

Workshop Report

Enhancing land-use sector readiness for addressing
climate change and lessons learned from REDD+



11-12th October, 2016
Wageningen, The Netherlands

Organizers:



In collaboration with:



Report of the Workshop¹:
'Enhancing land-use sector readiness for addressing climate change
and lessons learned from REDD+'

Table of Contents:

Executive summary

1. Introduction
2. Background
3. Main lessons learned
4. Summaries of group discussions
5. Follow up ideas
6. Proceedings for the meeting

Annex

¹ This report was prepared by the Co-organizers, in light of their understanding of key elements raised during the discussions, which not necessarily reflects a consensus among participants.

Executive Summary:

On Oct 11 & 12/2017 the workshop 'Enhancing land-use sector readiness for addressing climate change and lessons learned from REDD' took place in Wageningen, the Netherlands, with over 30 participants from 14 countries and organizations. The workshop was jointly organized by Wageningen University and Research, the Environmental Change Institute of Oxford University, and the Ministry of Economic Affairs of The Netherlands, in collaboration with CGIAR/CCAFS Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security, and CGIAR/FTA Research Program on Forests, Trees, and Agroforestry. The workshop addressed two questions: 1) How can the land-use sector better contribute to the 1.5/2 degrees Celsius climate change target, while also aiming to meet other objectives such as adaptation, food security, poverty alleviation and environmental sustainability? 2) What are key lessons learned from REDD+ and what do they mean for enhancing the land-use sector potential for an integrated approach to address climate change? Participants pointed to the need for the forest and agriculture sectors to work together more closely and develop an integrated approach towards managing climate change mitigation goals as well as adaptation and food security objectives. For that though high level political commitment will be needed. REDD+ can provide many useful lessons that both the agriculture sector and an integrated approach can benefit from in order to build capacity, organize stakeholder engagement and design policies and processes. This can then help to build the 'readiness' of the land-use sector as a whole to deal with climate and food security issues in an integrated way. How the integration across land use sectors might and can happen depends on country specific settings and at the geographical level at which the integration makes the most sense. Different types of donors, including private sector investments, need to be brought in to develop land-use sector readiness. The National Determined Contributions (NDCs), a number of which specified actions in the agriculture or forestry sectors, could become an instrument to bring forest and agriculture closer together in considering a 'land use sector approach'.

1. Introduction

On Tuesday 11th and Wednesday 12th October the workshop 'Forest, Agriculture and Climate Change' took place in Wageningen, The Netherlands. Over 30 participants from fourteen different countries and organizations contributed to the successful outcome of the workshop, which was organized by Wageningen University and Research, the Environmental Change Institute of Oxford University, and the Ministry of Economic Affairs of The Netherlands, in collaboration with CGIAR/CCAFS Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security, and CGIAR/FTA Research Program on Forests, Trees, and Agroforestry. Experts working on agriculture and forest in the context of climate change, including REDD+, exchanged ideas and formulated plans on how to enhance the land-use sector readiness for an integrated approach towards meeting global climate change targets, including adaptation and food security goals, among others. They also discussed lessons learned from REDD+ in two broad areas: i) setting the policy framework and ii) implementation, transparency and delivering results, and how/if the lessons can be applied to agriculture or/and a land-use level. Experts participated in their personal capacity, not in representation of the views of their organizations. The workshop addressed two specific questions:

- How can the land-use sector better contribute to the 1.5/2 degrees Celsius climate change target, while also aiming to meet other objectives such as adaptation, food security, poverty alleviation and environmental sustainability?
- What are key lessons learned from REDD+ and what do they mean for enhancing the land-use sector potential for an integrated approach to address climate change?

2. Background

The Paris Agreement recognizes the importance of the land-use sector in supporting global efforts to achieve climate goals. Many countries included forest and/or agriculture within their intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs) as currently, almost one quarter of global green-house gas emissions (GHG) are attributed to agriculture, forestry and other land-uses (IPCC 2014: 8). There is general agreement that we have a great opportunity today, more than ever, to make the land-use sector part of the solution. At the same time, the sector is also quite vulnerable to climate change impacts and traditionally the agriculture community focussed their attention mainly on adaptation activities, particularly in developing countries.

The forest and agriculture sectors have a history of following separate tracks, with different institutions and policies to govern both, while in essence they are closely interlinked and could benefit from a common approach. Policies generated in one domain can affect the other one and vice versa, for instance, policies to support agricultural production have led to

deforestation in many parts of the world and so far agriculture continues to be the main driver of deforestation. Equally important, forest and agriculture are highly vulnerable to climate change, while at the same time they are important sources of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Current international efforts to address land-use emissions in a more coherent and cooperative manner are not sufficient and require further enhancement.

Agriculture as a sector faces the challenge of enhancing food production for an increasing world population, since food and nutrition security is a high priority, while keeping emissions down and addressing other environmental and societal concerns, improving resource efficiency, reducing vulnerability and adapting to climate change. The consideration of the three reinforcing pillars of mitigation, adaptation and food production is what characterizes climate smart agriculture.

Since 2005 RED (later on REDD+) was introduced in the agenda of United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) as an effort to support developing countries to reduce emissions from deforestation. Years later, forest degradation, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks were included in the concept. REDD+ has triggered a series of actions, initiatives and funds at the national and international level. However, REDD+ success is highly dependent on how actors manage to address the main drivers of deforestation and work together with other sectors influencing land-use decisions (Corbera, Estrada, & Brown, 2010: 384; Kissinger, 2013: 43; Salvini et al., 2014). Learning from REDD+ and in particular from its Readiness phase² experiences in harnessing the forest sector to take on climate mitigation actions, both land-uses could draw separate and joint lessons that could enhance their role in addressing climate change challenges, while achieving food security and other environmental and social goals. Different approaches to REDD+ readiness can be found at the FCPF (Forest Carbon Partnership Facility of the World Bank) and UNREDD (FAO, UNEP and UNDP). Most of the REDD+ countries are still in the readiness phase, with few already in early implementation phases. The analysis of lessons learned can also lead to the identification of more integrative approaches for the land-use sector and balancing different objectives at the landscape level.

Forests and agriculture have their specificities and respond to different national priorities (for instance, conservation of ecosystems vs. food production), however, they both present important opportunities for synergies and reducing their trade-offs if more cooperative or landscape approaches are pursued, building more on complementarities and their interface

² Based on different understandings and definitions, the readiness phase can be defined as a status or a process in which a country has fulfilled certain conditions, including policy development and strengthened capacity, and is ready to achieve emission reductions in a measurable, reportable and verified manner (See Streck (2009). And in the case of REDD+, moving to implementation (Phase 2) and benefiting from performance or results-based payments (Phase 3).

than competition for resources. This workshop aimed to promote an exchange of views and develop a set of potential follow up activities on how to enhance the land-use sector readiness for an integrated approach, while balancing different objectives and building on lessons learned. It provided a platform for discussing different approaches to the land-use sector and climate action, for instance, sector versus coordinated or integrated approaches.

3. Main lessons learned

A number of key lessons emerged from the workshop and the discussion of the various topics:

- There is a clear need for the forest and agriculture sectors to work together more closely and develop an integrated approach towards managing climate change mitigation goals as well as adaption and food security objectives.
- High level political commitment will be needed to ensure integration efforts and implementation
- REDD+ can provide many useful lessons that both the agriculture sector and an integrated approach can benefit from in order to build capacity, organize stakeholder engagement and design policies and processes. This can then help to build the 'readiness' of the land-use sector as a whole to deal with climate and food security issues in an integrated way.
- How the integration across land use sectors might and can happen depends on country specific settings and at the geographical level at which the integration makes the most sense.
- Different types of donors, including private sector investments, need to be brought in to develop land-use sector readiness.
- The NDCs, a number of which specified actions in the agriculture or forestry sectors, could become an instrument to bring forest and agriculture closer together in considering the 'land use sector approach'.
- Success stories from countries used as best practices and learning opportunities.

4. Summaries of groups' discussions

Over the course of the workshop the group had a number of discussions to capture insights across a range of questions related to REDD+ processes in various countries and lessons for agriculture and a possible integrated approach.

4.1 REDD+ Lessons learned

REDD+ discussions centered around two main topics: setting the policy framework and implementation, transparency and delivering results.

a. Setting the policy framework

i. International agenda setting and framing strategies

There are several factors which could have led to the success of REDD+

- Changes in government
- Reframing (leading to a perception of self-interest)
- Internalization (from repetition of the idea)
- New findings, for example from science, which can strengthen the incentives

The break-out group discussion identified these key elements/ lessons learned:

• **Framing:**

- In Kyoto, and a bit later, there were concerns that there would be a flood of cheap credits, which would undermine efforts which are (arguably) more needed in the energy sector, where more emissions occur. Offsets traditionally were not favoured as overall there was no net benefit. The concept was clarified which removed these concerns.
- Reframing of the topic – initially some concerns about payments for “doing nothing” (from maintaining standing forest or “avoided deforestation” to “**reducing** emissions from deforestation”). Additionally, when the + was added, more elements were included, which made it more inclusive in terms of forest related activities and countries.
- The failure of ARCDM (Afforestation and reforestation under the Clean Development Mechanism) created the opportunity. Article 5 of the Paris Agreement is encouraging countries to implement REDD+
- Incentives were introduced. This changed the dynamic of the negotiations and made it more appealing to developing countries, who saw the willingness of developed countries to contribute.
- REDD+ is a flexible voluntary mechanism. Its definition allows for the inclusion of plantations - which means that it is more appealing –a lot of ambiguity was accepted in order to keep stakeholders engaged.

• **Science and methodologies:**

- The development of the methodologies (MRV (Measuring, Reporting, Verification)) allowed things to move forward. The full involvement of developing countries helped
- There was more knowledge of the urgent need to address emissions at the global level (see IPCC reports) – science based

- **Coalition building and political will:**

- Several developing countries came together to show their willingness to move the issue forward
- In this coalition building, try to agree to a common approach in advance, rather than trying to get a consensus during the international negotiations
- The process was good at maintaining a coalition (it had a strong entry point through the relevant forestry ministries)
- Political will is key to make REDD+ work
- Most developing countries have the state as the owner of the forest, so there is a strong incentive for government to engage and enforce their power
- Establish the difference between politically viable actions and those which are not viable to be addressed, and to start with the ones which are viable – an incremental strategy

- ii. Policy coherence/ policy development/ institutions building or strengthening

- **Aspire for programmatic approaches but start with projects.** To ensure that scaling up is done with robust approaches

- In contrast with CDM projects, REDD+ started out as a national level approach (rather than project level), but it did prove itself at the project level (testing MRV methodologies for example) before it moved to jurisdictional, national etc. This allowed countries to experiment before scaling up.
- REDD+ allowed for demonstration / pilot projects testing methodologies

- **Consistency and coherence:**

- Consistency is needed in methodologies, coherence in policies, compatibility, transparency
- Policy coherence at the international level on financial support and its conditions to countries. Clarify roles of different donors. Invite all the donors into the room, and organize how things would be funded
- New national goals (such as Costa Rica who aspired to become carbon neutral by 2021), incentivize adoption and working under a national coherent and consistent umbrella
- Opportunities for alignment where there are potential conflicts, with other frameworks such as biodiversity frameworks. Also the emergence of initiatives such as biodiversity offsets

- **Stakeholders involvement:**
 - The broad scope of REDD+ means that all relevant stakeholders should be involved from the beginning. This has transaction costs, though.
 - Early stage involvement of all relevant ministries
 - Alignment of sectoral policies to national/international initiatives, and inter-ministry approaches. Also Joint reporting
 - Strengthen cross-sectoral planning – i.e. don't work only with forest department – have to work with agriculture department too

- **Vertical and horizontal integration:**
 - Vertical as well as horizontal integration of relevant government structures

- **Need for new institutions and structures:**
 - One of the difficulties for countries is the lack of institutions/ structures in which to implement REDD+

- iii. Balancing different goals vis-à-vis using safeguards
 - **Multiple goals:**
 - Multiple goals need multiple instruments, and it is not logical to expect that one instrument can fulfil many goals
 - In terms of policy instruments, there is a rule of thumb which is that for each goal you have, you need a policy instrument, so if you have several different goals (for example the SDGs), then you cannot do this with one instrument such as REDD+. Have on primary goal, and ensure that safeguards support this

 - **Information systems:**
 - A national (centralized) multi-purpose information system could streamline reporting to a range of different initiatives (this is not the case for many countries)

 - **Assessment needs:**
 - Reduce the burden of reporting on safeguards by reviewing what countries already have and build on that
 - Be inclusive. Include relevant stakeholders
 - Prepare a country led assessment of national capacities and identify gaps
 - Review existing information streams, and then adapt them, as necessary (case of Indonesia).

- Assess if existing laws can provide the safeguards required (however in reality, laws on paper may not be sufficient) – this is a good learning process for all countries and should be iterative. Build an information system to match what is needed.
 - The initial framework for safeguards can be the Cancun safeguards (including rights of indigenous people), then discuss with stakeholders and come up with a new set of safeguards applicable to national context.
- **Design process:**
 - The safeguards on reversals and displacement should be part of the design of the reference level, under the right policy measures to be included in the design of the national REDD+ strategy and MRV
- iv. Addressing [agricultural] drivers of deforestation
- **Process:**
 - Start with the easiest drivers to address (based on political acceptability)
 - There is also a difference between planned and unplanned deforestation – the general feeling is that all deforestation should be stopped, and it is unrealistic to expect that other land uses can be stopped since they are more profitable than preserving forests.
 - **Trade and Agriculture related drivers:**
 - In terms of defining the drivers of deforestation, also consider international demand for products – this is often the major driver
 - Agriculture as a driver can be related to food security, but sometimes for food export to developed countries. For example oil palm in Indonesia.
 - Don't just consider agriculture as a direct driver but instead as agriculture-related (underlying) drivers. In Vietnam they don't talk about agriculture drivers, but agriculture related drivers, so they use these to find a solution for the drivers
 - In some countries, agriculture is not the main driver (case of India, where fuelwood collection is one of the main drivers, not agriculture conversion)
 - **Assessments:**
 - More systematic and consistent (empirical) assessment of land use change drivers (and causality) to support policy
 - **Private sector involvement:**
 - There are opportunities from the private sector to take responsibility for emission, and this can occur more quickly than other mechanisms

b. Implementation, transparency and delivering results

- i. Implementation phases, processes and stakeholder engagement at different scales (local, national, international)
 - Farmers who are owners of land (agriculture, forest) are interested in the efficiency of systems and the sustainability of incomes.
 - Finding solutions for the whole community remains a challenge. Smallholders (including indigenous people) need to be involved and their access to benefits needs to be supported, but expectations need to be realistic. Paradigm shift from conservation versus living in the forest. Capacity building is key.
 - Having all stakeholders together in one forum or platform is a challenge. Perhaps multiple spaces should be enabled.
 - REDD+ development at the national/local level has different levels (for instance, political, technical, personal, etc.)
 - REDD's success is dependent on addressing livelihoods, not only carbon monitoring
 - There is an increased demand for implementation and funds for performance rewards
 - Land-use sector faces the challenge of addressing multiple goals (food security, environmental issues, adaptation, livelihoods, etc.)
 - Countries should think about their strategy to integrate their different goals (livelihoods, mitigation, etc.) and inform and guide donors (not the other way round)
 - Land-use strategies need to be aligned to countries' needs
 - For implementation of sustainable activities, REDD+ needs more than incentives
 - NDCs present an opportunity for sectors to work together
 - As for transparency, be clear on what resources are needed, what does it imply, methodologies, information sharing, among others
 - Setting the methodological architecture: reference levels, Indicators of climate readiness and Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) systems, including production of reliable data
 - Linking carbon to agricultural productivity remains a challenge (no baselines, nor tools or monitoring). Farmers need to understand carbon in system. Pilot studies could be useful in terms of identifying proxies that can be suited and monitoring over time
 - There is some disconnection between the high-level ambitions and local level reality.

- High commitment of government need, including inter-ministerial coordination or agency/organization
- While at the farm level there is some integration, incentives from different sides present some obstacles for this integration. Top-down and bottom-up approaches need to flow better.
- Develop monitoring systems that respond to land-use sectors' multiple needs (for instance, bring together all the land-use sectors when doing their inventory)
- Integration of monitoring planning at national to regional and local levels. Consideration of landscape approach and integrated plan across different levels of government-.

ii. Finance and incentives frameworks

- There are some differences in finance for forest and agriculture. Agriculture is (highly) subsidized in some countries. Forest funding more scarce. Important to align priorities at the national level in development plans. Transformational changes needed in underlying drivers.
- More involvement of finance ministries is key
- Ministries of agriculture to consider safeguards
- Agriculture presents opportunities for carbon storage. REDD+ is funding sustainable agriculture solutions in some countries (e.g. Costa Rica).
- For both, forestry or agriculture, you need to consider small-scale farmers. They need to generate income and stop deforestation. Connect farmers to markets and promote investment funds to strengthen their positions.
- Put REDD+ in the context of the SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals), NDCs, etc., to create more interest and funding
- REDD+ money is not enough yet. Methodological approaches could be simpler so that significant amount of money does not stay with monitoring experts/ consultants. For instance, carbon monitoring at the local level has high transaction costs, it is too complex.
- Need for mitigation metrics for agriculture and the finance for accounting for climate change mitigation.
- Development of key performance indicators are needed for agriculture
- Consider landscape certification (avoid cost of looking at one farmer at the time)

4.2 What are the differences and commonalities between agriculture and forest sectors in meeting mitigation targets and achieving multiple objectives?

While both, forest and agriculture are part of the land-use sector, they encompass several differences and similarities. Understanding and analyzing these, as well as their inter-relationships, can provide important feedback for designing coherent and effective climate strategies, including those aiming at addressing the land-use sector as a whole, in a more integrative manner. The following were the main differences and similarities identified by participants:

Differences:

- People see agriculture as a driver of deforestation, so agriculture is seen as a threat (negative connotation).
- Forests are mostly owned by governments, while agriculture is mainly smallholders (in general). This is why REDD+ is more of a government led initiative, whereas a different approach is needed focusing on many small stakeholders in agriculture.
- Agriculture is more complex because of the variety of activities and actors.
- In the context of UNFCCC, REDD+ is mitigation, while adaptation is a co-benefit, whereas agriculture is seen as an opportunity for adaptation, and mitigation would be the co-benefit
- In the forest sector it is easier to separate the tenure rights of the product (trees) from the root title (land – which typically belongs to the state) via lease arrangements than in the case of agriculture, particularly smallholder agriculture. This is because in the agricultural sector people typically have a set of rights by different parties across the same landscape which means that trading in carbon rights in such a context may be both politically sensitive and legally complicated.
- In terms of mitigation, in forest we mainly measure using stock difference, but in agriculture it is mainly done using fluxes, so there is a difference in MRV approaches used
- Agriculture is more market oriented, whereas forestry is less market dependent (but still market oriented – production forests especially so), so the development of instruments should take this into consideration
- The regulatory regime is different, for example, forests tend to have more established (implemented in the long-term) regulations than agriculture
- A much greater proportion of the population are involved in agriculture than in forests

Commonalities:

- Over exploitation and unsustainable management practices are the main causes of emissions
- Both forest and agriculture are sources for food (for example non-traditional forests products in forests)
- Forest and agriculture are both land based concepts, which impact livelihood, so land rights (tenure and property rights) are key
- Need for more robust data on specific activities and use of land
- Both agriculture and forests contribute to global goals, including the SDGs and also climate change
- Complex: both can be seen as the problem or the solution
- Both can contain trees
- Common elements of MRV are accuracy, completeness, transparency and comparability
- Both have state controlled institutions that develop policies, programmes and plans

4.3 How/if lessons learned can be applied to agriculture and land-use

There was general understanding that REDD+ lessons learned are useful for climate action on agriculture or the land-use sector as a whole. Agriculture has a role to play as part of the land-use. In working on REDD+, countries could develop ideas on how to connect the agriculture and forest sectors. For some, “policy approaches to reduce emissions from deforestation” has agriculture implicit. Main views shared by participants included:

- Need to work at a very high political level, identify win-win opportunities across all different sectors
- Success in one land-use is dependent on working together with other sectors. Need to build bridges among them
- Overall sector can learn from REDD+ development and work towards an integrated approach
- There is urgent need to address emissions in the agriculture sector by integrating different land-uses
- Capacity development is necessary so integration works properly
- Addressing land use challenges needs a more holistic approach
- At a country level we need more analysis on data, for instance, shared data bases, including analysis of drivers

- With integrated land approaches we should think of different ways on how we collect data
- Scientists and policy makers need to engage with each other so research is more tailored and policy has a strong scientific back-up.
- The importance of markets in designing any land-use climate strategy is key

4.4 Lower scale and national/international scales- different approaches to the land-use sector and climate action

Participants shared views on different approaches and challenges to the land-use sector and climate action. The discussion took place at two levels: lower scale (local level) and high scale (national/international level), and these were the main ideas:

i. Lower scale (local level)

- **Challenges:** Land-tenure, -fragmentation and -allocation (for instance, by government, or from generation to generation, etc.) continue to be a challenge at the local level. In some cases, the enforcement or lack of land-regulations prevent the sustainable use of land. At the same time, lack of involvement at the farm level and a top down approach are also a challenge.
- **Framing:** There is a translation issue – at the national level we talk about emissions and carbon stocks, and at the local level we talk about production and vulnerability, for example. The realities about life at the community level require a different language to that used by scientists, and politicians.
- **Mitigation vrs. Adaptation:** In many developing countries, smallholder farmers are more interested in adaptation than in mitigation. They don't perceive themselves the benefits of mitigation. There are some win-win situations, however, for some, there will always be tradeoffs. There are practices which can address vulnerability, as well as adaptation and mitigation. In fact the entry point can be "vulnerability". The burden of mitigation should not be put on the farmer.
- **Way forward:**
 - Actions need to be context specific, there are some areas where adaptation should be prioritized, and some where mitigation can be prioritized.

- The integration of forest and agriculture can be more “do-able” at the local / district level (see for instance Green Economy Strategy in Indonesia which is focusing on how districts can transform their economy).
- It is necessary to translate national strategies into local level application (vertical as well as horizontal integration is required).
- Participation is key, also information sharing and technical capacity. It is important to stimulate discussions with farmer associations, how they can contribute, and what changes are needed.
- Provide the right incentives to farmers and forest owners (an example is the ecological blue flag in Costa Rica).

ii. Higher scale (national/ international)

- **Landscape and integration:** Sustainable management of resources requires climate action at the landscape level, considering that both forests and agriculture have a role to play for both adaptation and mitigation, for instance, restoring forest cover has been best adaptation strategy, which at the same time, contributes to mitigation. If we want to have integration of both, we have to recognize that some land is more suitable for agriculture and other for forests. The way forward is to approach the problem from a landscape level, which presents a political challenge. Silos overcoming needs integration in three areas: ideas, interests and institutions, both at the national and international levels. As regards to REDD+, at the national level it is impossible to have REDD+ implementation without working together with other sectors. Debates on REDD+ should consider the agricultural sector. In this regard, the optimal planning option is a landscape approach. Some countries are sceptical about including agriculture emissions in REDD+ for concerns about losing some REDD+ benefits
- **Adaptation vrs. Mitigation:** There are a lot of opportunities for both adaptation and mitigation. It should be context specific guided by the principle of Common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR). Could we talk about “Adaptive mitigation” vs “mitigative adaptation”?
- **Way forward:** Successful processes at the national level will push the discussions for a stronger agreement at the international level on the role of agriculture. National processes can inform the international level. However, we need empirical evidence for making the right decisions. There’s still a chance to revise the INDCs to align/reflect the national strategies, before they become NDCs. Countries should clearly state the role of land use sector, including how it will be measured. Specify what in the land use sector is agricultural targets. It can be useful to convert the global targets in country actionable targets.

4.5 Panel: Implementation and Funding streams in the context of climate action of the land-use sector and setting the scene for climate readiness

In general, there are several funding streams for the land-use sector (private, public, national, international), and these differ in the level of requirements, reporting, or integration or interaction desired among the different sectors. Panelists presented their views on how they see the role of climate finance supporting national/ local efforts and climate action in the land-use sector and had an interactive discussion with participants. Main issues raised during the panel discussion were:

- **Financing sustainable development:** Climate finance needs to be part of the sustainable economic development of countries. Investors want public funds to de-risk their investment. They want the risk removed through mixed constructions.
- **Country ownership:** Recipient countries themselves need to be at the driver seat when it comes to defining the use of international funds and engaging relevant sectors/ ministries, actors, etc. Finance tends to flow through ministries, so even if donors want integration, it must come from the country rather than from the donor. Ministries usually have a self-interest to make sure that the funds stay in their area of work. Main limiting factor is a sectoral interest of ministries. At the same time, donors have different reporting requirements, so this is difficult for countries/ project developers.
- **Drivers and inclusiveness:** The narrative has changed in REDD+, it is not just about donors giving finance to recipient countries to change their land use practices, but it is now about involving actors who are “drivers”, so they need to be brought in. There is also a need to increase knowledge about country specific direct and indirect drivers of deforestation, since this is key for successful implementation. Donors could mobilize their funds for this. Getting a good driver analysis would be useful (more detail on what the drivers of deforestation are, and to what extent they contribute to deforestation).
- **Governance and integration:** Some consider that the main barriers are existing governance structures, and the way in which Official Development Assistance (ODA) or similar are disbursed. It is possible to work with a more integrated approach but it is not an easy task (need to work at different sectors, levels, i.e. in monitoring, research, policy and each, in an integrated way). In order for benefits to get to the

actors on the ground, donors want safeguards, since usually existing structures are between the government and the donor. There is now more of an interest from donors to work on implementation, rather than readiness and the need for an integrated approach is more acknowledged as a key success factor.

5 Follow up ideas resulting from the workshop

Participants developed 5 topics of common interest for drafting recommendations and ideas on how to develop tailored strategies for enhancing the mitigation, adaptation and food security potential in the land-use sector, and also exchanged ideas for further research on selected issues. They designated champions for follow up. These ideas include:

1) Policies: What policy process do we need to make the integration of forest and agriculture at the landscape level happen

Champions: Rob Busink and Nghia Tran

Members: Rob Busink, Nghia Tran, Stanley Eze and Roberto Azofeifa

Activities identified:

1. Meetings between technical officers from planning, finance, agriculture, environment, forest at the provincial / regional level
2. Establish effective communication channels between policy makers, local practitioners, and farmers and foresters
3. As part of bullets 1 & 2 select a province / district as pilot for integrating the forest and agriculture sector at the landscape level
4. Organize meeting of representatives of the different land use sectors (agriculture, forestry, mining and consumers) to discuss their interests
5. Sharing experience during side events and webinar (in EN FR SP) / Forum at UNREDD / GACSA / FAO

2) Key messages for UNFCCC/ COP 22

Champion: Tabitha Muriuki

Members: Tabitha Muriuki, Augusto Castro-Nuñez, Roberto Azofeifa, Stanley Eze, Cinthia Soto, Novia Widyaningtyas

Activities:

1. Use of NDC processes to integrate forest and agricultural issues
2. Need to prioritize simultaneous work on adaptation and mitigation

3. Explore without compromising political implications of integrating adaptation and mitigation in the agricultural sector
4. Prioritize the exploration of the best options / scenarios for integration
5. Exchanging about the best practices preferably based on regions
6. Examples of options that work /successes. What are the obstacles (technical / institutional)

Plan of action:

- Dutch pavilion presentation of workshop outcomes at the COP22
- Initiate communications among members to develop a concept note
- Email and skype
- Link to other key messages /ideas

3) Metrics for jurisdictional unit / landscape performance that combine carbon stocks (trees, forest), people, exported and imported footprints: a basic concept and proposal outline

Champion: Meine van Noordwijk

Members: Meine van Noordwijk, Ricardo Ulate, Aritta Suwarno, Deuteronomy Kasaro, Reuben Ottou

Activities:

1. Define details of the method, data sources
2. First assessment and discussion of results (include countries with landscape approaches in their NDC's)
3. Broader group to judge salience
4. Refine method and start piloting

Use a graph of x (log of pop density) and y (forest area), and adjust with 'leakage' - where they are exporting emission.

Plan of action:

- Concept note describing the idea and steps
- Seeking funds for meeting of experts & data sources
- First assessment (paper)
- Results and side event 2017
- Next learning
- Coalition with public and private and research to be champions.

4) Commission a study to analyze INDCs/NDCs with a view to quantifying

Champion: Richard McNally

Members: Victoria Suarez-Davalos, Norma Pedroza Arceo, Richard McNally, Rizki Pandu Permana, Reuben Ottou, Maarten Bruring, Jagdish Kishwan, Kristin DeValue

Activities:

1. Voluntary commitment of emissions' reductions in agricultural sector i) developing countries ii) developed countries
2. Commitment to mitigation / adaptation treating land use as an integrated entity / landscape approach by i) developing countries ii) developed countries
3. To aim at introducing an integrated land use approach at the international level (UNFCCC)
4. Workshops to share experiences
5. Challenge - national registry for all NDC actions
6. Analyze INDCs commitment proposed by different countries for the agriculture sector, and land use sector
7. Coordination between forest and agriculture sectors could help increase level / amount of commitment included in NDCs
8. Identify case studies for example success stories included in the SOFO, and relate to SOFA (State of forests and agriculture)– support FAO

Potential partners: Climate Focus (studies), UNDP, USAID (doing work on NDCs and link with private sector), SNV (advising, initial contact). Timeframe, 6 months – 1 year

5) Research priorities

Champion: Martin Herold

Members: Martin Herold, Nadine Herold, Mariana Rufino, Octavio Carrasquilla, Bas Arts, Augusto Castro-Nuñez , Sarah Carter, Eric Patrick

Activities:

- Integration of multiple objectives in landscape development (overall idea)
- Measure the eco-efficiency of forest land and agricultural activities (land resources, energy, water, vulnerability, raw materials, GHG emissions, risk of pollution) (Octavio)
- Align sustainable intensification with farmers' priorities and forest protection
- Landscape level performance using land and product level accounting for multiple objectives (Meine, Mariana, Martin)
- Multi-level governance research

- Linking underlying agricultural drivers of forest loss, to facilitate a dialogue with the agricultural sector. (Sarah, Eric, Mariana, Martin)
- Barriers for adoption of sustainable CSA approaches –Approaches for linking adaptation and mitigation (Augusto)
- Revisiting CSA objectives / practices. Landscape scale outcomes – scaling of outcomes and impact of performance (climate performance) (Mariana, Martin)
- Practical implications of environmental policy integration (Bas)

Potential donors: CCA FS, CIFOR, FTA, IFAD, NORAD, CAF-Development bank of Latin America

6 Proceedings of the meeting

Day 1: 11 October 2016,

The day was opened by Ms. Cinthia Soto, Wageningen University and Research, who introduced the agenda of the day and welcome all participants. She introduced Mr. Rob Busink, Senior Policy Advisor, Ministry of Economic Affairs, The Netherlands. Mr. Rob Busink welcome everyone on behalf of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, the Wageningen University and Research Centre, The Environmental Change Institute of Oxford University, in collaboration with CGIAR/CCAFS Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security, and CGIAR/FTA Research Program on Forests, Trees, and Agroforestry. Mr. Rob Busink emphasized the opportunity of this workshop, which brings together policy advisors, research and practitioners from all around the world, to make this workshop a success together.

Mr. Meine van Noordwijk, from the CGIAR/ FTA followed Mr. Rob Busink with a presentation that showed historical trends on development sustainability policies (from Brundtland report to SDG's) and the current need for an integrated holistic approach if we are to make the 1.5-2 degree climate targets. Important messages from Mr. Meine van Noordwijk are that many of the countries that have lowered their emissions, have actually exported their emissions to other countries. At the same time, emissions embodied in trade and outsourced food production represent important issues: a country might increase forest cover and reduce emissions by outsourcing food production, and importing raw materials (wood). Accountability for the carbon footprints of the production is a complex issue. If we continue on this path it is highly unlikely that the 1.5-2 degree target will be obtained.

Ms. Monika Zurek, from the Environmental Change Institute, Food Systems Group, University of Oxford, as facilitator of the workshop, introduced the next presentation on the "FAO's State of the World's Forests: 2016 Report" by Ms. Kristin DeValue, FAO Expert on REDD+ Safeguards and Governance. Ms. DeValue showed how the greatest loss of forests and gain in agricultural land was in tropical and low-income countries. Often there are many policies in place, however they may not always work together properly. The report

highlighted eight success factors from countries that have increased both their food security and their forest covers.

Ms. Zurek then introduced Mr. Ricardo Ulate, Advisor for the National Forestry Financing Fund, Ministry of Environment and Energy, Government of Costa Rica. Mr. Ulate provided an in-depth view on REDD+ implementation based on the Costa Rican experience. He argued that the readiness processes include many complex steps countries should take before they can enter REDD+ results based payments. Mr. Ulate highlighted some challenges Costa Rica faced implementing REDD+ and gave an overview of the lessons learned in the process.

Ms. Zurek emphasized how the issues discussed in the workshop are complex and not easy to solve. Therefore, the workshop will broke-out in two groups. The first group discussed lessons learned from the REDD+ policy framework. The second group discussed the lessons learned from the implementation of REDD+. The last half hour of the group discussions were dedicated to exploring commonalities and differences between forest and agriculture in meeting mitigation targets and achieving multiple objectives.

Both break-out groups came together again. Ms. Cinthia Soto presented the first groups' results of the discussion as their facilitator during the session. The group started by questioning why deforestation entered UNFCCC in 2005 and not before that time. Ms. Soto summarized key factors the group has found through their discussions. Last but not least, an extensive list of commonalities and differences between agriculture and forestry was given, of which some were source of debate within the group.

Following Ms. Soto, Mr. Ivo Mulder presented the second groups' lessons learned on the implementation and financing side of REDD+. Mr. Mulder presented a list of implementation activities that have not worked and those that have worked. Mr. Mulder presented an overview of the methodological architecture and possible solutions to issues the group had found there. The presentation is finished by discussing the financing and incentives.

The day's session is closed by some key messages by Ms. Monika Zurek, who emphasised that one issue keeps popping up, and that is that there is a movement among farmers towards the landscape level and to take on a broader view. However, it is the international institutional level that is lagging behind and that has to catch up. After providing an overview of the next day's schedule Ms. Monika Zurek closed off the day.

Day2: 12 October 2016

Ms. Zurek opened the day by welcoming all participants and introducing Prof. dr. Bas Arts, Professor at the Wageningen University, Chairman of the Forest- and Nature Conservation Policy Group. Prof. Arts welcome everyone and linked the different aspects of Forest- and Nature Conservation Policy to the workshop's discussions.

Ms. Zurek introduced some changes to the programme, based on discussions held the day before, and started the session on "Background on current discussions within the agriculture

and food systems community with respect to climate change in light of the Paris Agreement” by making a presentation on “1,5 degrees and 10 billion people: How to feed the world while mitigating climate change?”. She emphasized that we need to talk about food systems, not just about agricultural production and that globally we all have come to the point where we have to move forward through action. An important message is that the biggest and quickest gains possible are linked to food waste and dietary changes. The presentation by Ms. Zurek was followed by Mr. Augusto Castro-Nunez, PhD from the University of Copenhagen and co-author of the CGIAR/CCAFS’ report “Options for agriculture at Marrakech climate talks: messages for SBSTA 45 agriculture negotiators”. Mr. Castro shared ten options described in the report to take agriculture forward and the pro's and con's that accompany these options. This is followed by an active discussion from the floor on the different options and their pro's and con's.

After the break the participants came together once more to form two break-out groups. Each group exchanged views on different approaches to the land-use sector and climate action, for instance, sector versus coordinated or integrated approaches and in which circumstances would each approach fit best. One group focused at the local level, and the other group at the national and international levels.

After the discussions the break-out groups reconvened and Ms. Zurek asked the facilitators of both groups to summarize their groups' findings. As facilitator of the break-out group on higher-scale implementation, Ms. Mariana Rufino presented a summary of the discussion. Key messages were that the INDC's were produced in haste and improvements made towards the NDC's could support a more integrated approach. Furthermore, the NDC's are a good entry point for integration of the different silo's.

Mr. Meine van Noordwijk, as second facilitator, presented the summary of the group that focussed on the local level. Key messages from the group were that approaches should start bottom-up and then be fed into the international process. Furthermore, a change in societal perspectives is needed towards a more green and sustainable approach.

The afternoon session was kicked off by a panel discussion on the implementation and funding streams in the context of climate action of the land-use sector and setting the scene for climate readiness. The panel was integrated by Mr. Ivo Mulder, REDD+ Green Economy Advisor, UN-REDD Program, UNEP; Mr. Richard McNally, SNV Global Coordinator Climate Smart Agriculture, Global Coordinator REDD+, Program Manager REAP Program; Mr. Erick Patrick, Adaptation Specialist, IFAD; Mr. Octavio Carrasquilla, Main Executive, Environment and Climate Change Directorate, CAF (Latin America Development Bank). Panelists presented their views on how they see the role of climate finance supporting national/ local efforts and climate action in the land-use sector and had an interactive discussion with participants.

The write-shop took place after the panel. Participants proposed different topics that they would like to see some action taking place, including ideas for further research, and

discussed among themselves how to move forward. There were 5 groups formed on the following topics:

- 1) Policies: What policy process do we need to make the integration of forestry and agriculture at the landscape level happen
- 2) Key messages for UNFCCC/ COP 22
- 3) Metrics for jurisdictional unit / landscape performance that combine carbon stocks
- 5) (trees, forest), people, exported and imported footprints: a basic concept and proposal outline
- 6) Commission a study to analyze INDCs/NDCs with a view to quantifying
- 6) Research priorities

The last plenary session was in interactive discussion on insights, findings and key messages from the workshop.

The meeting ended by thanking participants for their enriching contributions, as well as thanking the team of co-organizers, sponsors and collaborators, speakers and note-takers.

Annex 1
PROGRAMME

Tuesday, October 11 th	
9:00-9:30	Registration
9:30-9:50	Welcome and introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome remarks by Rob Busink, Senior Policy Advisor, Ministry of Economic Affairs, The Netherlands, on behalf of the co-organizers and collaborators • Presentation of the workshop objectives, programme, organization of our work
9:50-10:40	Background land-use sector and climate change: achieving current global climate targets <p>Presentation by: <i>Mr. Meine van Noordwijk, (CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry- CGIAR-FTA-)</i></p> <p>Objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To present an introductory overview of the land-use issues and climate, what we know and what recognized gaps are. <p>Discussion</p>
10:40-11:00	Coffee break
11:00-11:30	Presentation of “FAO’s State of the World’s Forests: 2016” report <p>Presentation by: <i>Ms. Kristin DeValue, FAO Expert on REDD+ Safeguards and Governance</i></p> <p>Objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To present an overview of latest state of world’s forests, which addresses forests and agriculture interactions and improving food security while halting deforestation <p>Discussion</p>
11:30-12:00	Background and current state of REDD+: The case of Costa Rica <p>Presentation by: <i>Mr. Ricardo Ulate, National Forests Financing Fund, FONAFIFO, Costa Rica</i></p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To address REDD+ more in-depth since its inception, including readiness processes • To share REDD+ lessons learned and relevance for the land-use sector in the INDCs /NDCs <p>Discussion</p>
12:00-13:00	Lunch
13:00-15:15	Break out groups’ work <p>Objectives: To discuss REDD+ lessons learned in 2 broad areas:</p> <p>Break-out group 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Setting the policy framework, e.g., <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International agenda setting and framing strategies • Policy coherence/ policy development/ institutions building or strengthening • Balancing different goals vis-à-vis using safeguards

- Addressing agricultural drivers of deforestation

Break-out group 2:

- d. Implementation, transparency and delivering results, e.g.,**
 - Implementation phases, processes and stakeholder engagement at different scales (local, national, international)
 - Setting the methodological architecture: reference levels, Indicators of climate readiness and Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) systems, including production of reliable data
 - Finance and incentives' frameworks
 - Successful ground/grassroots efforts, especially those that have gone to scale

Guiding questions:

- What were key success factors? Conflicts and tensions? Key actors?
- What were key national and international supportive or guiding policies?

What are the differences and commonalities between agriculture and forest sectors in meeting mitigation targets and achieving multiple objectives? (last 30 minutes for discussing this matter)

15:15-15:45 Coffee break

15:45-17:20 Break-out groups' presentations and discussion on how/if lessons learned can be applied to agriculture and land-use

10 min. presentation per group

15 min. for Q&A

60 min. for plenary discussion

Guiding questions:

- How/if the lessons can be applied to agriculture or/and a land-use level?
- Can agriculture/ land-use sector learn from forests' experience on mitigation and what can it learn from it?
- Do we need to connect (and how) agriculture and forest when pursuing climate action?
- Can we enhance agriculture's mitigation potential while still pursuing other equally important objectives such as adaptation and food security?

Discussion

17:20-17:30 Final remarks

18:30 Meeting time for Welcome Dinner and transportation

19:00-21:00 Welcome dinner at Fletcher Hotel-Restaurant de Wageningsche Berg, Generaal Fouldkesweg 96

Wednesday, October 12th

9:00-9:20 Summary of discussions Day 1

9:20-10:15 Background on current discussions within the agriculture and food systems community with respect to climate change in light of the Paris Agreement

Presentation 1 by: Ms. Monika Zurek, Environmental Change Institute, Food Systems Group, University of Oxford

Summary presentation of CGIAR/CCAFS' report "Options for agriculture at Marrakech climate talks: messages for SBSTA 45 agriculture negotiators"

Presentation 2 by: Mr. Augusto Castro-Núñez, University of Copenhagen and co-author of

Objectives:

- To provide an overview of where agriculture opportunities and challenges are present in relation to climate change
- To share in what way can food systems have the potential to contribute to climate change mitigation
- To provide a short background of agriculture discussions within UNFCCC and a set of options for its further consideration at Marrakech (COP22)

Guiding questions:

- Why agriculture could be highly “complex” when it comes to climate change?
- The 3 pillars: mitigation, adaptation and food security – synergies and trade-offs?

Discussion

10:15-10:30 Coffee break

10:30-12:00 Break-out groups’ work

60 min. group work discussion

10 min per group to report back plenary

10 min. Q & A

Group 1: “lower scale” (local level) Group 2: “higher scale” (national/international)

Objective:

- To share views on different approaches to the land-use sector and climate action, for instance, sector versus coordinated or integrated approaches and in which circumstances would each approach fit best

Guiding questions:

- What type of approach do we need for enhancing the potential of the land-use sector to support climate action?
- Under what circumstances does it make sense to have sector vrs. integrated approaches? Where is coordination or an integrated approach needed? What are the implications for policy and governance at different scales?

12:00-13:00 Lunch

13:00-14:15 Panel: Implementation and Funding streams in the context of climate action of the land-use sector and setting the scene for climate readiness

Panel participants:

- *Ivo Mulder, REDD+ Green Economy Advisor- UN-REDD Programme, UNEP*
- *Richard McNally, SNV Global Coordinator Climate Smart Agriculture, Global Coordinator REDD+, Program Manager REAP Program*
- *Eric Patrick, Adaptation Specialist, IFAD*
- *Octavio Carrasquilla, Main Executive, Environment and Climate Change Directorate, CAF (Latin America Development Bank)*

Objectives:

- To share views on funding solutions that would encourage climate readiness in land-use, agriculture and forestry projects

Guiding questions:

- What would climate readiness mean for funding streams and implementation? Key requirements?
- Do current funding sources support integrated or separate approaches?

14:15-15:30 Plenary discussion- Transition towards climate readiness

Objective:

- To identify what is necessary for a transition towards climate readiness in the land-use sector

Guiding questions:

- What climate readiness of the land use sector would entail and if and how it could be measured (baselines, accounting, finance, etc.)?
- Potential implications for policy and governance?
- Potential implications for implementation?
- Identify priorities for readiness or actions needed (nationally or internationally) and by whom?

15:30-15:45 Coffee break

15:45-17:00 Write-shop on main outcomes of the workshop

Based on discussions:

- Recommendations and ideas on how to develop tailored strategies for enhancing the mitigation, adaptation and food security potential in the land-use sector, which can serve as an input to UNFCCC/ COP22 or any other relevant process. This includes suggestions on actions needed and by whom.
- Recommendations and ideas for further research on selected issues or locations.
- Any other proposals?

17:00-17:30 Closure

Annex 2

Participants' list

	Given name	Surname	Organization, position
1	Bas	Arts	Professor, Forest and Nature Conservation Policy Group, Wageningen University and Research
2	Roberto	Azofeifa	Chief Sustainable Production Department, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock of Costa Rica
3	Maarten	Bruring	Wageningen University and Research
4	Rob	Busink	Ministry of Economic Affairs, The Netherlands
5	Octavio	Carrasquilla	CAF, Development Bank of Latin America
6	Sarah	Carter	Wageningen University and Research
7	Augusto	Castro-Nuñez	Pre-doctoral Research fellow, University of Copenhagen
8	Kasaro	Deuteronomy	Mitigation Specialist, Climate Change Secretariat, Ministry of National Development Planning, Zambia
9	Kristin	DeValue	FAO Expert on REDD+ Safeguards and Governance
10	Stanley	Eze	Climate Change Network Nigeria
11	Hein	Gevers	Wageningen University and Research
12	Martin	Herold	Professor, Laboratory of Geo-information Science and Remote Sensing, Wageningen University and Research Centre
13	Nadine	Herold	Wageningen University and Research
14	Jagdish	Kishwan	Chief Advisor- Policy, Wildlife Trust of India, and former Lead Negotiator- India for REDD+ and LULUCF
15	Richard	McNally	SNV Global Coordinator Climate Smart Agriculture, Global Coordinator REDD+, Program Manager REAP Program
16	Ivo	Mulder	REDD+ Green Economy Advisor- UN-REDD, UNEP
17	Tabitha	Muriuki	Wageningen University and Research
18	Meine	Noordwijk, van	ICRAF/ CGIAR/FTA
19	Reuben	Ottou	Project Coordinator, Ghana, SNV
20	Eric	Patrick	Adaptation Specialist, IFAD
21	Norma Mercedes	Pedroza Arceo	FAO representative at CONAFOR, Mexico
22	Rizki Pandu	Permana	Sector Leader Agriculture, SNV, Indonesia
23	Kyle	Poorman	GACSA, FAO
24	Mariana	Rufino	Professor of Agricultural Systems, Lancaster University
25	Cinthia	Soto	Wageningen University and Research
26	Maria Victoria	Suarez Davalos	REDD+, Ecuador
27	Aritta	Suwarno	Tropenbos International
28	Niki	De Sy	Wageningen University and Research

29	Nghia Dai	Tran	Head of department, Department of natural resources and environmental economics, IPSARD, Vietnam
30	Ricardo	Ulate	Fonafifo, Costa Rica
31	Novia	Widyaningtyas	REDD+, Indonesia
32	Monika	Zurek	Environmental Change Institute, Oxford University
