body.

In the usual writeshop method, the contents as well as lay-out of each draft would be subjected to rigorous collective critiquing, editing, re-writing and re-formatting. An assigned group of writers from the participating organizations would finalize each draft based on the results of the collective critiquing in the plenary sessions. Three cycles of collective critiquing would end up with a 3<sup>rd</sup> draft of the written materials, the preferred lay-out and illustrations for each of the written materials.

For the two and a half-day writeshop, there was not enough time to go through a collective critiquing of each of the 9 thematic groups or sections of the strategy paper. Given the limited time, a modified version of the writeshop was adopted for this particular activity. The process that was adopted was simply a short presentation of each thematic section after which thirty minutes was allotted for clarificatory questions, comments and suggestions on the content and writing style of each section. The editing and revision of the drafts was done at the end of the day by an assigned group of writers and the revised draft was again presented for comments the next day. Two cycles of this simple process was undertaken in the two days.

The draft REDD Plus National Strategy Paper was divided into nine thematic groups: 1) Context, 2) Strategic Directions, 3) Policy, 4) Governance, 5) Resource Use Allocation and Management, 6) Monitoring, Research and Verification, 7) Research and Development 8) Capacity Building and 9) Sustainable Financing. The author of the section on "Context" was not around during the first day and so the 1<sup>st</sup> drafts of the next four section: Strategic Directions, Policy, Governance and Resource Use Allocation was presented and critiqued by the body. Rewriting of these four sections based on the

comments and suggestions offered during the plenary were undertaken by the group of writers assigned to each. In the morning session of the 2<sup>nd</sup> day, the 1<sup>st</sup> drafts on the section on MRV, Research and Development, Capacity Building and Financing were also presented and critiqued. In the afternoon of the second day, the second cycle of draft presentation and critiquing proceeded until the morning of the third day.

To further provide guidance and direction to the formulation of the National REDD Plus strategy paper, a short presentation was provided by Dr. Antonio La Viña, Consultant for the National climate Change commission and Chief Legal Council of the Philippine Delegation to the International Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen in October 2009. Dr. La Viña, shared with the body the critical issues that arose in the negotiations in Copenhagen as well as critical points for discussions on REDD that might be taken up in Mexico in 2011.

The final session in the afternoon of the third day ended with a second draft of the strategy plan. After the discussions on the second draft the body discussed other general concerns in regard to the finalization of the draft. The final session was an action planning session that determined the immediate next steps that the CODE REDD-Philippines needs to take to be able to proceed with the participatory process of crafting of the first strategic plan of REDD in the Philippines.

To close the writeshop, Mr. Joey Austria DENR, Bruce Young and Ms. Cristina Guerrero of the NTFP-EP thanked the participants.

**III. Summary of comments and suggestions during the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle plenary**  
(see Annex 1 and 2 for complete documentation of round 1 and 2 presentation)

Theme	1 <sup>st</sup> draft	2 <sup>nd</sup> draft
1. Strategic Directions	There should be one mission statement for all  Set qualitative and quantitative targets  Timeframe should be agreed on	Timeframe will include readiness (2-5 years) and full implementation (10 years)
2. Policy	Offer a menu of options for carbon ownership  Conceptual options for financing  Include discussion on conflicting laws	Articulate safeguards in the document  Principles on sharing schemes instead of proposing actual scheme
3. Governance	Capacity building should include LGU	Option 1 preferred and NCIP should be part of the sectoral body

	<p>Present several options for governance of REDD</p> <p>Address the issue of political arrangements</p>	
4. Resource allocation	<p>ANR concept will be discussed in the annex</p> <p>Definition of terms</p>	<p>Definition of production and protection</p> <p>Discussion on FPIC should be included in this section. The NCIP Director will help write this section</p>
5. MRV	<p>On the final diagram, integrate the climate goals with the non-climate related goals because actually poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation are also climate</p>	<p>Parts of the introduction will be transferred to the definition of terms.</p> <p>A portion to explain the variation on the NAMRIA and FMB data</p> <p>Articulate into a strategy the baseline collection. Type of approach to be taken in the baseline. Dir. Acosta and Yay to write their recommendations</p>
6. Research and Development	<p>Private sector's role related in R and D should be noted by policy section</p>	<p>Studies on climate change can be included in the introduction and in the methodology of MRV or with Research and Development. Dr. Lasco and Yay's data, will be included in the appendix.</p>
7. Capacity Building		<p>Include in the trainings academe and research institutions</p> <p>Include module development as a separate activity</p>
8. Financing	<p>Include a portion for cases of 'what if situations' to anticipate problems and present possible solutions</p> <p>Consider options such as portfolio investments, debt for carbon</p>	<p>Make more explicit in the document that we will do baseline study for assessment of situation of communities pre-REDD. To also include the cultural aspect in terms of resource use patterns. Feasibility studies should also</p>

	National REDD strategy has to clearly articulate where investors can invest and help communities implement REDD	include social preparation. Baseline data gathering will be done by RUAM and R&D before piloting as basis for assessing if the site is 'REDDable'
--	---	--

#### IV. General Concerns and Next Steps Ahead

##### 1. Primary Users of the NRSP

The body agreed that the primary target audience and users of the NRSP are the REDD Plus practitioners/organized groups, LGU technical working groups, People's organizations involved in CBFM, Government agencies (DENR, etc.), the Climate Change Commission, funders/donors of REDD Plus. The target users and audience of the NRSP should define the language and writing style of the document.

##### 2. Timeframe covered by the NRSP

- Readiness (5 years) – includes demonstration, scaling up, capacity building
- Full implementation

##### 3. Additional Suggestions for the thematic groups:

Context Analysis	Include discussion on the significance of the Philippines in the global REDD+ scenario
	Add a section on 'Risk Assessment' right after the Context analysis, even the sections on MRV and Ruam already discusses this.
Strategic Directions	Include discussion on indigenous knowledge, skills and practices (IKSP) and cultural identity
Policy	Include discussion on 'safeguards'
MRV, Sustainable Financing	The baseline assessment should include 'cultural accounting' and a section on how to deal with the cultural impact of REDD Plus
others	Glossary of terms to be placed at the end of the document. But for key terms or concepts, put this as footnotes so that the reader immediately sees definition of the term used on the same page.

Plans for the Immediate Next Steps Ahead

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
Determine targets	March 26
Submission of component writers to Jacob (Jacob to email writing guidelines to all the writers)	March 26
Submission by Jacob to writers	April 5
Submission by writers back to Jacob	April 8
Draft submission of NRPS	April 12
Meeting with CCC commissioners (Mayumi Natividad, Dir. Marlon Mendoza, Cristina Guerrero, Dr Juan Pulhin, Marlea Munez, Pastor Delbert Rice, Romeo Acosta, Dir. Leilene Gallardo)	

**V. About the Organizing Institutions/Agencies**

The National REDD Plus Strategic Planning is a multistakeholder collaboration between the Forest Management Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and CoDe REDD Philippines. This collaboration is with funding support from Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SDC) and Nature and Poverty.Net.

1. **CoDE REDD-Philippines** refers to a loose group of forest-based communities and Non-Government Organizations composed of AntroWatch (AW), Environmental Legal Assistance Center, Inc (ELAC), Fauna and Flora International (FFI), Go Organic Mindanao (GOM), Kalahan Educational Foundation (KEF), Philippine Federation for Environmental Concern (PFEC), Upholding Life and Nature (ULAN), Women Initiative for Society and Environment (WISE, Inc.), working towards pro-community and pro-conservation REDD thru REDD plus advocacy.
2. **Forest Management Bureau** – is a line bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources that provides support for the effective protection, development, occupancy management, and conservation of forest lands and watersheds. It collaborates with international and local development organizations in several forestry development programs.
3. **Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)** is Switzerland’s international cooperation agency within the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA). In operating with other federal offices concerned, SDC is responsible for the overall coordination of development activities and cooperation with Eastern Europe, as well as for the humanitarian aid delivered by the Swiss Confederation. The goal of

development cooperation is that of reducing poverty. It is notably meant to foster economic self-reliance and state autonomy, to contribute to the improvement of production conditions, to help in finding solutions to environmental problems, and to provide better access to education and basic healthcare services.

4. **Nature and Poverty.Net** is founded by the IUCN National Committee of the Netherlands, in close cooperation with 17 Dutch-based organisations and their NGO partners in the South, to support a process that helps organisations better learn from each other to improve their work. Natureandpoverty.net started its first activities in 2007.

## VI. List of Participants

### Government Agencies (20)

- |                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| 1. Servando Acendo         | PENRO, Southern Leyte                    |
| 2. Maritess Agayatin       | PAWB                                     |
| 3. Lawrence Ang            | Climate Change Commission                |
| 4. Isabelita Austria       | Forest Management Bureau, DENR           |
| 5. Joey Austria            | DENR                                     |
| 6. Beata Baradlan          | DENR-NAMRIA                              |
| 7. Jose Cabayan, Jr.       | NAMRIA                                   |
| 8. Remedios Evangelista    | Forest Management Bureau, DENR           |
| 9. Julian Escosura         | TEFI                                     |
| 10. Anthony Foronda        | PCARRD-DOST                              |
| 11. Leilene Marie Gallardo | National Commission on Indigenous People |
| 12. John Jamarillo         | Forest Management Bureau, DENR           |
| 13. Rex Manoso             | Forest Management Bureau, DENR           |
| 14. Edilberto Nasayao      | Climate Change Office, DENR              |
| 15. Mayumi Natividad       | Forest Management Bureau, DENR           |
| 16. Edna Nuestro           | Forest Management Bureau, DENR           |
| 17. Nilda Patiga           | Forest Management Bureau, DENR           |
| 18. Lovella Segayo         | Forest Management Bureau, DENR           |
| 19. Jun Sibucan            | Forest Management Bureau, DENR           |
| 20. Lourdes Wagan          | Forest Management Bureau, DENR           |

### Non-Government Association (19)

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. Abigail Aguilar  | Non Timber Forest Product TF                 |
| 2. Grizelda Anda    | Environmental Legal Assistance Center        |
| 3. Ronal Altamirano | Fauna and Flora International                |
| 4. Arlynn Aquino    | Non Timber Forest Product Exchange Programme |
| 5. Ester Batangan   | Non Timber Forest Product Exchange Programme |
| 6. Rowena Boquiren  | Conservation International                   |

- |                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| 7. Tanya Conlu               | Non Timber Forest Product TF                   |
| 8. Hazel Consunji            | Environmental Leadership Training Initiatives  |
| 9. Bong Dela Torre           | Kitanglad Integrated NGOs                      |
| 10. Mark Dia                 | Greenpeace South East Asia                     |
| 11. Cristina Guerrero        | Non Timber Forest Product TF                   |
| 12. Neal Aldrin Mallari      | Fauna and Flora International                  |
| 13. Katherine Mana           | Non Timber Forest Product TF                   |
| 14. Marlea Munez             | WISE   |
| 15. Laarni Ocampo            | Non Timber Forest Product TF                   |
| 16. John Francisco Pontillas | Palawan Council for Sustainable Development    |
| 17. Edmundo Rico             | Fauna and Flora International                  |
| 18. Florena Samiano          | Philippine Federation of Environmental Concern |
| 19. Portia Villarente        | ANTHROWATCH                                    |

Community/ people's Organization (3)

- |                   |                                |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Venancio Cueno | Region 10 CBFM                 |
| 2. Delbert Rice   | Kalahan Educational Foundation |
| 3. Isagani Santos | NATRIPAL, Palawan              |

Academe and Research (6)

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. Leonida Bugayong | FDC University of the Philippines Los Baños  |
| 2. Antonio Lavina   | Ateneo School of Government                  |
| 3. Erlinda Mari     | FRDI University of the Philippines Los Baños |
| 4. Honorato Palis   | PCARRD                                       |
| 5. Florencia Pulhin | FDC University of the Philippines Los Baños  |
| 6. Lawrence Ramos   | ICRAF  |

LGU (1)

- |                   |                                 |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Jose Caputilla | Municipality of Quezon, Palawan |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|

International Organization (4)

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. Romeo T. Acosta  | Asian Development Bank                       |
| 2. Peter Sluijs Van | IUCN   |
| 3. Jacob Phelps     | Consultant/Integrator, NTFP-EP               |
| 4. Bruce Young      | Non Timber Forest Product Exchange Programme |

## ANNEX 1: ROUND 1 CLARIFICATORY QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

### 1. STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Clarifications	Author's Response	Suggestions/Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Forestland as used in the document, as forest cover or classification</li> <li>- Just upland ? what about wetlands?</li> </ul>	wetlands to be included because its water ecosystem approach	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where in the mission is the R and D?</li> </ul>	R and D- cross cutting, better articulated in the R and D section	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Statement of obj-stated as qualitative or set target (qualitative)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Both</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PO and IP- paano yun communication (from technocrats to community)? Mode of com or engagement esp sa IP, how can the process be empowering esp sa IP?</li> </ul>	<p>The process must always participatory and therefore decisions will be communicated to various participants of governance</p> <p>It was suggested that a dialogic process with the various sectors, especially with the IPs should be undertaken. And we start with an attitude of humility, rather than knowing it all</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financing- more discussions on how REDD can be economically viable (baka kasi maliit ang pondo)</li> </ul>	Finance group to discuss	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- what is the basis of tenure? timeframe</li> </ul>	timeframe: we need to agree if this is a 5-year or a 10year plan.	

<p>- Strategic direction as preambular part and capture the whole essence of the document</p> <p>Do we need to have an over-all mission statement for all</p>	<p>Yes, it would be good to have a mission statement for all, then we will have roles and responsibility for the various sectors. It is important to have specific set of responsibilities so that we know who is accountable</p> <p>will capture after the 2<sup>nd</sup> round</p>	
	<p>One vision for all stakeholders, but should not subsume roles/mandate of all stakeholders</p>	<p>On the Vision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the way the vision was presented not promoting collaboration</li> <li>- should be a broad statement of collaboration</li> </ul>
	<p>on pop mgmt: pop mgmt in relation to land use mgmt and disaster mgmt</p> <p>Group writing on governance should handle this concern on population</p>	<p>On the pop'n</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-look at rate and movement of population</li> <li>- consider migration</li> </ul>

## 2. POLICY

Clarifications	Answers by writers	Suggestions/comments
<p>Is this a section that would include matters related to finance architecture? Who owns the carbon? Where would that be handled/ discussed?</p>	<p>As an option, the group can come up with a structure of a national legal framework , with a IUCN framework as a guide.</p>	
<p>Would finance architecture be explicitly written down in the REDD strategy or one of the endeavors? For the ownership of property rights, it should be</p>	<p>There is a conceptual options that can be considered in the section.</p>	<p>As part of the whole process, the group should set the landscape of identifying who would make the decisions.</p>

<p>discussed in the section, including key points.</p> <p>Would you intend to resolve that in the next 2 days?</p>		
<p>On carbon ownership, if we have a national, local- level program – it should be included in the policy on the negotiations aspects</p>	<p>If it is carbon, the opinion is- it is owned by IPS but subject to the existing regulations involving taxes and other permitting requirements.</p>	<p>Come up with the proposed national legal framework that will address issues such as who owns the carbon? Address benefit sharing,e.g</p> <p>We can indicate this in the framework – ownership questions. There are actually conceptual options to address this.</p> <p>Who owns carbon withn the ancestral territory,it is the indigenous community but they are covered by laws on taxation, etc.</p> <p>I suggest that we advocate for a position or we can have conceptual options, a range of options, depending on the applicability of these options, bearing in mind the community’s preference. But we have to get the sense of the participants of this workshop Be firm on the national framework. How comfortable we are in the negotiations in terms of bilateral, ODA negotiations. The way to go is to identify options and what are applicable to the. Offer a range of options bearing in mind the community perspective will dominate</p>

		<p>Pax: can we park this issue of ownership of carbon and see how the other sections also address this.</p> <p>wag natin kalimutan yung carbon taxation.</p> <p>Isama yung pag-address sa issues ng mining, issues re agriculture</p>
<p>On carbon ownership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- will this section include definition of who owns the carbon</li> <li>- Will that be written explicitly</li> <li>- Will that be resolved w in this activity?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- will include esp the benefit sharing</li> <li>- it will be in the financing and included in the framework, there are conceptual options that can be considered and included</li> <li>- firm up the national framework and identify range of options</li> <li>- no</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carbon ownership – negotiation is one issue discussed, do we need to have a policy negotiation ...</li> <li>- Ven – should be included in the policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o carbon taxation</li> <li>o population control as pop'n is considered a threat;</li> <li>o mining;</li> <li>o agriculture</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>sectoral policies (e.g. agri, mining)</p> <p><b>PARK the carbon ownership issue</b></p>
		policy incentives
		include intellectual property rights
<p>How can we encourage entities to go into clean technologies and how this can be accessed by the communities given limited resources to invest on these technologies. Consider</p>	<p>The proposal for a legal framework is an option. Can look into other options on the interim to see if local legislation can start, CCA formulating a strategy.</p>	

IPR in policies		
How to address Non-forestry policies that may come in conflict with the REDD plus proposed policies (e.g land conversions allowed by DAR)	We need to mention conflicting laws, because the first threat to REDD are some laws such as the mining act. We will indicate this as part of reality. But the climate change act can provide us the opportunities to revisit and hopefully revoke these laws that are contradictory to REDD. We really need to harmonize our policies.	
Threat to REDD are conflicting laws		- consultation with all sectors esp private sector; climate change debate can be an opportunity to revisit and hopefully revoke conflicting laws
Where are the reps of TLA since indicated that this is multistakeholder		
Are we going to include specific strategies, eg. Specific legislation for REDD or do we situate this in the current climate change act	Local legislation is an option. It is not the only solution,we can identify various creative solutions but yes, we will advocate for local legislation.	
		Existing documents from other countries (World Bank) and it was observed don't explicit state who owns carbons. Some cites examples. Others cites gaps that the need to be addressed.

### 3. GOVERNANCE

Clarifications/Questions	Author's response	Suggestions/comments
Sharing agreement- 25% to be deposited in the DENR/PO	Its just a reference. This is just one model we can study	
		Institutional governance of

		REDD
		On page 3, letter d: look at the capacity requirements: we look at both the present and required capacities and address the gaps
		On page 3, letter d) we also include capacity building of LGUs, not only IPs and forest dependent communities
		LGU to be capacitated should be mentioned in ref to page 3 let d Roles and responsibility of stakeholders should be in this component
		Governance format can be adopted by other components kasi mas clearer, the REDD strat plan can be written this way
Are we going to have an indicative clause on the NPRS that we would continue to assess the capacities of the FMB, CCC, etc.? Have a statement that establishes a mechanism to engage these issues. Use CCC and the advisory board as venues given the mechanism in the CCC per IRR of CC Act.		
Should we have a designated national authority and national mechanisms (a multi-stakeholder mechanism? Is this within the climate change commission?) for the regulation, monitoring of REDD, to	* maybe we can present several options to address this.	

address issues arising from the REDD implementation		
How do we address building trust between communities, perceived conflict of interest between communities and LGUs?	This portion is not clearly articulated in laws although we claim policy formulation and implementation is claimed to be participation. But we want to be able to clearly articulate this in this section	
How do we address the issue of institutional and political arrangements?	How do we depoliticize the process? Yes, we should elaborate on this in the document	Elaborate on political arrangement in page 1- is this same as political will? what strategy to address this issue
How do we operationalize enabling policy? How do we empower forest managers? How can policies help them transform for an improved forest management?		Policy alone cannot transform. Enabling environment will be discussed by the section on capacity building

#### 4. RESOURCE USE ALLOCATION and MANAGEMENT

Clarifications	Author's Response	Suggestions/Comment
Define ANR particularly the A	In the UDP experience, there is a need of full understanding of ANR. Part of the Annex will include the explanation of the real ANR. Technically address in the paper as part of the annex	
		There are cases in organic farming program implementation that DA would provide incentives to farmers if chemical fertilizers are procured. The said practice is contradictory to the goal of

		organic farming.
	Goal oriented rather than process oriented contracts on land tenure. To be discussed by the governance group	No trust to community as managers even if they are called forest managers because of the demand for extensive paper work
1 <sup>st</sup> strategy- what production forest means, how it is defined? Are this already identified? Are these forest plantations?  the 1 <sup>st</sup> strategy seems to promote production than promoting sustainability, better if ecosystem approach	Just to determine the available areas for both  Production forest means to allow sustainable use- timber and non-timber production  In intro, we said we will delineate first forestland boundaries. But this task is still ongoing.	Delineate first permanent forest estate then let the managers define the zonings  In the intro, include what has been done/being done now by the dept as far as forest land use planning is concerned. List initiatives vis-a -vis defining forestland boundaries. (e.g some provinces have existing forest land use plan)
	the group will meet to agree on targets	How realistic are the targets? Be practical and achievable
		In agro-forestry the 60:40 may not be viable instead have a menu of options and not prescribe the 60:40
		In the REDD strat plan, what specific do want to achieve, considering what is being done? We are not starting from zero. What areas are we prioritizing in terms of our interventions?
	This should already be part of the section of r&d but will be discussed for final decision	How to proceed with the piloting is that with R and D or with the resource use group?
	Include this in the strategic directions. (e.g. If we will focus on areas with land use plan, we need to identify this in the strategic direction)  Although it is not for the	Forest management plan should be climate smart/climate proof. The strategic direction yesterday did not identify the short-term and long term direction for planning.

	<p>strategic direction group to set the priorities, each section should do this.</p> <p>In REDD+, ANR will be included. ANR will result to enhanced carbon stock but we need to clearly define ANR.</p>	<p>Can we include that in the section on the strategic direction? What can be done in support of what gov't is doing?</p>
		<p>Have a definition of terms in the Section since there are interchangeable terms such as ANR, regeneration</p> <p>Based on the standards available and current practice, ANR is ineligible for REDD. The said strategy it covers forest protection and governance and management.</p>
		<p>Must be articulated in the strategies of the RUAM section on REDD and REDD+. There is no standard (c/o R&amp;D)</p>
		<p>Under No. 5 – suggest split the said section (on biodiversity spp).</p>
		<p>On the process in the formulation of the strategy on RUAM, it seems that there is no common understanding of the process that we tend to touch on the issues of additionality and permanence.</p>
		<p>The strategic directions section posted that the NPRS is 10 year plan. Section groups should provide the prioritize given the time frame</p>
		<p>Careful on the use of the word of plantation-</p>

		<p>plantation is not forest because it doesn't promote biodiversity</p> <p>Assumption that protection forests sequester carbon, I do not agree it is zero sequestration. The real sequestration is in the production forest therefore we should work on this</p>
--	--	--

### 5. MRV

Clarifications	Author's Response	Suggestions/comments
		Note for tomorrow that there are segments that would be part of a cluster (e.g the MRV institutional framework could also be part of governance)
		Realized the MRV is a basic and summarative tool attached to REDD unless we know that recommended strategies would work well. Want to have an institutional framework for the strategies to be in placed
		Ensure gender responsiveness is not assumed, can it be articulated in the text?
	The same plots will be re-measured but very limited funding and just ensure no encroachment	On the estimation of FRA plots, there are only 70 plots that are maintained. Revive the 300 plots plus the additional plots. These same plots will be measured in the next assessment
		<p>What to do with the clouds????</p> <p>- there are still 10</p>

		<p>passes, so hopefully at least 1 can capture a clear image</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- at least 10% cloud free</li> <li>- 2005-2007 may data but not sure if useful</li> </ul>
		Explore funding for imagery from WB w higher similar to WB's assistance to Panama.
		Forest cover should be 2003 not 2005 in the 1 <sup>st</sup> slide
	<p>KALAHAN exp – spend money in the community and not in the technologies since it is more accurate at least to areas w community but to areas w out then the satellite can be utilized; they have learned from their initial mistakes and continue to improve their system; can be done at the local level, equipments like a small computer is enough</p>	<p>Where does the scientist see the level of community participation in MRV</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not only participation (measurement, interpretation) but also in decision making</li> </ul>
		Can be included in RUAM the activities that pertain to the development of plans. The information in the said plans can be used in the MRV.
	<p>It is not reported as absolute figures from satellite data. Ground truthing is also conducted</p>	<p>Result from the satellite should be verified by the community before it becomes final</p>

## 6. R and D

Clarifications/Questions	Author's response	Suggestions/comments
San yun IEC? There should be a separate strategy for IEC. IEC is part and parcel of R&D,	IEC is part of R and D	

we need to inform the public about the results of our research		
	Attention to Policy, Governance and Sustainable financing groups	With many researches need to be done, how to link to other components to be prioritize
	Section on policy and financing please take note of this.	In financing, encourage private sector to engage in R&D in forestry by considering tax credit as a an incentive to finance and support R and D
		On the final diagram, integrate the climate goals with the non-climate related goals because actually poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation are also climate related.
		Include development and competitiveness for REDD. REDD R&D as market based commodity
Can R and D be privately done for more quality	Academe do R and D Policy to include this	
		Level or extent of community participation in R and D in order to identify capacity needs for the community

## 7. CAPACITY BUILDING

Clarifications/Questions	Author's response	Suggestions/comments
May IPCC guidelines na	Meron na pero wala pang nag-iimplement	
IP communities would have difficulty understanding these technical terms/language, I myself had difficulty understanding. Is it part of the system we would like to set up to accredit 'community friendly'	Aim is to build local experts so that we are not at the mercy of consultants. PF for a consultant of one REDD consultant would be \$450,000. Aim is to democratize expertise; strengthening social	

consultants who can train.	expertise.	
Ako hindi ko talaga naintindihan yan mga standards nay an.	Kung gagamitin natin ang UN tracks for funding, aaralin natin yung standards nila that will require particular skills for us to be able to comply with their requirements. Pero sana naman wag puro market driven ang ating projects. There are also philanthropists who want to support our efforts to address climate change.	
Yun yung hamon – are we not market driven? Funding agencies have certain biases. As CODE REDD do we identify the tracks we want to take? I think we need to answer this because this is a question of integrity.	CODE REDD ay pro-community. Kung anong track, ngayon ba sasagutin yun?	Lets look at the different tracks, but magscenario building and discern based on this. Each group of writers can do this for their section.
An appeal to govt side to start screening investors for the carbon trading. Because we had experiences of mining companies who were allowed by govt to enter IP communities and caused problems to the IPs.		Maybe this will fall in the section of governance: who will endorse, assess what companies will be allowed enter, and credible yung assessment
CI has two projects in wherein Voluntary carbon accrediting is being done using the community and biodiversity standards was used. In both project sites were are not using CDM. If there is efforts to study the different tracks, CI can share its experiences. There is a		

lot of methodological development that we need to study.		
--	--	--

## 8. FINANCING

Clarifications/Questions	Author's response	Suggestions/comments
In case the commodity has a surplus, it becomes a cheaper. If there is over supply of carbon credits. What happened to the investor that can easily buy large credits of C, does he has the right to emit more?	It may happen. Include in the document that such case may happen but stressed that Philippines will not be involve in such practice.  Refine the statement that the community will earn income buy avoiding deforestation and further forest degradation	There is oversupply at the global level. Philippines should worry more on getting into the market at first and maintain credibility when its there (can we deliver the needed supply)
		On the fund management mechanism, difficult to compensate the communities for the opportunities lost. Take at serious look if carbon credits are enough to compensate the communities for them in go into REDD+.
		REDD strat plan should include a portion for cases of 'what if situations'; we anticipate problems and present possible solutions
Clarification on wood cutting, does it mean zero utilization	Not utilizing the forest will not sequester carbon. Instead of trying to avoid leakage, report the activity. c/o RUAM	
		Have a domestically grown mechanism to sustainably finance REDD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "debt for carbon swap"</li> <li>- Gov't fund for debt service can be used for</li> </ul>

		REDD or adaptation
Is REDD zero utilization?	Section on resource utilization should answer this.	<p>Production forest sequester more carbon than protection forest (e.g. in processing the lumber one could sequester more carbon than a standing tree)</p> <p>Zero utilization is not possible, should be sustainable use</p> <p>A discussion on land use and development of areas for sources for own consumption. If another advocacy point that should be included : No extraction</p>
We need to study if carbon credits alone will be enough to compensate communities from changing their forest use and land use plan		
	Yes we have discussed this and will be one of the options	Consider portfolio investment as part of strategy in financing
Debt for carbon- will this be an advocacy point? This will be difficult	To be taken up by policy	
Who will handle the funds? Are we going to discuss this here?	<p>DENR will have regulatory functions, it will not handle the funds. Fund management will still be discussed but definitely it will be a multistakeholder mechanism</p> <p>Will have specific guidelines once implementation</p>	
The ultimate success of REDD is financing, if this is what we say in the community this would make it more market	Will include in the document indicating sustainable use or forests more valuable by cutting when it is time to cut, but	

driven which we do not want to happen	basically the statement means we need resources to implement REDD	
		National REDD strategy has to clearly articulate where investors can invest and help communities implement REDD
		SF is based on how well NPRS is written. There is an eagerness on funding REDD projects at the moment. How the Ph will absorb in REDD. National REDD Strategy is important; strategic enough to articulate where investors can put their money in.
	We will protect our national strategy paper from these possible pitfalls.	We need to reduce emissions globally, REDD should keep sight of this and not just focus on making money out of our carbon credits and REDD projects. If we support the market approach, we might be potentially increasing emissions globally
		<p>On oversupply of credits would result to a 75% decrease in the price of carbon and would have the following effect:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effect on RE</li> <li>2. Reduce investments in clean technologies in devg countries</li> <li>3. Developed countries could potentially overpay they credits which may cause a problem on the mitigation activities of the developed countries (leakage problem).</li> </ol> <p>TDERM is similar to polluter's</p>

		<p>pay mechanism</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create a good price of carbon</li> <li>2. Management of fund could be patterned after the Montreal Protocol of ozone depleting substances</li> <li>3. Depend on the quality of carbon reductions based on REDD (MRV is necessary)</li> </ol>
		<p>Advocacy points, articulation on off-setting and fungibility</p>

## ANNEX 2: ROUND 2 CLARIFICATORY QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

### ROUND 2

#### 1. STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

Clarifications/Questions	Author's Response	Suggestions/Comments
<p>We bring our own biases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- what are we selling</li> <li>- who are the people to be affected?</li> </ul>		
<p>Was the need for time frame already discussed</p> <p>Is it a strategy for REDD or for REDD readiness?</p>		<p><b>To be resolved tomorrow</b></p> <p>10 years too long for planning, but too short for the implementation</p> <p>2-3 years for readiness according to the finance group</p> <p>5-7 years readiness based on other countries ( e.g Ghana)</p>
		UN REDD requirement be a basis for deciding

#### 2. POLICY

Clarifications/Questions	Author's Response	Suggestions/Comments
		Can we include a policy on allocation from the REDD income projects? It should be plowed back to the community
What if the other stakeholder not doing their job? Can the sharing be forfeited? Can policies be made on that?	Improve on the CBFMA incentive scheme and sanctions	
Forego word "ownership" because technically speaking it is owned by the state, sharing instead of		Clearly indicate sharing schemes

ownership		
		Ownership should be with the people Governance starts with the people
		This in not the group to decide “ownership” instead highlight issue of ownership as one of the consideration  The numbers should come in later just principles of sharing lang
		Disagree that this is not the body to answer, this are points for negotiation
What if there are no profits to be shared since we do not now the viability of a REDD project		
		Use of the word “Safeguards” since this is just strategy and not yet operationalize
		In other countries, ownership and right are discussed and defined clearly, so kailangan syang pag usapan  Consider safeguards and performance
		Anchor on the tenure situation.  Ownership definition should adhere to principle of responsibility  Articulate safeguards in the document
		If the systems in the ground are in place (e.g. MRV, cap build) the safeguards can be applied
		Carbon ownership make it

		as an incentive for protection
Buyers would want to know who owns the carbon	Our strategy is to advocate....	
		We POs have the rights to the carbon, we have tenurial instrument, we have annual and 5 year plans, we are the forest managers doing protection and management  We have a DAO for CBFM in sharing that can be a basis

### 3. GOVERNANCE

Clarifications/Questions	Author's Response	Suggestions/Comments
Are we just presenting options?	Option 1 is preferred by the group, engage the CCC and advisory commission	Indicate steps in forming the body, how to manage funds
	The pros is the offices are existing but funds are limited  Sectoral Body needed to be formed, need funding to start the process	Interim is ok but present the pros and cons of the option and needed support mechanisms for it to be functional
What is the role of the sectoral body?	To oversee projects	
Sharing on the natl caves law???- DENR +sectoral body		
		DENR as TWG, CCO stand alone
		Someone from FMB part of CCC, then DENR as TWG
The CCO was created to oversee climate change initiatives lang		
What about NCIP?	NCIP can be part of sectoral body	
FMB is staff bureau no line function, there must be office in the DENR that is why there is CCO		DENR Usec. for Operations as an option

#### 4. Resource Use and Allocation

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	AUTHORS' RESPONSES	SUGGESTIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS
	Will include in the intro	<p>Please also include definition of indigenous forest management practices somewhere in the introduction</p> <p>If we have to define production and protection forests – consider the definition of the IPs on these terms</p>
PES	In terms of sharing, large portions should be given portions to communities protecting the watershed	
Policy and Governance components can't accommodate the issue on population management. It is suggested that the said issue should be discussed in RUAM.		Policy on forest dweller population is one aspect, another is governance, but management of specific activities on the ground (e.g census, updating of maps, migration patterns and issues) could be retained in this section
What about FPIC? Are we facilitating for the gov't or for the community?		Give the IPs informed consent whether to agree to implement REDD plus because there are IP communities who agree to this, there are others who don't. This has to be included in this section. The authors requested NCIP Director to write this section.
On the issue of mining – how are we going to manage, in terms of allocation of resource, given that mining is	In the policy component – there is a presentation of conflicting policies such as mining and forest	Not just conflict of laws but the policy of the government to promote mining. Indicate a strong IP

<p>one of the land uses that can affect the forests. How are we going to ensure that our forests will be at the more higher agenda. It is suggested indicate that we are not against mining as long as it does not affect the forests</p>	<p>protection</p>	<p>... give IP to have an informed consent. Are we facilitating for the government of for the IP communities if REDD+ is a concern.  Request Dir. Gallardo on the statement regarding IP involvement</p>
<p>Suggestion to only include EP and delete the phrase “intensify est. of tree plantations of indigenous spp.”</p>		
<p>Issue on plantation by Pastor Rice, was it addressed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft?</p>	<p>Yes cited in activity -the use of indigenous species in tree plantations</p>	<p>production – allow exotic species protection- no exotic species  not close door plantation in REDD because that would put pressure on the natural forest, production forest will be source of timber</p>
<p>Cannot be pure plantations because plantations drive wildlife away; threaten biodiversity.</p>		<p>Not all tree plantations use monoculture farming. There are plantations that use the mosaic approach wherein various species are allowed to grow, thereby promoting biodiversity.</p>
<p>Plantations are impt allowing for timber needs but under the REDD+ concepts</p>		<p>Allocate areas not ecological areas and decide to avoid monoculture but REDD has nothing to do with that. Plantation is not part of REDD. Reference to plantation may not be accurate.  Articulation should be clear on the plantation issue</p>
	<p>There is a law on under utilized fishpond, they will quote this in the</p>	<p>Possible REDDable area are abandoned fishponds, though there are no clear</p>

	policy group	mechanism to revert this abandoned fishpond
Shifting cultivation areas- are this included in the REDD?		Allocate areas not ecological areas and decide to avoid monoculture but REDD has nothing to do with that. Plantation is not part of REDD. Reference to plantation may not be accurate.
Suggestion to only include EP and delete the phrase “intensify est. of tree plantations of indigenous spp.”		
Issue on plantation by Pastor Rice, was it addressed in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> draft?	Yes cited in activity -the use of indigenous species in tree plantations	production – allow exotic species protection- no exotic species  not close door plantation in REDD because that would put pressure on the natural forest, production forest will be source of timber
Security of private tenurial instrument may be threat to REDD+. No private indls that secure tenuirial instrument that has no forest trees. In the future, with REDD+, the private indl’s can be conflict		

## 5. MRV

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS</b>	<b>AUTHORS’ RESPONSES</b>	<b>SUGGESTIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
There are portions in the introductory that is too descriptive. To make it shorter, transfer to definition of terms		
Explain why there are variation in the NAMRIA and FMB data	We will get original copies of the drafts	
How do we capitalize on what		

we have to have a credible MRV? Cite samples ( e.g. carbon models for agro-forestry)		
Do have enough good baseline data?	We have a lot of local primary data but in terms of mapping we need to improve on it. In REDD, look up at the rate of deforestation for last 50 year  Need 1 year to establish a baseline	Articulate into a strategy the baseline collection Type of approach to be taken in the baseline  RTA and Yay to write their recommendations
Include capability on carbon mapping assessment		

## 6. Research and Development

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS</b>	<b>AUTHORS' RESPONSES</b>	<b>SUGGESTIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
		Coordination and integration between MRV and R&D, same plots to enhance data collection
		Researches on Community based carbon accounting strategies
		Action research on REDD demo sites shld not just be the concern of R&D, it should involve RUAM, capacity building, etc.
What do you mean by institutional capacity?		If capacity on data banking its not part of cap build, just re-tooling
		Importance of action research as one principle
		Finding ways for academe to collaborate w community
Where to place the studies on climate change? Put it the introduction? Should it be w	Dr. Lasco and Yay have data, can be included in the	

MRV or with R and D especially the methodology	appendix. Yes will be part of our introduction and we can include paper of Yay	
Readiness phase includes the piloting, is it possible to say that we are ready to pilot to shorten the timeframe for readiness?	Issue on piloting- its going to be a collaboration not just R and D	There are areas ready for piloting, just set criteria for demo site  Focus on (1) areas that are ready and (2) sites that are representatives of the different scenarios (example community carbon pooling)
		CBFM Po and Region 8 PO are ready for the REDD
Is there an institutional mechanism and institutional capacity in implementing the pilot site	Still strategic planning, mechanism be developed during implementation  Approach will be multistakeholder	

## 7. Capacity Building

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS</b>	<b>AUTHORS' RESPONSES</b>	<b>SUGGESTIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
		Include in the trainings academe and research institutions
What about module development?		Include module development as a separate activity
What about training of trainers?	In the document this is referred to as T3 activity: training the trainer. They will be trained as trainers, resource persons and facilitators. Graduates of this will be part of the community of trainers	
What about training on livelihood dev and management?	The list in the section is a partial listing of trainings, more can be	

	addede depending on the results of the competency assessment	
Will the training lead to planning and advocacy at the local level so that we can influence the local development plan e.g plan to amend the national physical framework plan		This will be part of the action plan of those who will graduate from the trainings. After each training, there is continuing mentoring and coaching so that the participants can prepare their local plans
Will there be trainings to help the stakeholders prepare their plans		Along with the training to help the stakeholders prepare local plans there should be a tool to measure if the action plan/local dev plan is REDD ready

## 8. Sustainable Financing

<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS</b>	<b>AUTHORS' RESPONSES</b>	<b>SUGGESTIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
		Specify in the strategy 1 for funding, this would be from international sources
		We're not saying we are shutting our doors to engaging in carbon markets, but we will explore this with caution
Other commodities to be included such as watershed protection? Is the bundle of services included? Is it a strategy itself?		We are open to having the bundle of commodities. In the section on policy, PES is included in the policy agenda.
		It might be logical to reverse REDD as a component of PES. Reverse the thinking
On page 1, how do you measure pre-REDD livelihoods? Do we have that baseline date?		Make more explicit in the document that we will do baseline study for assessment of situation of

		<p>communities pre-REDD. To also include the cultural aspect in terms of resource use patterns. Feasibility studies should also include social preparation.</p> <p>Baseline data gathering will be done by RUAM and R&amp;D before piloting as basis for assessing if the site is 'REDDable': assess the carbon – do you have enough biomass for the REDD proj to be viable?</p>
--	--	--