
Session 3 – Thinking from Broader Perspectives: Landscape Approach – Q&A Session

(Forestry Agency, Mr. Satoshi Akahori) Let me ask you a question, Ms. Lee. You talked about Ethiopia and also the Carbon Fund case studies. When it comes to livestock and the agricultural productivity improvement, does that lead to the improvement of livelihoods? I believe it does. Does it link to the landscape approach to improve or to reduce the deforestation? Maybe there is some dilemma. If you have any good case studies, please let us know.

I would like to ask Dr. Verchot about the land-use and also the factors related to the land use such as organizations, drivers, regulations and laws, and analysis. Also, you showed us a model of the landscape approach. In the end you said that things are very complicated in the real field. Talking about the practical applications in the future, if you have any thoughts, please let us know as well.

(Independent Consultant, Ms. Donna Lee) If I understood your question, you are asking about whether or not improving agriculture would improve livelihoods in Ethiopia, and if there are any case studies, and maybe a little bit more about tackling these drivers of deforestation.

I had the opportunity to visit one of the really important forest ecosystems in Ethiopia. It is called the Bale Mountains, and that is where they really are starting this REDD+ program in Oromia. It was very interesting. We visited the farmers that surrounded the forest and talked to them to try to understand why it was that deforestation was happening. What was fascinating to me is that the problems in Ethiopia are not just about land policy. It is clear that agriculture was part of the issue, but when we talk about landscape approaches, even there, maybe we are being too narrow. What was happening in the Bale eco-region was that there was a drought in the Hararghe region. There was a lot of immigration into the area. The expansion in agriculture was not just from the local communities, but it was this internal displacement that was occurring within the country. In addition to that, part of it was family planning policies. The families in and around the area, the farmers, they did not have access to things like birth control, so they had many children. When you have many children, as those children have children, they need a farm; they need a place to expand to provide themselves an alternative livelihood.

The issues around deforestation are really complex. I think Dr. Verchot was right. If you are not dealing with the underlying problems, and it is agriculture but it is also a lot of other human dynamics that are happening, then you are not going to be able to protect the forests. That said, what was interesting to me is that the farmers in and around those communities knew exactly what needed to be done in order to protect the forests. They had experience with participatory forest management. They knew exactly what the problems were. They knew that they needed new types of livestock; they needed to crossbreed with cows from the Netherlands that are more productive. For me it was really a learning experience. On some ways we can do fancy models, but at the end of the day these local

communities actually know what they need. It seems as though that is the starting point. What is difficult about landscape approaches is that, in order to get them what they needed, you need to have that cooperation with these different ministries. The Agricultural Ministry provides extension programs that can provide the new types of seeds, the new types of livestock that they can use in order to reduce that pressure on the forests.

It is a really interesting case, the Bio Carbon Fund trying to tackle Ethiopia. There are these multiple drivers, and they try to do this coordinated program that deals with grazing; deals with improving agricultural yields; intensifies participatory forest management; does clean cook stoves; all at one time, and at the same time measures emissions reductions. It could be quite interesting. I hope that it becomes a case study in the future that we can look at.

(CIFOR, Dr. Louis V. Verchot) I will pick up on some of those themes. Drivers of deforestation are often outside the forest sector. Clearly there is a need to address the underlying causes of those drivers. Agricultural improvement is often touted as one of the major solutions to reducing deforestation, but agricultural improvement by itself, without some improvement in governance, is often destructive.

As you increase returns to land, and as you increase returns to labor, you create incentives to expand agriculture. If you do not have governance that enforces some sort of zoning, you cannot protect your forest. It has to be improving the livelihoods and the productivity of people locally, but also improving governance and the ability of governments to negotiate the different services that society needs out of its landscapes.

I talked a lot about complexity, but I also said that we cannot let the complexity paralyze us. We have been making progress in developing countries. We need to build on strengths that individual countries have, and what countries have been able to achieve, to move forward from the unsustainable types of practices that we see in some places today to more sustainable practices. We do have models of that. We certainly have seen improvement in many places. We have seen decreases in deforestation in Brazil. There has been a decrease and a subsequent increase in deforestation in Indonesia. If we can begin to harness some of the things that have been pushing us in the positive direction and reinforce those, we can make incremental progress. We are not going to solve these problems in a day. They were not created in a day. They are not going to be solved in a day. The complexity should not paralyze us, but we should not be ignorant of it either.

(Forestry Agency, Mr. Satoshi Akahori) I think that Ms. Lee has shared with us on the situation. The answer that was just made I think, the professor and expert from Laos said the same thing. I think that not only the forestry, but the governance as well as the land utilization would have to be done well. Otherwise, things will not function accordingly. Therefore, I think it is quite in line with what they have said.

I would like to open the floor for some questions. Maybe we could entertain some other questions first, and then have the panelists answer them altogether.

(Q1: Ministry of Environment, Cambodia, Mr. Hong Heng) I have two questions. My question is to Ms. Lee. First question: I would like you to clarify the role of project that links local community to national government in your previous presentation. You mentioned about the role of projects that are more involvement from local community and the link to the government policy. Second question: how do private sectors get involved with a sustainable landscape approach?

(Q2: UNU, Dr. Richard Rastall) My question is about examples you gave about REDD+. Is the improvement more because of enforcement of legislation? How much of this actually was influenced by REDD+? I am not sure there is any link with REDD+. Even this year actually increased forestation in Brazil for the first time. How much is from the success that you show in some of the cases can be explained by REDD+, or by other factors. If you look at the legislation in many countries, if you want to actually control deforestation, basically enforce some of those legislations; help the countries to enforce, provide technology, or other means. I would like to understand how much REDD+ has actually explained some of those successes.

(Q3: FFPRI, Dr. Takeshi Toma) I learned about the landscape approach. In that context, I think that, for monitoring, it is not necessary to focus on the forest. Because we are using satellite remote sensing, it is better to monitor whole land-use changes rather than the specific changes of forest. What do you think about that?

(Q4: UN-REDD, FAO, Dr. Maria Sanz-Sanchez) We have been talking for years in the context of LULUCF. I wonder what could be different in the context of a landscape approach. What innovation needs to be brought into the previous discussions that are being done on LULUCF, mostly by developed countries, to move towards this landscape approach?

(Independent, Consultant Ms. Donna Lee) There is a linkage between the first presentation that I gave about scaling up from projects to the national strategies, and this issue of landscape approaches. In my limited experience, it seems as though we have spent a lot of money and effort at the national level focusing on measurement and monitoring and understanding land-use change, but not very much on what we actually need to do in order to reduce emissions.

I was working with a country last year that: spent over \$50 million to use fancy remote sensing techniques like LIDAR to try to get very precise measurements of land-cover change; spending a lot of money on carbon assessments to get good emission factors. However, they did not really actually

know what they were planning to do to actually reduce emissions. In the REDD+ strategy, they had 200 actions that they thought might be useful things to do, but they had not actually prioritized or thought, “Given our resources, given our capacity, what are the five things that we can do to really reduce emissions?”

This is where there is activity on the ground where these projects really are looking at how we can actually reduce emissions. What are the things that we can do that are sustainable; that provide alternative livelihoods, that are beneficial to local communities; that help us reduce poverty; that can be part of our economic development; that is integrated into a broader sustainable development for our country; that therefore will be something that does not go away in three years, but something that has traction and will stay for the long term? That is where these projects I think really can inform a national strategy, but we just do not see that happening enough. There are these really great projects on the grounds that are helping local communities. They are just not connecting back up to national strategies in helping to inform them. For me, that is the strongest linkage that we should be making.

On the question about the private sector, it is a really good one. How can we involve the private sector? If we look at the amount of investment flows from, say big agribusiness, they far outweigh anything that official development assistance can provide. How is it exactly that we can engage private sector, and how does the BioCarbon Fund, for example, plan to engage them? There are a few companies that are really interested in this issue. They are not interested because of corporate social responsibility; they are interested because they really see their future business being affected by this scarcity of land to produce the raw materials that they need to make their consumer products.

I think they see themselves playing a role in these types of new landscape approaches, which is new for them, because, again, before they would only deal with their supply-chain driving it all the way down to the farm level, but not think about the broader issues of governance and land tenure. I think the way in which they can get involved to have to do with things, like offtake agreements. In other words, within the BioCarbon Fund, if they have a project in a province that is creating oil-palms sustainably, then you can get companies like Unilever and Nestlé to think about, “Can we actually provide predictability and create these future agreements to offtake that product?” That can be quite beneficial for a province.

I think they are willing to think about this. Changing a supply chain is actually quite expensive for them. It is not easy. It is not something that they can just do tomorrow, but I think because you have some of these companies that are interested in sustainable, predictable, and affordable future supply, that they are willing to contemplate this; and also to think about how to make their investments consistent with some of the efforts that are happening at the landscape level. It is in very early days. There are a limited number of companies who are interested in participating in this way, but I think it is an important part of the puzzle.

(CIFOR, Dr. Louis V. Verchot) Let me pick up on the question about Brazil. I think academics are debating far and wide as to just how Brazil achieved its emissions reductions. Clearly, Brazil claims it was all about enforcement and improvement of governance in the region. They are probably right. That is a big part of why they were able to achieve the emissions reductions. What did REDD+ have to do with it? Absolutely nothing, and this is why my friend Dr. Arild Angersen, who is Norwegian, thinks that Norway should not have spent the money in Brazil; that the emissions reduction were not traditional and would have happened anyway.

It is clear that perhaps in Brazil the international REDD+ mechanism itself was not the driver, but the desire of the Brazilian government to bring rampant deforestation under control and rationalize land-use in the Amazon was the driver. This has to be the driver in all countries. It should not be about the international desire for emissions reductions. It should be part of national development plans to rationalize land-use in the territory of countries themselves to achieve these emissions reduction.

Brazil has shown how improving governance and improving the rule of law and being able to enforce zoning in areas is essential for achieving emissions reductions. I think there is a lesson there for countries that do have governance challenges. That is often the case on the forest frontier. Dr. Toma, you asked about whether we need to focus on forest themselves or whether we need to monitor for land-use change. Clearly, deforestation happens in predictable patterns. It tends to happen as a front. You deforest from the bottom of the mountain towards the top. You deforest from the road going back. It is generally not a random process. You certainly can be much more efficient by following frontiers or monitoring more areas of active deforestation and spending more resources there on your quantification to reduce your uncertainty than if you just take a wall-to-wall approach and monitor absolutely everything.

Dr. Sanz-Sanchez asked about what is different in the context of a landscape approach. I think part of it has to do with the difference between AFOLU and REDD+. I think AFOLU is really about emissions reductions in all land uses. Maybe that is where things need to evolve. There are many of us working on these issues that would like to see, not just worrying about emissions from the forested parts of landscape, but reducing emissions across all landscapes. I guess we are hoping that REDD+ is a bit the thin end of a wedge that opens things up so we can get back to some of these AFOLU issues. If REDD+ can take a different direction than what was taken under the CDM and actually become effective, without all the complexity that was introduced into the CDM, maybe it opens up the opportunities for AFOLU and addressing emissions from other land uses. Is that not what you are talking about?

(Q4:UN-REDD, FAO, Dr. Maria Sanz-Sanchez) No, because AFOLU is nothing else but all the land

components plus the livestock emissions, which is not so much related to the land itself. Indeed, the land-use change and forestry, the LULUCF includes agricultural lands. What we are changing is the name. My question is about what we are evolving in our thinking that will make a difference when handling our lands, which would include the land-use change and land-use change in forestry. What is the difference?

(CIFOR, Dr. Louis V. Verchot) This conference is perhaps one example. REDD+ is seen as the domain of foresters. What we are saying is that the pressures coming on forestry come from other parts of the landscape. If we do not understand what those pressures are; if we are not in dialog with the mining interests; we are not rationalizing how land is allocated between agriculture and other land uses; we are not going to achieve the emissions reductions. It is trying to take REDD+ out of the domain of foresters, forestry, and forest ministries, and make those connections that are more representative of the drivers of what is really causing the emissions.