
Session 1 – Lessons Learned from REDD+ Readiness and Demonstration Project Implementation and Linkage with SFM – Q&A Session

(Dr. Ma) This time I would like to also volunteer some of the panel member from within the participants. Please welcome the three panel members from IGES and UNU. The panel members will try to share their research experience and ideas. They will talk about some of their views from the idea and observations from the presentation made by Dr. Yetti.

(IGES, Dr. Yamanoshita) I would like to speak on behalf of IGES, the Institute for Global Environmental Strategy. Today, I would like to share our experience on community monitoring. We have been working on community forest monitoring for several years in Indonesia, PNG, Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia with our local partners such as NGO's, universities, and local communities. At the beginning, we focused on carbon monitoring, because community participation is required in the UNFCCC decision, and we believed that carbon monitoring will be the first step for the community to participate in the REDD+ activities.

What we found in our initial fieldwork is community can measure the carbon in an appropriate way and their measurement is reliable. Community can provide information that contributes to the national Forest Monitoring System, which is required in REDD+. For reliable monitoring by the community, training of the community is crucial. For the good training, training of the trainer is also important.

We do not intend to argue that all forests in a country should be monitored or measured by communities. Community involvement in forest monitoring makes good sense when the community themselves are forest managers. For sustainable forest management, we already know that scientific data is required and data generated through the monitoring will help the community to improve their forest management. In this sense, we should not limit the community monitoring to target only on carbon. The community monitoring needs to cover broader items, which are meaningful for the community and relevant to their livelihood, such as tree species, land use, environmental change, etcetera, considering the context of the local community. They will find new things and learn from the process of monitoring. That will lead to sustainable forest management and sustainable development of the community.

It will also contribute to REDD+ by providing carbon and safeguard information. This is the picture we are looking at in REDD+ and sustainable forest management. Yesterday, there was discussion that training of the community for carbon measurement is costly. Maybe it is true, but if the training is not only for the carbon measurement skills, but also for building capacity of the community for the sustainable forest management, or for improving their livelihood, it will be worth paying for. We are now expanding our activity to develop community forest monitoring methods and

community-based REDD+ approach reflecting the local context of each project site.

Then, even the potential of the community forest monitoring is shown, it is often said that application of the community monitoring in REDD+ is not realistic. Now we are seeking the possibility to integrate the community monitoring into the national forest monitoring system. To create the completely new system for the national forest monitoring system will be very tough, and it is time consuming. We are focusing on the existing policy to build upon. In many countries there are some existing policies or programs that facilitate the community forest management. That means that the community and the central government are somehow connected through the local government. We may use this connection to flow the information provided by the community forest monitoring. Also, community training will be able to provide it under the program. The monitoring will contribute to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

We have just started the study recently, and we cannot yet provide the result here today, but for brief information, in Indonesia, we are looking at the forest management unit and looking to include the synergy of this existing policy and REDD+. Also in Thailand, we are looking at the community-based forest management. We are trying to identify the potential challenges and solutions to overcome all kinds of constraints. We hope we can share our result very soon.

Finally, I will do a little bit of promotion. We are developing a manual for training of trainers for community monitoring based on our experience. It will be published in April, hopefully, so I will try to share this information with you again sometime later.

My question is completely different from my statement. In your presentation, you mentioned about the JCM, the bilateral mechanism, and our institute is working closely with the Indonesian government and the Japanese government on JCM, especially in energy sector. We recognize the importance of REDD+ under the JCM, but it would be nice if you share the expectations, demand of JCM REDD+. It would be nice if you can provide or tell us if you see any particular role of JCM or bilateral agreement mechanism under REDD+, because we already know you received lot of international funds for REDD+. What is the difference from the other funds?

(Dr. Yetti) Thank you, Dr. Yamanoshita, for your information about community monitoring including Indonesia. That is really very useful, because Indonesia is one of the countries that have high population. We really need many tools for our community to bring about results.

From my point of view, Indonesia really hopes that through JCM, we could do not only G to G (government to government), but we could bring the implementation to scale up our best efforts together with private to private. We cannot scale up with the government money. Of course, even though we got a log of financial support from developed countries, those in terms of government support cannot be used for investment, because this tax money from developed country can only be used for facilitation for natural disaster, training, and capacity building. We need to scale up our effort.

I think JCM is really one of the examples, I think in the world right now that is already offered under various approaches of UNFCCC. We are really thankful to Japanese government to bring the JCM.

For Indonesia, we could provide to scale up our best practice. Even we still do have a lot of problem, at the same time, we could do a lot of things to mitigate and adapt to climate change through scaling up our investment and to have a market. The real gap that needs to be fulfilled is how to set up the criteria indicator, monitoring inventory of carbon that countries and globe agree with that. That is not so complicated, as we heard previously. How to make it simple so we could actually test our general formula; biomass is equal to two times CO₂ equivalent. Indonesia only has soil, only has people, only has 11 hours of sunshine, but we do not have a real market or big market. We do not have big investments. We need that.

(Dr. Ma) Dr. Yetti and Dr. Yamanoshita had some very interesting information and also question and answer. Can I invite now Richard Dr. Rastall to share your research experience and some of your research concerns in the context of Indonesia?

(UNU, Dr. Rastall) I think it is very good to start the day with some reflection on Indonesia as well as a key REDD+ country. It is very much taking the lead in the development of the international mechanism and also at the national and subnational levels as well. I think it is very good for leading into some of the later discussions that we are going to have today.

I am a master student at United Nations University. In fact, I will be taking a REDD+ elective course on Monday under Dr. Ma. I look forward to some instructions in this area. I have also some experience working in conservation and forest management projects in South East Asia since about 2000. I would like to share some thoughts and experiences and relate that a little bit to the discussions relevant today and to Indonesia as well, where I was actually involved in helping to develop a project document for a REDD+ project in Central Kalimantan for a Japanese client under the Joint Credit Mechanism. I have a little bit of relevant experience that I can share on that as well.

Last night over a beer, some of my colleagues asked me why do you love REDD+, or why are you so passionate about REDD+? I do not know if I gave him the right answer last night, but thinking about it a little bit more, you do not love REDD+. REDD+ is something that is quite crude, it is quite obscene, and it is what it is. On the other hand, when I think about the experience that I have had starting in 2000-2001 working in countries like Cambodia and Vietnam for a conservation organization, in that period of 2000 and even up to 2005, forest protection and conservation was not really on the agenda in a very serious or meaningful way. There would be soil conservation NGO's or even World Bank or GEF funding for these kinds of projects, funding from the national governments themselves in those kinds of countries for those kinds of activities was rather limited. The projects that would come in would be for three to five years, something with an exit strategy and those projects

then leave and then what is the sustainable outcome in terms of protecting our natural capital, natural resources, and these special forests and landscapes?

Then we went through also the ICDP phase. I was also involved with that phase and that had its own problems with the failure to really properly link conservation and development. You ended up with protected areas effectively as islands, and not really integrated into the wider landscapes. You would go to discuss with protected area management boards, they would have the map of their protected area on the wall behind them, and it would literally have blank wide space around it. This is the kind of environment were working in.

As time moved on, I do not know whether it was because of REDD+ or during the same timeframe that REDD+ has emerged, you have got more of an integrated or systematic approach that looks much more in detail at the causes and the underlying drivers of biodiversity laws, deforestation, and forest degradation. I think that those kinds of approaches together with really putting the finance on the table and really raising the profile of forests, is where REDD+ comes in. The attraction really is not in REDD+ itself, but it is rather the wider potential of REDD+ in making some kind of a partial contribution to something much bigger. Perhaps Dr. Verchot will be able to speak about this in a more competent manner than I, but the transformational change in societies towards more sustainable and socially equitable scenarios or development pathways. Also that places a greater emphasis on ecological sustainability. I think that is where it comes in. It is not a love for REDD+ itself.

I think that the mechanism itself, and this is something that I think Indonesia is one of the countries that is really taking the lead and making some of these steps, is that when you think about what REDD+ is, it is a creation of a market mechanism for an abstract something in the air: carbon; reducing carbon dioxide emission. Then, if you need a market, then you need clear property rights. Then this whole rights-based agenda goes with that. If you need property rights, you need land tenure rights, you need to respect local and traditional communities and their ways of life, and you need to respect claims of self-determination of those regions, of those particular people.

REDD+ demands that you are going to have to bring in new governance mechanisms. Some of these may not be better. There are certainly challenges there, but there is the potential for more multi-stakeholder governance, greater participation in governance, and in governance of natural resources, and, indeed, the socioeconomic development pathway of a particular region and country. It is going to require greater accountability and transparency.

There are massive challenges and issues. The difficulty again will be how we actually go about doing this at all levels, I think that also Ms. Lee will talk later of scaling up REDD+ from projects at subnational and national levels. This is going to call for a lot of creativity, a lot of flexibility, a lot of innovation in how you do this, and overall lot of balls as well. Just thinking about some of the challenges that lie therein from the experience of trying to develop these projects under the JCM for REDD+ in Kalimantan, you begin then thinking about how it is all going to work within the national

accounting framework. If you are going to design a project for Indonesia, which has already made its own emission reduction strategy and action plan of 26% nationally and 41% with assistance, and how that is broken down through the different levels of governance and across sectors as well. You have the land use change and forestry sector being very important in terms of making those emission reductions. In reality, how you are going to achieve those when you have a rapidly growing population, I think they advertise the advert on CNN for Indonesia 50% of the population under the age of 30, and all the economic development priorities that go with that, how do you go about making the right kind of decisions at the landscape level? There are some really challenges there.

Also then, who are the players in influencing that? You then end up with what I think Ms. Swickard will talk about later, this jurisdictional nested REDD being the logical approach really, that your emission reductions are embedded within the national accounting framework at subnational and then national levels. That means that you have players coming in maybe from outside, such as Japanese corporations or other international private sector entities, NGO's in partnership with major financial institutions or major mining and oil sector companies having greater influence over the socioeconomic development pathway of particular regions in Indonesia. This will be something that will probably emerge in other countries as well.

That is one thing maybe I would like to put to Dr. Dr. Yetti in working out how we might strategically address some of these challenges in terms of REDD+ and its orientations; what role it can play in terms of the green economy and Indonesia's development in its regions and how that may compare or contrast with this MP3EI program with accelerating economic growth as well. What are the tradeoffs and opportunity costs?

(Dr. Ma) You have so much observation and then also a very important question. Dr. Yetti Dr. Yetti, please touch on this direct contribution of the impact of the green economic development.

(Dr. Yetti) Thank you, Mr. Dr. Rastall for a very complete story of REDD+. I believe we have the same spirit, to promote REDD+ because you said it has big potential to solve the problem.

Let me start with property rights of forests that you mentioned. Probably Indonesia is a bit different from other countries in our forest land use system or national land use system. Our constitution says that forest ownership belongs to the nation. It does not mean that no forests are private forests or community forests. We have some, but almost all forest belongs to the nation. I showed you the function of the forest in our constitution.

Ownership: we intend to define ownership as the right to use, so not ownership. The right to use is very clear. The process is very clear. I think we will improve by the time because it is all the dynamic matters. When we come to the project like REDD+ project, we have to deal with global standards and things like that, so the question comes to the surface. The underlying constitution says

that the forest is not talking about the ownership, but talking about the right to use. This is very clear in our rules and regulation.

In terms of coordination and a new institutional arrangement for the climate change, this is a big question. This is not easy to set up the new equilibrium, but we believe we move forward. I say that this is a dynamic world, so we move forward. When we move forward, there must be some change, institutional or coordination and things like that, but it does not mean that we stop working. Let us do our best to find a new equilibrium. Many new institutions are coming. It is okay. They are learning by process. What did we do in forestry? We provided support of technical base on forests; inventory, mapping, whatever, knowledge of forestry or data, we provide that. Whatever the nation will take a final policy, we go together and also whatever the best fit with the global program.

For the economic growth, this is not easy. We experienced with the A/R CDM project and the LULUCF project. I know quite well with one of verifier from Japan that is JACO CDM that is verifier under UNFCCC Secretariat. When we did a project of A/R CDM and LULUCF, it was so complicated. We have experience with that. To get economic growth under that, that is almost impossible. We are really happy we came up with Bali Action Plan that put more probability to scale up our best practice.

What we need to provide is a clear market. What is a market? It is not only a grant or aid program, but a market to scale up the effort. To do that, we have to be very clear tools to count that. Start from field up to economy and beneficiary. This is not only the problem at national level. This is only how to create the new economy between countries that can be implemented in countries, both partners. I think it is a big challenge of how to simplify, how to bring the banking system, because without a banking system, how do you introduce incentive into our work? I think this is another Ph.D. topic to discuss.

(Dr. Ma) So many topics we are discussing in this session focusing on Indonesia, like main governance issue as well as also technical issue, but also one of the issues like the institutional arrangement. There is need to bring up some clear institutional arrangement that facilitates REDD design and implementation on the ground. That is also an important issue.

Last in the panel is Dr. Jose Dr. Puppim. Maybe due to time constraint, I would like to encourage Dr. Jose to concentrate on some experience, particularly the institutional arrangement. I know you are very much deep into the institutional arrangement. You have a lot of experience. Can you share? Then some question to Dr. Yetti Dr. Yetti will be appreciated

(UNU-IAS, Dr. Puppim) Unfortunately, I do not know much about forests, even though I have written a lot about forests. I basically work with institutions, particularly local institutions in my area, is more political economy of implementation in local governments. In the last few years, I have been

working a lot with how to connect what we call these global initiatives with local implementation. The idea of institutions is key for that because they connect big ideas; I have all these big ideas and interesting initiatives like REDD, and what you call the implementation on the ground; how you translate those big ideas into institutions, especially those things that are going to move both in different levels, but particularly in the ground in terms of forest because that where it is going to make an effect in terms of reducing deforestation.

I am going to just highlight one word that I think is important for this discussion of REDD is the idea of connections; connect the institutions, build institutions as well as connect. You have actually quite a long time in terms of implementing forest carbon projects; REDD-like to the national and international levels. NGO's have been doing this for almost 20 years. You have a lot of interesting experience that you could get from those initiatives. In terms of what I said, I think the big gap is exactly how to connect things, because REDD is an interesting idea.

I have seen that there are some resources and lot of good people involved, but how do you actually make the connections? First, I think there is one point in connection in terms of design of REDD. A lot of REDD now what I am seeing little thought about first the connection in terms of territory. I see a lot of projects, lot of initiative, but how to scale up. I think this is going to be discussed today at different levels. I have seen some of the interesting initiatives now coming in what you call nested REDD to integrate at district level and all other levels. I think this is one connection. In terms of design, I think it is missing a lot of those initiatives.

The second connection was mentioned by Richard, and it is exactly the connection in terms of time. Most of the initiatives last three to five years and then they are gone. You put in all the resources, and as soon as it is gone, it goes back to what it was initially; how to think of initiatives that move towards long-term connections with the preservation of forest. This can be done under a lot of mechanism, discussing class; the 'bounce', for example; all the things that you could create beyond the project that is finishing in three to five years. I think is the first point in terms of connection, in terms of design, and institution connection.

The second point that was mentioned in the presentation of Dr. Yetti, and that I found very interesting to see this highlighted, was that you need to connect those initiatives to what you call the larger economy. Not just forests, but with the larger economy and link with the societal problems, societal needs; not only stay just the forests and the biodiversity. It is very interesting, but if you do not connect with this larger and society, you are not going to sustain the REDD to get results in the long-term and also stop deforestation.

One interesting thing is that I work in cities. In recent decades you have large growth in urbanization. Indonesia is one country that urbanized very quickly. It means less people in the rural areas where the forests are, close to the forests, but interestingly, deforestation is increasing in some of these instances because they are looking a lot in terms of the forest preserved but not much in demand.

Where does the demand come from? A large part of the demand, they come from the cities where the population is, and where the economy is. 80% of the economy in many countries comes from the cities. It is from where the demands come. This is an important point to make those connections.

The third point that I would like to highlight in terms of connections, we have been discussing these for quite a while, that is called connection between global and local governance; multilevel governance. We have a lot of initiatives at very high level, UN and national government or international organizations and banks, but how to connect these to the local settings or the local institutions is the thing that interests me more in terms of work, and how to make those connections. Because when you go to those communities to talk about climate change, I doubt that there is one person that understands much about climate change in detail. Maybe they have heard about, maybe the persons, one or two people in the community know, but most of the people, particularly in the setting you are talking about, people are sometimes not even educated to read a report of the UN. Sometimes they do not understand the language of the country. In my country Brazil, you go to Amazon, there are some people that do not speak Portuguese and everything is in Portuguese. It means you need to adapt these local institutions; the global institutions translate these at the local level.

This is why I think it is important you start looking more at those institutions in the discussion about REDD, because the institution is sometimes difficult to understand. If people all decide what the institutions are, why do we talk all the time about these? I see that we have advanced a lot in terms of the technical part of understanding forests and understanding carbon capture, etcetera, but very little in terms of building those institutions, those connections. I think that this is the opportunity here and other for us is to start discussing more about these issues. What Einstein said is very interesting, "Not everything that can be counted counts." Not everything that cannot be counted actually is important for counting for the results of the project, meaning you have to look more at those aspects that maybe cannot be counted; you cannot measure with numbers or with models, but they are important to exactly make those translations.

I will just give you maybe a couple of examples. One is the issue of integration, for example, with the national institution. I see there are lots of points regarding the safeguard discussions, environmental and social safeguards, but most of the countries, actually they have laws on those issues and the big problem is that those laws are not being enforced or not being implemented. Instead of coming on the top with new safeguards asking for sometimes more bureaucracy to fill out forms or hiring consulting companies to safeguard, you should push for more implementation/enforcement of local legislation in those areas where the REDD is being implemented. You see a lot of countries have very good forest policies and laws. Labor laws are same in most of the countries. No country allows now slave labor, most of the countries have law on child labor, but why you have to ask these in a project and not make the government to implement the policies that are already in place. In broader sense, not only the project where REDD is happening, broader than this, in subnational and national

level, as well as the tenure system is to say, a lot of times, in Indonesia may not be the case, but in many countries, the tenure system is linked to the local communities and implementation of REDD poses threats to the tenure system of those communities. That could be very good in terms of carbon, but not very good in terms of wellbeing of those communities. I would like to highlight the importance of making those connections, and the institutions are a key for helping us to move forward in those connections to have the results in the long-term that we expect.

(Dr. Ma) Maria also mentioned about there are many REDD Demonstration project taking place in many parts; Africa, Latin America, and Asia. We are now talking a lot about context of Indonesia, but very quickly, but our colleague from Nigeria and the Ministry of Environment will share one point on REDD readiness in the context of Nigeria. After that, I would also like to invite the Ministry of Environment of Cambodia, Phnom Penh. Lastly also I am eager to invite Abdul from the subnational level at the state of the Pahang.

(Nigerian Ministry of Environment, Raymond) Nigeria is in West Africa. Its capital is in Abuja. It is divided into 36 states with a population of about 150 million people. Like every other country in the world, climate change is affecting Nigeria in the form of growth and desertification, gully erosion, flooding, rise in temperature, and sea level rise. These are a result of man-made activities such as agricultural production, population increase, overgrazing, logging of wood, industrialization, bush burning, and charcoal production. The Nigerian government has been playing a major role in reducing the impact of climate change through policies and legislation. The Federal Ministry of Environment through the Department of Forestry is in charge of forestry matters in Nigeria. It collaborates with the Department of Climate Change in combating with the impacts of climate change.

The journey of REDD in Nigeria so far: Nigeria joined UN REDD as an observer in 2009 with the high interest shown in the REDD+ program. The UN REDD team came to Nigeria for a scoping mission. The team was led by UN technical advisor to Nigeria on REDD+, Mr. Joseph Gary. The idea was to assess Nigerian forest potentials that would qualify her to be a UN REDD member. The team was taken to Cross River State where the Nigerian REDD pilot project is taking place. They came and saw tropical rainforest in Nigeria at its best in Cross River State. The report to UN REDD Secretariat after the visit attracted Nigeria the sum of \$4 million for REDD readiness activities in Nigeria.

So far, Nigeria has developed an institutional framework for REDD at national and states levels. Nigeria National REDD Secretariat coordinates activities of REDD program at state levels. The National Steering Committee at the national level for the implementation of REDD+ has been established. At the Federal level, the national secretariat of REDD has set up office secretariat, and we have set up a GIS office with equipment. This was commissioned by the honorable Minister of

Environment in 2013. Every staff of the National REDD+ Secretariat has been opportune to attend one or two international seminars abroad.

Nigeria's national work plan has been developed and approved by the National Steering Committee. It is to be noted that in 2012, Nigeria was appointed co-chair at the UN Policy Board. At the state level, Cross River State is chosen as pilot state for REDD implementation for obvious reasons. The state houses 50% of what is left of the natural forest in Nigeria. The Governor of Cross River State has shown political will to make the REDD+ program in Nigeria a success. He put a ban on logging for two good years. Cross River State has been able to set up a REDD+ office, purchase office equipment, cars, and recruit staff through its Forestry Commission in charge of REDD+ at state level.

Nigeria had done a PGA, trained staff on MRV and safeguards. Stakeholders' awareness meeting had been carried out. Its members include NGO's, forest communities, and civil society organizations. There is always gender consideration on what we do on REDD+ program in Nigeria. Sustainable livelihood projects have been introduced or provided. We follow FPIC in the selection of forest communities.

In all this, we have some challenges. One of the challenges is funding. It is our greatest problem. Other states in Nigeria have shown interest to key into REDD+. We are looking for more funding to extend the REDD+ to two more states in Nigeria. We have equally applied through this Forest Carbon Partnership Fund of the World Bank. In the case that a decision comes through, we would be able to extend to other states in the country.

(Dr. Ma) Next, I would like to invite *Hei Hung* from the Ministry of Environment, Cambodia, Phnom Penh. He is working also on national strategy and action planning there. I think you can now with colleagues, you are very eager to share or talk with him.

(Cambodia Ministry of Environment, Mr. Hung) I will only tell you about three main points that are related to Cambodia; first institution, second opportunity and challenges, and third REDD+ program.

In Cambodia, there are three main institutions that have role and responsibility to protect forests. One, the Forestry Administration under the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fishery protect mangrove forests and plant forests. Second, Forestry Administration under Ministry Of Agriculture protects forest-protected area and third, General Department of Administration for Nature Conservation and Protection under the Ministry of Environment protect forests in protected areas.

Two, opportunity and challenges; according to a government policy that we call decentralization policy we provide right and role of local community to participate in forest management. We organize fishery community, forestry community, and community protected area through the participating committee, we think that it is a part of sustainable forest management.

However, through these we have opportunity and challenges. For opportunity, stronger policy support, good collaboration between institutional and the local community, well cooperation and networking community, more involvement by local community and local authority, more benefit for local community, and opportunity for REDD+ activity in the future. For challenges, lack of good collaboration between all stakeholders, some of the communities do not have management plans, some communities lack of support of NGO's and other partner both financial and technical support, and communities lack of their own ownership management their forest community. Communities lack skill and resources for processing *NTIP ([AM-1]01:37:12)*, and lack of good market due to low quality and products for local community.

So far Cambodia has already prepared REDD map that guide Cambodia how to do in the present and in the future, but Cambodia has not yet implemented REDD+. But, Cambodia has only two signed projects that implement REDD+ under the Ministry of Agriculture.

(Dr. Ma) Last time the guided questioner, last expert, *Abdul Karim* from the State of Pahang, can you very quickly introduce some of your experiences from the State of Pahang.

(Malaysia, Mr. Khalim) We are different from Indonesia. Indonesia, our political system is a federal/state system. In our constitution, article 74-2 stated that land and forests are a state matter. The federal government or the central agency only gave us some training, advising and also research assistance. That is the federal function.

In this case, we already implemented sustainable forest management long time ago. More than 10 years ago we are using this SFM. Our forest management system, first of all, we are doing pre-inventory felling. That means we want to know what is in the forest; stocking of the forest. After we do the pre-inventory, we determine the cutting limit. The cutting limit for Malaysia is normally 60 cm for dipterocarp, and 50 cm for non-dipterocarp. After we determine the cutting limit, then we do the tree tagging. We tag the trees to be felled. We tag the trees to be protected. We tag the mother trees, so not only human have mother, trees also have mothers for future generation.

After we do the tagging, then do the logging. After that, we do the post-inventory. We want to know what treatment to be done to that logging area. That is basically our Forest Management System. In fact, we also do volume control. That means we control true cutting limit and also volume control. According to our National Land Council, the minimum logging in a forest is 65 m³/ha. For virgin forest, it is 85 m³/ha. That means, although one area is 10,000 m³ is allowed, after we reach the 10,000 m³, although there are still trees within the cutting limit, we did not allow it to be logged. That is what we are doing here; volume control and cutting limit control to ensure sustainability.

To certify our management, we are doing the Malaysian Criteria and Indicators. Like

yesterday's presentation, in our MC&I, Malaysian Criteria and Indicators, we have nine principles. We are quite strict. We have 9 principles, we have 47 criteria, we have 97 indicators, and we have 307 verifiers. Like Dr. Patrick said that MC&I is very costly to the loggers, but we have to follow it to protect our forest. The MC&I will be certified by independent certification bodies. In Indonesia, there are only two certification bodies SGS International based in Sweden and also SIRIM Sdn. Bhd. SIRIM is standard department in Indonesia, but they do everything for checking or auditing. Also, the uniqueness of this MC&I, when the auditor is doing the verification in the field, before they present their report, there is another expert panel to verify the auditing team report; to check the balance of the auditing. That means we have two tiers of auditing before certification and the FMU is certified as SFM. There are two tiers, one report by the auditing team and this auditing team is verified by another expert panel. Both are independent. It is a very strict procedure. If the independent panel says that one criterion is in noncompliance, let us say minor, the report can be changed to major noncompliance. That is the system of checking and balance. After the final report, then we will be certified. That means, the FMU will be certified as a timber certification under the Malaysian Timber Certification system. Basically, that is our SFM.

Related, now for Pahang, we are undergoing one project of REDD. Dr. Ma knows about that because he was one of the PIC members. Three is the lead agency. The site chosen is Pahang, because in peninsular Pahang, we have everything. We have the biggest state in the peninsula, and also we have three types of forests. We have mangrove forests, we have peat swamp forests, and we have dry inland forests including hill forests. That is the reason for this project. There are four components of this project, and we call it as subnational level. The first component involves National Forest Degradation Estimator; the second component, Forest Degradation Reduce and Forest Management Unit; the third component, incentive for carbon and ecosystem services established, and fourth one is the capacity of major stakeholders and communities, where relevant, is strengthened.

These are the four components for REDD that are ongoing. We just started this project back in February 2013 and it is an ongoing project. This will be a reference level for subnational. At the federal level, there is already another project for REDD. They will design the framework and the legislation laws that is under the federal level.

(Dr. Ma) I think at this session, I believe we brought many, many issues of REDD from Indonesia. Also we had benefit from complementary information from Nigeria, Cambodia, and Malaysia. I believe also our audience will engage in REDD; a lot of information, a lot of experience, and lot of lessons, I think. At a later stage also we can have more information. I believe in today's session we had lot of ideas, particularly we learnt that REDD is a golden opportunity to rule the decision where the higher level to the deforestation and SFM, also green economy. Also we recognize there is an important need to scale up community-based capacity building program and also scale up the

partnerships, particularly with the private sector. I think that is also a very important challenge for the future.

Before closing, I would like to invite Dr. Yetti Dr. Yetti to make some closing remarks.

(Dr. Yetti) Let us move forward to save our planet and do our best, and then for that, expertise from global forestry body or institution like FAO, ITTO, and universities that are very rich in knowledge and scientific results. Many important studies with clear results are very important for moving forward intensively. Community, bureaucracy, or government needs tools for new policy; national, bilateral, even global.