Chapter 3

What are the costs and potentials of REDD?

Ruben N. Lubowski

3.1 Introduction

Scientific evidence indicates that avoiding dangerous interference with the climate system – e.g. warming greater than 2 degrees Celsius by the end of the century – requires rapid and large-scale reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from developed and major-emitting developing countries. Reducing emissions from tropical forests offers an immediate opportunity to mitigate a significant emissions source at relatively low estimated costs. Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) efforts could also offer an attractive 'bridge strategy' of reducing near-term emissions while buying time to adapt to a low carbon future.

This chapter looks at some important questions for decisions over the policy and architecture of REDD: What will REDD cost? How will REDD affect the overall strategy for reducing GHG emissions? How will REDD affect the carbon price and efforts to reduce emissions in other sectors? The chapter focuses on ways in which different economic models provide answers to these questions.

3.2 What will REDD cost?

3.2.1 Types of REDD costs

Estimated costs of REDD vary with the data and modelling approach used and the types of costs considered. Studies report costs in terms of supplying or buying REDD, or both. Most estimates focus on the 'opportunity costs' of avoiding deforestation from a landowner's perspective (i.e. foregone economic benefits from alternative land uses), without the costs of developing institutional capacities and actually implementing and transacting a REDD programme.

Some economic models have estimated 'supply curves' ('marginal cost curves') that indicate a cost spectrum for incremental reductions in forest emissions (Figure 3.1). The cost curves slope upwards, showing that for small emissions reductions, costs can be kept low by, for example, protecting just the lowest-cost lands; with greater reductions, the added incremental or 'marginal' costs rise as protection must extend to higher-cost lands and protection activities.. For example, estimates of total opportunity costs more than double in moving from 94% to 100% protection of the Brazilian Amazon forest, because of the high agriculture potential of just 6% of the lands (Nepstad *et al.* 2007).

The costs of implementing REDD policies comprise upfront costs of 'capacity building'; ongoing 'administrative costs' of monitoring, enforcement and other activities needed to run a REDD programme; and 'transaction costs' involved in successfully connecting buyers and sellers. Countries will differ in their ability to reduce tropical forest emissions, and implementation costs will vary with national capacities and strategies. One-time needs for capacity building and policy reform for REDD in 40 countries were recently totalled at USD 4 billion (Eliasch 2008). In addition, the costs of generating valid REDD credits will crucially depend on the baseline-setting rules for how REDD efforts shall be compensated (see Chapter 6).



Figure 3.1. Supply and demand for REDD 'credits'

3.2.2 Modelling approaches

Most estimates of REDD costs come from 'bottom-up' or 'engineering' studies based on detailed information on particular activities in particular locations, at fixed prices. In contrast, 'top-down' models are more aggregate and take into account commodity market interactions – both demand and supply. Top-down models have generally yielded higher estimates for the costs of large-scale REDD, partly because they account for market feedbacks (see Table 3.1). Feedbacks occur as reductions in deforestation lower timber harvests and land conversion to agriculture. Consequent lower growth in supply of soybeans, cattle, and timber will raise their prices, thereby raising the incentives to deforest, as long as the unsatisfied demand does not abate completely. Such feedbacks will raise the costs of REDD and increase the risk of 'leakage', by providing incentives to shift deforestation elsewhere.

Table 3.1. Halving global deforestation: comparison between bottom-up and top-down models

	Bottom-up Analysis of eight tropical countries (Grieg-Gran in Eliasch 2008)	**Top-down** Review of three global land use models (Kindermann *et al*. 2008)
Cost of halving deforestation	USD 7 billion/year	USD 17.2-28 billion/year
Time frame	Immediate; and annual reductions assured over 30 years	By 2050
Costs included	Opportunity costs of protecting forests (e.g. the costs of supplying emissions reductions in Figure 3.1); estimated administration costs of USD 233-500 million/year for REDD; and estimated USD 50 million one-time cost for national forest inventories in 25 countries plus USD 7-17 million/year to administer them	Opportunity cost curves are estimated. Total costs above include opportunity costs of supplying emissions reductions plus the 'rents' (profits) earned by REDD providers in selling reductions at a single market price (Figure 3.1). This is the expenditure for a buyer in a competitive market; the seller's 'rents' are a redistribution of resources, not a cost to society as a whole. However, the rents affect the cost effectiveness or ability of a REDD programme to maximise reductions for a limited budget.
Comments	Commodity prices fixed	Market effects incorporated (e.g. price rises as supply falls), which tends to raise costs

Differences in the modelled 'baseline' scenario of what deforestation would be without REDD policies also affect the estimated costs of REDD. Greater forecasted deforestation under the 'business as usual' (BAU) scenario would bring higher emissions to be potentially reduced, but may also mean greater modelled pressures on forests and thus higher costs of forest protection. Other differences in data and assumptions contribute to varying estimates of REDD costs (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2. Effects of including different modelling features on the estimated costs of REDD

Select features included in the model	Effect on costs
Price feedbacks: lower supplies of timber, crops, etc. raise prices and thus opportunity costs of forest protection.	+
Number of deforestation drivers modelled: accounting for more drivers, such as timber and agriculture, will raise opportunity costs of forest protection. Accounting for new future drivers, such as biofuels, rather than extrapolating from past drivers, can also increase estimated costs.	+
Implementation and transaction costs, investment risks.	+
Land conversion benefits as opposed to costs: one-time benefits from timber harvests upon forest clearance will raise costs of forest protection.	+
Greater assumed parameter for the 'elasticity of transformation', the convertibility of forest land to other uses, raises costs in some models.	+
Carbon density/releases: greater emissions avoided per hectare protected will lower cost per ton.	–
Timber benefits from protected forests (e.g. sustainable forest management).	–
Scope of the REDD model (forestry activities, sectors, countries, gases): greater scope implies less leakage and more opportunity for low-cost global reductions.	–
Scope of incentives: more complete coverage lowers leakage and thus costs.	–
Targeting of incentives: targeting payments at emissions reductions lowers transfers to non-emitters and thus costs (to buyers), but avoiding 'leakage' and ensuring equity must also be considered.	–

3.3 How will REDD affect the overall strategy for reducing emissions?

Consideration of deforestation and other land-based options for reducing emissions within climate models is a relatively new field. Nevertheless, results from the Energy Modeling Forum 21 (Rose *et al.* 2007) and related efforts suggest that reducing deforestation, in addition to planting trees (afforestation and reforestation, A/R), changes in forest management, and other land-based options to mitigate GHGs, may provide important cost savings to reach climate stabilisation goals over the next century (Table 3.3, Fischer *et al.* 2007).

These cost savings may enable greater global emissions reductions than could be achieved without REDD for the same overall cost. Estimated savings of USD 2 trillion through global forestry mitigation could finance a 10% stricter target or 0.25°C less of warming over the century depending on the modelled scenario (see Table 3.3). The potential gains from REDD depend on the target GHG concentrations in the atmosphere and the menu of available options for reducing emissions. More alternatives bring more potential sources of cheap reductions and reduce the reliance on any single option for meeting a particular emissions target at least cost. Another critical assumption affecting the estimated role of REDD across models is the expected development of future biofuel technologies (Table 3.3). In particular, biomass production for electricity generation combined with carbon capture and sequestration could, in theory, be a powerful competitor for land if it became a feasible means to generate energy with negative carbon emissions (e.g. Obersteiner *et al.* 2001).

Most studies of REDD focus on the economic potential, assuming that institutional frameworks and capacities are readily available to immediately implement REDD worldwide. However, not all countries will choose to join an international climate agreement or be able to effectively reduce deforestation emissions in the near term. These institutional and political barriers lower the realistic scale of reductions and their effective global impact. Inconsistent incentives for REDD and other GHG reductions across countries would create the potential for international emissions 'leakage' or 'displacement', with reductions in one country potentially being offset by increases elsewhere. For example, Gan and McCarl (2007) estimate international leakage as high as 42-95% in the forestry products industry.

Table 3.3. Estimated potential of REDD to lower costs and buy additional emissions reductions: comparison of models

Model and type	Results
WITCH coupled with GTM (integrated assessment analysis; Tavoni *et al.* 2007)	Including emissions reductions from deforestation, A/R and changes in forest management enables an atmospheric target of 550 CO_2e parts per million by volume (ppmv) for the same total cost as a 600 ppmv target without forestry mitigation. Global forestry mitigation saves about USD 2 trillion; this buys the climate an estimated additional 0.25°C less warming by the end of the century at no added cost (compared with energy sector only reductions).
GLOCAF coupled with GCOMAP and IIASA cluster model (integrated assessment analysis; Eliasch 2008)	The costs of reducing global emissions to 50% of 1990 levels by 2050 (475 CO_2e stabilisation) may be lowered by 25-50% in 2030 and 20-40% in 2050 when deforestation reductions and A/R are included. The cost savings of almost USD 2 trillion could finance a 10% lower global emissions target.
MESSAGE (integrated assessment analysis; e.g. Rao and Riahi 2006; Riahi *et al*. 2006)	Includes a broad set of land-based options: avoided deforestation, A/R, agricultural mitigation, and biofuels for both liquid fuels and energy with carbon capture and sequestration. The biofuel options compete heavily with forests; forestry and biofuel options contribute 1-2% and 6-24%, respectively, over the next 50 years, and 4-8% and 14-29% over the next century when stabilising at about 650 CO_2e ppmv. Substantial conversion of primary forests to managed plantation forests is predicted.
GRAPE (integrated assessment analysis; Kurosawa 2006)	Includes avoided deforestation, A/R, agricultural mitigation, and biofuels for liquid fuels (but not for energy). It estimates a large role for forestry activities: 55% and 15% of the abatement over the next 50 and 100 years, respectively.
GTEM ('general equilibrium' model; Jakeman and Fisher 2006)	Includes avoided deforestation, A/R and agricultural mitigation; excludes biofuels. For 650 CO_2e concentrations target, estimated contribution of forestry is 11% of total abatement over the next 50 years, with all land-based mitigation options saving USD 1.6-7.6 trillion depending on the inclusion of non-CO_2 mitigation options.

3.4 How will REDD affect the carbon price and efforts to reduce emissions in other sectors?

The potential cost advantages of REDD may detract from abatement in other sectors, if REDD credits were made fully interchangeable with other GHG credits. A perceived risk is that REDD may 'flood' the carbon market, dampening the price signal to develop and deploy clean energy technologies.

The effect of REDD on carbon prices and technology incentives depends on several factors:

- How much emissions from avoided deforestation can actually be achieved and credited in practice (the supply of REDD), which depends on the total costs of REDD, the countries that participate and the crediting conditions.
- The demand for REDD, based on the overall emissions reduction target and the availability and costs of other mitigation alternatives. Under stricter targets, there will be greater demand for REDD and more expensive reductions from other sectors.
- The options for applying ('banking') early actions to reduce emissions against future obligations, thus potentially raising current demand for REDD.
- Rules on the 'fungibility' of REDD credits. Restricting the use of REDD and other mitigation options would tend to raise the carbon price (and the total costs).

Tavoni *et al*. (2007) estimate that global implementation of REDD plus A/R and changes in forest management would delay deployment of some technologies and reduce investment in energy research and development by about 10%, for a fixed emissions reduction target. Anger and Sathaye (2006) find a 40% carbon price reduction from introducing REDD into a market that also allows unlimited credits for developing country mitigation through the clean development mechanism. Other studies find more muted impacts, depending on the policy scenario.

According to Eliasch (2008), introducing REDD credits along with modest quantitative limitations on REDD has a negligible estimated effect on the European Union's carbon price, even if countries can satisfy 50-85% shares of their abatement through international credits, depending on the stringency of the European Union target. The precise proportional impact of REDD on the price depends on the assumptions determining the shape of the cost curves, including the costs of the potential alternatives.

Sufficiently ambitious and credible long-term targets anticipated by market participants also provide incentives for saving up credits for use under tighter future targets. Taking into account such 'banking,' Piris-Cabezas and Keohane (2008) estimate a global REDD programme would lower the global carbon price by 14%, while using all forestry mitigation options would reduce the price by 31%, for a fixed emissions reductions target. Doubling the estimated supply of REDD credits has a relatively small effect on the modelled price, as additional credits are 'banked' and used gradually over time. If REDD helps build a store of relatively low-cost emissions reductions, this 'bank' can also dampen price volatility by providing a buffer against unexpected price spikes in the future.

3.5 Conclusion

The latest science suggests that only a global programme that begins almost immediately and achieves large reductions in GHGs by mid-century can preserve options to avoid dangerous interference with the climate system. Despite different assumptions, a range of economic models indicates that REDD can make a significant contribution to cost-effectively stabilising GHG concentrations at this scale and speed.

The cost and timing of REDD are critically important. Estimated cost savings from REDD could buy greater and faster global emissions cuts than can be achieved for the same global expenditure without REDD. Stabilising GHG concentrations at safe levels requires ambitious efforts to reduce emissions quickly from tropical forests as well as other sectors. Most estimates of REDD policy costs focus on 'opportunity costs' without considering capacity building and transaction costs, which may amount to significant additional requirements. However, the long-term estimated costs savings from global forestry in most models provide significant scope for covering these additional expenses.

The economic impact of REDD depends on the overall climate targets and policy architecture, the design and implementation of REDD and its fungibility with the rest of the GHG market. The potential risk of REDD supply 'flooding' the carbon market can be contained by policy designs ranging from strict and long-term targets with 'banking', to modest limits on the use of REDD and other types of credits.

Early emissions reductions also have particular value as a global insurance policy for maintaining climatic options in light of scientific uncertainty (Fisher *et al*. 2007). As tropical forests are disappearing, REDD is also a cost-effective opportunity for reducing emissions that is available for a limited time only. The time-limited and irreversible nature of REDD – once deforestation occurs, it cannot be avoided in the future – adds further value to protecting tropical forests now rather than foreclosing future options for lowering global emissions.

References

Achard, F., Belward, A.S., Eva, H.D., Federici, S., Mollicone, D. and Raes, F. 2005 Accounting for avoided conversion of intact and non-intact forests. Technical options and a proposal for a policy tool. Joint Research Centre of the European Commission.

Achard, F., DeFries, R., Herold, M., Mollicone, D., Pandey, D. and de Souza, C. 2008 Guidance on monitoring of gross changes in forest area. Chapter 3 *In*: GOFC-GOLD. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries: a sourcebook of methods and procedures for monitoring, measuring and reporting. GOFC-GOLD Report version COP 13-2. GOFC-GOLD Project Office, Natural Resources Canada, Alberta, Canada.

Alvarado, L., Rubio, X. and Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S. 2007 Why are we seeing 'REDD'? An analysis of the international debate on reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries. Institut du Développement Durable et des Relations Internationales (IDDRI), Paris.

Angelsen, A., and Kaimowitz, D. 1999 Rethinking the causes of deforestation: Lessons from economic models. World Bank Research Observer 14 (1): 73-98.

Angelsen, A. 2007 Forest cover change in space and time: Combining von Thünen and the forest transition. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4117. World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Anger, N. and Sathaye, J. 2008 Reducing deforestation and trading emissions: Economic implications for the post-Kyoto market. Discussion Paper No. 08-016. Center for European Economic Research, Mannheim, Germany.

Asner, G.P., Knapp, D.E., Broadbent, E.N., Oliveira, P.J.C., Keller, M. and Silva, J.N. 2005 Selective logging in the Brazilian Amazon. Science 310 (5747): 480-482.

Aukland, L., Costa, P.M. and Brown, S. 2003 A conceptual framework and its application for addressing leakage: the case of avoided deforestation. Climate Policy 3 (2): 123-136.

Blanco, J. and Forner, C. 2000 Special considerations regarding the 'expiring CERs' proposal. International Forum on Enhancement of Japan's Private Sector's Overseas Re-afforestation Cooperation, Ministerio del Medio Ambiente de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia.

Börner, J. and Wunder, S. 2008 Paying for avoided deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon: From cost assessment to scheme design. International Forestry Review 10 (3): 496-511.

Balmford, A. and Whitten, T. 2003 Who should pay for tropical conservation, and how could the costs be met? Oryx 37 (2): 238-250.

Brown, D. and Peskett, L. 2008 International forest policy: Integrated climate and forestry policy options. Policy Department A: Economic and Scientific Policy, DG Internal Policies, European Parliament, Brussels.

Brown, K., Adger, W.N., Boyd, E., Corbera-Elizalde, E. and Shackley, S. 2004 How do CDM projects contribute to sustainable development? Tyndall Centre Technical Report No. 16. Tyndall Centre, Norwich. http://www.tyndall.ac.uk/research/theme2/final_reports/it1_13.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Brown, S., Hall, M., Andrasko, K., Ruiz, F., Marzoli, W., Guerrero, G., Masera, O., Dushku, A., de Jong, B. and Cornell, J. 2007 Baselines for land-use change in the tropics: Application to avoided deforestation projects. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 12 (6): 1001-1026.

Brown, S. and Braatz, B. 2008 Methods for estimating CO2 emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. Chapter 5 *In*: GOFC-GOLD. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries: a sourcebook of methods and procedures for monitoring, measuring and reporting. GOFC-GOLD Report version COP 13-2. GOFC-GOLD Project Office, Natural Resources Canada, Alberta, Canada.

Bruijnzeel, L.A. 2004 Hydrological functions of tropical forests: not seeing the soil for the trees? Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 104 (1): 185-228.

Byron, N. and Arnold, M. 1999 What future for the peoples of the tropical forests? World Development 27 (5):789-805.

Chave, J., Andalo, C., Brown, S., Cairns, M.A., Chambers, J.Q., Eamus, D., Fölster, H., Fromard, F., Higuchi, N., Kira, T., Lescure, J.P., Nelson, B.W., Ogawa, H., Puig, H., Riéra, B. and Yamakura, T. 2005 Tree allometry and improved estimation of carbon stocks and balance in tropical forests. Oecologia 145 (1): 87-99.

Chomitz, K.M. 2000 Evaluating carbon offsets from forestry and energy projects: How do they compare? World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 2357. World Bank, Washington, DC.

Chomitz, K.M., Buys P., de Luca, G., Thomas, T.S. and Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S. 2006 At loggerheads? Agricultural expansion, poverty reduction, and environment in the tropical forests. Policy Research Report. World Bank. Washington. DC. http://go.worldbank.org/KVK3ZDK510 (26 Nov. 2008).

CISDL (Centre for International Sustainable Development Law) and GPPI (Global Public Policy Institute) 2007 A carbon stock approach to creating a positive incentive to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. Joint submission to the UNFCCC on reducing emissions from deforestation in developing countries. 23 February.

Colfer, C.J.P. and Capistrano, D. (eds.) 2005 The politics of decentralization: Forests, power, and people. Earthscan, London.

Colchester, M. 2008 Beyond tenure: Rights-based approaches to peoples and forest areas: Some lessons from the Forest Peoples Programme. FPP and RRI: Moreton-in-Marsh.

Colchester, M. and Ferrari, M. 2007 Making FPIC work: Challenges and prospects for indigenous peoples. FPIC Working Papers, Forest Peoples Program.

Convention on Biological Diversity, 1760 UNTS 79; 31 ILM 818 (1992).

Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (ILO No. 169), 72 ILO Official Bull. 59; 28 ILM 1382 (1989).

Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, GA Res. 34/180, 34 UN GAOR Supp. (No. 46) at 193, UN Doc. A/34/46; 1249 UNTS 13; 19 ILM 33 (1980).

Corbera, E. 2005 Bringing development into carbon forestry markets: Challenges and outcomes of small-scale carbon forestry activities in Mexico. *In*: Murdiyarso, D. and Herawati, H. (eds.) Carbon Forestry: Who will benefit? p. 42-56. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.

Correa, R. and Moreno, L. 2007 Keeping ITT crude underground: the proposal. Ministry of External Affairs, Commerce and Integration, Quito.

Cosbey, A., Murphy, D., Drexhage, J. and Balint, J. 2006 Making development work in the CDM: Phase II of the Development Dividend Project. IISD, Winnipeg, Canada.

da Fonseca, G.A.B., Rodríguez, C.M., Midgley, G., Busch, J., Hannah, L. and Mittermeier, R.A. 2007 No forest left behind. PLoS Biology 5 (8): 1645-1646.

Decision 1/CP.13. Bali Action Plan, FCCC/CP/2007/6/Add.1.

Decision 2/CP.13. Reducing emissions from deforestation in developing countries: approaches to stimulate action, FCCC/CP/2007/6/Add.1.

DeFries, R., Achard, F., Brown, S., Herold, M., Murdiyarso, D., Schlamadinger, B. and de Sourza Jr., C. 2006. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation in developing countries: Considerations for monitoring and measuring. Global Terrestrial Observing System (GTOS), Rome.

DeFries, R., Achard, F., Brown, S., Herold, M., Murdiyarso, D., Schlamadinger B. and de Souza, C. Jr. 2007 Earth observations for estimating greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation in developing countries. Environmental Science and Policy 10 (4): 385-394.

de Jong, B., Bazán, E.E. and Montalvo, S.Q. 2007 Application of the 'Climafor' baseline to determine leakage: the case of Scolel Té. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 12 (6): 1153-1168.

Dutschke, M. 2002 Fractions of permanence - Squaring the cycle of sink carbon accounting. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 7 (4): 381-402.

Dutschke, M. 2007 CDM forestry and the ultimate objective of the Climate Convention. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 12 (2): 275-302.

Dutschke, M. 2008 The climate stabilization fund – Global auctioning of emission allowances to help forests and people. Climate 2008/Klima 2008, Scientific Online Climate Conference. www.climate2008.net (25 Nov. 2008).

Dutschke, M. and Michaelowa, A. 2006 Development assistance and the CDM - how to interpret 'financial additionality'. Environment and Development Economics 11 (2): 235-246.

Dutschke, M. and Wolf, R. 2007 Reducing emissions from deforestation in developing countries. The way forward. GTZ Climate Protection Programme, Eschborn, Germany. 29p.

Ebeling, J. and Yasue, M. 2008 Generating carbon finance through avoided deforestation and its potential to create climatic, conservation and human development benefits. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society for Biological Sciences B, 363 (1498): 1917-1924.

ECJRC (European Commission Joint Research Centre) 2003 The global land cover map for the year 2000. GLC2000 database, European Commission Joint Research Centre.

EC (European Commission) 2008 Addressing the challenges of deforestation and forest degradation to tackle climate change and biodiversity loss. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Com (2008) 645/3. Brussels.

Eggleston, S. 2008 Overview of relevant methodologies in IPCC Guidelines and Good Practice Guidance. Presentation at the UNFCCC workshop on Methodological Issues relating to Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries. Tokyo, 24-27 June. http://unfccc.int/files/methods_and_science/lulucf/application/pdf/080625_tokyo_eggleson_ipcc.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Eliasch J. 2008 Eliasch Review – Climate change: Financing global forests. UK Office of Climate Change www.occ.gov.uk/activities/eliasch.htm (25 Nov. 2008).

Enkvist, P.A., Nauclér, T. and Rosander, J. 2007 A cost curve for greenhouse gas reduction. McKinsey Quarterly 2007 (1): 35-45.

Euroactiv 2008 Brussels pushing for forests in global climate deal. Euroactiv, 20 October, Brussels, Belgium. http://www.euractiv.com/en/environment/brussels-pushing-forests-global-climate-deal/article-176474 25 Nov. 2008).

Fearnside, P.M. 2000 Uncertainty in land use change and forestry sector mitigation options for global warming: Plantation silviculture versus avoided deforestation. Biomass and Bioenergy 18 (6): 457-468.

Fearnside, P.M., Lashof, D.A. and Moura-Costa, P. 2000 Accounting for time in mitigating global warming through land-use change and forestry. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 5 (3): 239-270.

Fearnside, P.M. 2002 Time preference in global warming calculations: a proposal for a unified index. Ecological Economics 41 (1): 21-31.

Fischlin, A., Midgley, G.F. 2007 Ecosystems, their properties, goods, and services. *In:* Parry, M.L., Canziani, O.F., Palutikof, J.P., van der Linden, P.J. and Hanson, C.E. (eds.) Climate change 2007: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 211-272. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Fisher, B., Nakicenovic, N., Alfsen, K., Corfee Morlot, J., de la Chesnaye, F., Hourcade, J-C., Jiang, K., Kainuma, M., La Rovere, E., Matysek, A., Rana, A., Riahi, K. Richels, R., Rose S. and van Vuuren, D., Warren, R. 2007 Issues related to mitigation in the long term context. *In*: Metz, B., Davidson, O.R., Bosch, P.R., Dave, R. and Meyer, L.A. (eds.) Climate change 2007: Mitigation of climate change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Foti, J., de Silva, L., Werksman, J., Shaffer, L., Talbot, J. and McGray, H. 2008 Voice and choice: Opening the door to environmental democracy. World Resources Institute.

Gan, J. and McCarl, B. 2007 Measuring transnational leakage of forest conservation. Ecological Economics 64 (2): 423-432.

Gibbs, H.K., Brown, S., O'Niles, J. and Foley, J.A. 2007 Monitoring and estimating forest carbon stocks: Making REDD a reality. Environmental Resource Letters 2 (2007): 045023 (13pp).

GOFC-GOLD 2008 Reducing greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries: a sourcebook of methods and procedures for monitoring, measuring and reporting, GOFC-GOLD Report version COP 13-2. GOFC-GOLD Project Office, Natural Resources Canada, Alberta, Canada.

Grieg-Gran, M. 2008 The cost of avoiding deforestation. IIED, London: 20. http://www.iied.org/pubs/pdfs/G02290.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Hamilton, K., Bayon, R., Turner, G. and Higgins, D. 2007 State of the voluntary carbon markets 2007: Picking up steam. The Ecosystem Marketplace and New Carbon Finance, Washington, DC.

Hamilton, K., Sjardin, M., Marcello, T. and Xu, G. 2008 Forging a frontier: State of the voluntary carbon markets 2008. Ecosystem Market Place and New Carbon Finance, San Francisco and London.

Hansen, M.C., Stehman, S.V., Potapov, P.V., Loveland, T.R., Townshed, J.R.G., DeFries, R.S., Pittman, K.W., Arunarwati, B., Stolle, F., Steininger, M.K., Carroll, M. and DiMiceli, C. 2008 Humid tropical forest clearing from 2000 to 2005 quantified by using multitemporal and multiresolution remotely sensed data. PNAS 105 (27): 9439-9444.

Hardcastle, P.D. and Baird, D. 2008 Capability and cost assessment of the major forest nations to measure and monitor their forest carbon. Office of Climate Change. LTS International, Penicuick, UK. http://www.occ.gov.uk/activities/eliasch.htm (25 Nov. 2008).

Hare, B. and Macey, K. 2007 Tropical deforestation emission reduction mechanism (TDERM): A discussion paper. Greenpeace International, Amsterdam, Netherlands. 52p. http://www.greenpeace.org/raw/content/international/press/reports/TDERM-full.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Hoare, A., Legge, T., Nussbaum, R. and Saunders, J. 2008 Estimating the cost of building capacity in rainforest nations to allow them to participate in a global REDD mechanism. Chatham House and ProForest, UK. http://www.occ.gov.uk/activities/eliasch/Chatham_House_cost_of_building_capacity.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Hughes, R. and Flintan, F. 2001 Integrating conservation and development experience: a review and bibliography of the ICDP literature. International Institute for Environment and Development, London, UK. 24p. http://www.ucc.ie/famine/GCD/ICDP_sec.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

INPE 2004 Monitoramento ambiental da Amazonia por satelite. Brazilian Institute for Space Research. http://www.obt.inpe.br/prodes/ (25 Nov. 2008).

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, GA Res. 2200A (XXI), 21 UN GAOR Supp. (No. 16) at 49, UN Doc. A/6316 (1966); 993 UNTS 3; 6 ILM 368 (1967).

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, GA Res. 2200A (XXI), 21 UN GAOR Supp. (No. 16) at 52, UN Doc. A/6316 (1966); 999 UNTS 171; 6 ILM 368 (1967).

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) 2003 Good practice guidance on land use, land-use change and forestry, prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme. Eggleston, H.S., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T. and Tanabe, K. (eds.). Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), Japan.

IPCC 2003a Definitions and methodological options to inventory emissions from direct human-induced degradation of forests and devegetation of other vegetation types. Penman, J., Gytarsky, M., Krug, T., Kruger, D., Pipatti, R., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T., Tanabe, K. and Wagner, F. (eds.), IPCC-IGES, Kanagawa.

IPCC 2003b Good practice guidance for land use, land-use change and forestry (GPG-LULUCF). Penman, J., Gytarsky, M., Krug, T., Kruger, D., Pipatti, R., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T., Tanabe, K. and Wagner, F. (eds.), IPCC-IGES, Kanagawa. http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpglulucf/gpglulucf_contents.html (25 Nov. 2008).

IPCC 2006 IPCC Guidelines for national greenhouse gas inventories, prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme. Eggleston, H.S., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T. and Tanabe, K. (eds.). Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), Japan. http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/index.html (25 Nov. 2008).

IPCC 2006 Guidelines for national greenhouse gas inventories – volume 4: Agriculture, land use and forestry (GL-AFOLU). http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/vol4.html (25 Nov. 2008).

Iskandar, H., Snook, L., Toma, T., MacDicken, K. and Kanninen, M. 2006 A comparison of damage due to logging under different forms of resource access in East Kalimantan, Indonesia. Forest Ecology and Management 237 (1-3): 83-93.

Jakeman, G. and Fisher, B.S. 2006 Benefits of multi-gas mitigation: an application of the Global Trade and Environment Model (GTEM), multi-gas mitigation and climate policy. The Energy Journal 27 (3): 323-342.

Kanowski, J.J., Catterall, C. and Wardell-Johnson, G.W. 2005 Consequences of broadscale timber plantations for biodiversity in cleared rainforest landscapes of tropical and subtropical Australia. Forest Ecology and Management 208 (1-3): 359-372.

Karousakis, K. 2007 Incentives to reducing emissions from deforestation: Lessons learned from Costa Rica and Mexico. OECD, Paris. 50p.

Khan, M. 2006 State failure in developing countries and strategies of institutional reform. http://www.gdnet.org/pdf2/online_journals/cerdi/issue2_3/Khan_paper1.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Kindermann, G., Obersteiner, M., Sohngen, B., Sathaye, J., Andrasko, K., Ramesteiner, E., Schlamadinger, B., Wunder, S. and Beach, R. 2008 Global cost estimates of reducing carbon emissions through avoided deforestation. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 105 (30): 10302-10307.

Korhonen L., Korhonen, K.T., Rautiainen, M. and Stenberg, P. 2006 Estimation of forest canopy cover: a comparison of field measurement techniques. Silva Fennica 40 (4): 577-588. www.metla.fi/silvafennica/full/sf40/sf404577.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Kurosawa, A. 2006 Multi-gas mitigation: an economic: analysis using the GRAPE model. The Energy Journal 27 (3): 275-288.

Lambin, E.F., Geist, H.J. and Lepers, E. 2003 Dynamics of land-use and land-cover change in tropical regions. Annual Review of Environmental Resources 28: 205-241.

Larson, A. and Ribot, J. 2007 The poverty of forestry policy: Double standards on an uneven playing field. Sustainability Science 2 (2): 189-204.

Leach, P. 2008 Carbon sunk? The potential impacts of avoided deforestation credits on emissions trading mechanisms. The Rainforest Foundation, London. http://www.rainforestfoundationuk.org/Carbon_Sunk (25 Nov. 2008).

Lecocq, F. and Chomitz, K.M. 2001 Optimal use of carbon sequestration in a global climate change strategy: Is there a wooden bridge to a clean energy future? World Bank Development Research Group Infrastructure and Environment, Washington, DC.

Marklund, L.G. and Schoene, D. 2006 Global assessment of growing stock, biomass and carbon stock. Forest Resources Assessment Programme Working paper 106/E, Rome.

Massai, L. 2007 European Climate Policy Dossier. T.M.C. Asser Institute, The Hague, NL. 57p.

Mather, A. 1992 The Forest Transition. Area 24 (4): 367-379.

M-Co Consulting 2008 Review and assessment of options for reducing emissions from deforestation in developing countries. Government of New Zealand, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Wellington.

Meijaard, E., Sheil, D., Nasi, R., Augeri, D., Rosenbaum, B., Iskandar, D., Setyawati, T., Lammertink, M., Rachmatika, I., Wong, A., Soehartono, T., Stanley, S. And O'Brien, T. 2005 Life after logging: Reconciling wildlife conservation and production forestry in Indonesian Borneo. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia. http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/publications/pdf_files/books/BMeijaard0501E0.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Miles, L., Kapos, V., Lysenko, I. and Campbell, A. 2008 Mapping vulnerability of tropical forest to conversion, and resulting CO2 emissions: A rapid assessment for the Eliasch review. UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre. http://www.occ.gov.uk/activities/eliasch/UNEP_WCMC_mapping_vulnerability_of_tropical_forest(1).pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Mollicone, D., Achard, F., Federici, S., Eva, H.D., Grassi, G., Belward, A., Raes, F., Seufert, G., Stibig, H.J., Matteucci, G. and Schulze E.D. 2007 An incentive mechanism for reducing emissions from conversion of intact to non-intact forests. Climate Change 83 (4): 477-493.

Motel, P.C., Pirard, R. and Combes, J.L. 2008 A methodology to estimate impacts of domestic policies on deforestation: Compensated successful efforts for 'avoided deforestation' (REDD). Ecological Economics (forthcoming).

Moura-Costa, P. and Wilson, C. 2000 An equivalence factor between CO2 avoided emissions and sequestration: Description and applications in forestry. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 5 (1): 51-60.

Muller, A. 2007 How to make the clean development mechanism sustainable – the potential of rent extraction. Energy Policy 35 (6): 3203-3212.

Murphy, P.G. and Lugo, A.E. 1986 Ecology of tropical dry forest. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 17: 67-68.

Murray, B.C. 2008 Leakage from an avoided deforestation compensation policy: Concepts, empirical evidence, and corrective policy options. Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, Duke University, Durham, NC. 32p.

Nepstad, D. 2007 The Amazon's vicious cycles: Drought and fire in the greenhouse. WWF Report. http://assets.panda.org/downloads/amazonas_eng_04_12b_web.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Nepstad, D., Soares-Filho, B., Merry, F., Moutinho, P., Oliveira Rodrigues, H., Bowman, M., Schwartzman, S., Almeida, O. and Rivero, S. 2007 The costs and benefits of reducing deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon. The Woods Hole Research Center, Woods Hole, MA.

Obersteiner M., Azar Ch., Kauppi P., Möllersten K., Moreira J., Nilsson S., Read P., Riahi K., Schlamadinger B., Yamagata Y., Yan J. and van Ypersele J.-P. 2001. Managing climate risk. Science 294 (5543): 786-787.

OECD (Office of Economic Co-operation and Development) 2005 Paris declaration on aid effectiveness: Ownership, harmonisation, alignment, results and mutual accountability. OECD, Paris. www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Ogonowski, M., Helme, N., Movius, D. and Schmidt, J. 2007 Reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation: The dual markets approach. International Future Action Dialogue. Center for Clean Air Policy, Washington, DC.

Olander, L.P., Gibbs, H.K., Steininger, M., Swenson, J.J. and Murray, B.C. 2008 Reference scenarios for deforestation and forest degradation in support of REDD: a review of data and methods. Environmental Research Letters 3 (2008): 025011. http://www.iop.org/EJ/article/1748-9326/3/2/025011/erl8_2_025011.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Pearce, F. 2007 Save the climate by saving the forest. New Scientist, 22 March 2008.

Pearson T., Harris N., Shock D., Pandey D. and S. Brown. 2008. Estimation of carbon stocks. Chapter 4 in: GOFC-GOLD. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries: a sourcebook of methods and procedures for monitoring, measuring and reporting, GOFC-GOLD Report version COP13-2, GOFC-GOLD Project Office, Natural Resources Canada, Alberta, Canada.

Pedroni, L., Streck, C., Estrada, M. and Dutschke, M. 2007 The 'Nested Approach': A flexible mechanism to reduce emissions from deforestation. CATIE, Turrialba, Costa Rica.

Penman, J., Gytarsky, M., Hiraishi, T., Krug, T., Kruger, D., Pipatti, R., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T., Tanabe, K. and Wagner, F. 2003 Good practice guidance for land use, land-use change and forestry. IPCC National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme and Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), Kanagawa, Japan. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpglulucf/gpglulucf_contents.htm (25 Nov. 2008).

Penman, J. 2008 An exploration by the EU on methodological issues relating to reducing emissions from forest degradation in developing countries. UNFCCC Informal Meeting of Experts, Bonn, 20-21 October 2008. http://unfccc.int/methods_science/redd/items/4579.php (25 Nov. 2008).

Peskett, L., Huberman, D., Bowen-Jones, E., Edwards, G. and Brown, J. 2008 Making REDD work for the poor. IUCN/ODI for the Poverty and Environment Partnership, Gland.

Petley, S. 2007 Forest backed securities: Alternative finance for tropical natural forest. Presentation to the Asia-Pacific Tropical Forest Investment Forum, August, 2007. www.itto.or.jp/live/Live_Server/3289/PetleyITTOBangkokREV.JG.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Piris-Cabezas, P. and Keohane, N. 2008 Reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries (REDD): Implications for the carbon market. Environmental Defense Fund, Washington, DC. 13p. http://www.climaedesmatamento.org.br/files/general/EDF_Analysis_of_REDD_in_the_carbon_market_061808.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Rao, S. and Riahi, K. 2006 The role of non-CO2 greenhouse gases in climate change mitigation: Long-term scenarios for the 21st Century, multi-gas mitigation and climate policy. Energy Journal 27 (3): 177-200.

Riahi, K., Grubler, A. and Nakicenovic, N. 2006 Scenarios of long-term socio-economic and environmental development under climate stabilisation. Technological Forecasting and Change 74: 8-9.

Rights and Resources Initiative, 2008. Foundations for effectiveness. Policy brief prepared by RRI and RFN in preparation for the International Conference on Rights, Forests and Climate Change, Oslo, October 15-17, 2008.

Rio Declaration, UN Doc. A/CONF.151/26 (Vol. I); 31 ILM 874 (1992).

Robertson, N. and Wunder, S. 2005 Fresh tracks in the forest: Assessing incipient payments for environmental services initiatives in Bolivia. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia. 137p. http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/pes/publications/pdf_files/BRobertson0501.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Rose, S., Helal, A., Eickhout, B., Fisher, B., Kurosawa, A., Rao, S., Riahi, K. and van Vuuren, D. 2007 Land in climate stabilization modeling: Initial observations. Energy Modeling Forum Report, Stanford University.

Roy, D.P., Jin, Y., Lewis, P.E. and Justice, C.O. 2005 Prototyping a global algorithm for systematic fire-affected area mapping using MODIS time-series data. Remote Sensing of Environment 97 (2): 137-162.

Rudel, T.K., Coomes, O.T, Moran, E., Achard, F., Angelsen, A., Jianchu Xu and Lambin, E. 2005 Forest transitions: Towards a global understanding of land use change. Global Environmental Change 15 (1): 23-31.

Santilli, M., Moutinho, P., Schwartzman, S., Nepstad, D., Curran, L. and Nobre, C. 2005 Tropical deforestation and the Kyoto Protocol. Climatic Change 71 (3): 267-276.

Sathaye, J. and Andrasko, K. 2007 Special issue on estimation of baselines and leakage in carbon mitigation forestry projects. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 12 (6): 963-970.

Schelhas, J. and Sanchez-Azofeifa, G.A. 2006 Post-frontier forest change adjacent to Braulio Carrillo National Park, Costa Rica. Human Ecology 34 (3): 407-431.

Schlamadinger, B., Ciccarese, L., Dutschke, M., Fearnside, P.M., Brown, S. and Murdiyarso, D. 2005 Should we include avoidance of deforestation in the international response to climate change? *In:* Carbon forestry: Who will benefit? Murdiyarso, D. and Herawati, H. (eds.) CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.

Schlamadinger, B. and Johns, T. 2006 Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation: Latest developments. Climate Change Mitigation Measures in the Agro-Forestry Sector and Biodiversity Futures, Trieste / IT, ICTP.

Schlamadinger, B., Bird, N., Johns, T., Brown, S., Canadell, J. Ciccarese, L., Dutschke, M., Fiedler, J., Fischlin, A., Fearnside, P., Forner, C., Freibauer, A., Frumhoff, P., Hoehne, N., Kirschbaum, M.U.F., Labat, A., Michaelowa, A., Montanarella, L., Moutinho, P. Murdiyarso, D., Pena, N., Pingoud, K., Rakonczay, Z., Rametsteiner, E., Rock, J., Sanz, M.J., Schneider, U.A., Shvidenko, A., Skutsch, M., Smith, P., Somogyi, Z., Trines, E., Ward, M. and Yamagata, Y. 2007 A synopsis of land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) under the Kyoto Protocol and Marrakech Accords. Environmental Science and Policy 10 (4): 271-282.

Scholz, I. and Schmidt, L. 2008 Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries: Meeting the main challenges ahead. German Development Institute (DIE) Briefing Paper (preliminary version). http://www.illegal-logging.info/uploads/GermanDevInstREDD.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Schwarze, R., Niles, J.O. and Olander, J. 2002 Understanding and managing leakage in forest-based greenhouse gas mitigation projects. TNC, Arlington.

Seymour, F. (forthcoming) Forests, climate change, and human rights: Managing risks and trade-offs. *In:* Humphreys, S. (ed.) Human rights and climate change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Skutsch, M. and Trines, E. 2008 Operationalising reduced degradation within REDD. Policy Paper No.2: Kyoto: Think Globally Act Locally project.http://www.communitycarbonforestry.org/resources_Pub08.htm (25 Nov. 2008).

Sohngen, B. and Brown, S. 2004 Measuring leakage from carbon projects in open economies: a stop timber harvesting project in Bolivia as a case study. Canadian Journal of Forestry Research 34 (4): 829-839.

Stern, N. 2006 Stern Review: The economics of climate change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Stern, N. 2008 Key elements of a global deal on climate change. London School of Economics and Political Science, London. 56p.

Strassburg, B., Turner, K., Fisher, B., Schaeffer, R. and Lovett, A. 2008 An empirically-derived mechanism of combined incentives to reduce emissions from deforestation. *In:* CSERGE Working Paper ECM 08-01. Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment (CSERGE), University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK.

Subak, S. 2003 Replacing carbon lost from forests: an assessment of insurance, reserves, and expiring credits. Climate Policy 3 (2): 107-122.

Sunderlin, W., Hatcher, J. and Liddle, M. 2008 From exclusion to ownership? Challenge and opportunities in advancing forest tenure reform. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington, DC. http://www.rightsandresources.org/documents/index.php?pubID=736 (25 Nov. 2008).

Tavoni, M., Sohngen, B. and Bosetti, V. 2007 Forestry and the carbon market response to stabilize climate. Energy Policy 35 (11): 5346-5353.

Terrestrial Carbon Group 2008 How to include terrestrial carbon in developing countries in the overall climate change solution. Draft, 8 August.

Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat. Ramsar (Iran), 2 February 1971. UN Treaty Series No. 14583.

Trines, E., Höhne, N., Jung, M., Skutsch, M., Petsonk, A., Silva-Chavez, G., Smith, P., Nabuurs, G., Verweij and P. Schlamadinger, B. 2006 Integrating agriculture, forestry and other land use in future climate regimes. Methodological issues and policy options. Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, Bilthoven.

Tutin, C.E.G. and Fernandez, M. 1985 Foods consumed by sympatric populations of *Gorilla g. gorilla* and *Pan t. troglodytes* in Gabon: Some preliminary data. International Journal of Primatology 6 (1): 27-43.

Tuvalu (Government of) 2007 Submission from Tuvalu *In:* Reducing emissions from deforestation in developing countries: Approaches to stimulate action. Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technologica Advice, Twenty-seventh session, Bali, 3-11 December 2007. http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2007/sbsta/eng/misc14a03.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Underdal, A. 2002 One question, two answers. *In*: Miles, E.L., Underdal, A., Andersen, S., Wettestad, J., Skærseth, J.B. and Carlin, E.M. (eds.) Environmental regime effectiveness. Confronting theory with evidence. MIT Press, Cambridge.

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, GA Res. 61/295, U.N. Doc. A/RES/61/295 (13 Sept. 2007), 46 I.L.M. 1013 (2007).

United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) Non-legally binding instrument on all types of forests, E/2007/42.

UN Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, 2161 UNTS 447; 38 ILM 517 (1999).

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, 1954 UNTS 3; 33 ILM 1328 (1994).

UNFCCC 2007 Investment and financial flows to address climate change. UNFCCC, Bonn.

UNFCC 2007c Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice, Twenty-seventh session, Bali, Indonesia, 3-11 December 2007.

UNFCCC 2008a Views on outstanding methodological issues related to policy approaches and positive incentives to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries. Advanced version. SBSTA Misc. for 28th session. Bonn, 4-13 June.

UNFCCC 2008b Informal meeting of experts on methodological issues relating to reducing emissions from forest degradation in developing countries. Bonn, 20-21 October.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, GA Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc A/810 at 71 (1948).

Ward, M., CWard, M., Strect, C., Winkler, H. Jung, M., Hagemann, M., Höhne, N., and O'Sullivan , R. 2008 The role of sector no-lose targets in scaling up finance for climate change mitigation activities in developing countries. International Climate Division, Dept. of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DERFA), United Kingdom.

Watson, R.T., Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Noble, I.R., Bolin, B. 2000 Land use, land-use change, and forestry: A special report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. 377p.

Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S. 2008 Cost-effective methods for monitoring forest cover changes and associated CO_2 emissions for REDD. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), London, UK and World Resources Institute (WRI), Washington, D.C., USA.

WHRC (Woods Hole Research Center) and IPAM (Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazonia) 2008 How to distribute REDD funds across countries? A stock-flow mechanism. Joint submission to the UNFCCC regarding AWG-LCA (FCCC/AWGLCA/2008/L.7), 30 September.

Winrock. 2002 Analysis of leakage, baselines, and carbon benefits for the Noel Kempff Climate Action Project. 45. Ecosecurities Ltd., Sylvan Acres, Geographic Modelling Services.

Wittemyer, G., Elsen, P., Bean, W.T., Coleman, A., Burton, O. and Brashares, J.S. 2008 Accelerated human population growth at protected area edges. Science 321 (5885): 123-126.

Wong, J. and Dutschke, M. 2003 Can permanence be insured? Consideration of some technical and practical issues of insuring carbon credits from afforestation and reforestation. HWWA Discussion Paper 235. 17p.

World Bank 2004 Sustaining forests: A development strategy. World Bank, Washington,DC. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTFORESTS/Resources/SustainingForests.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

World Bank 2008 Climate investment funds: Mapping of existing and emerging sources of forest financing (CIF/FDM.1/2, October 7, 2008). First design meeting on the forest investment program, Washington, DC, October 16-17. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCC/Resources/Mapping_study_Final_for_FIP_Design_Meeting_Oct_16-17_08.pdf (25 Nov. 2008).

Wu, J.J. 2000 Slippage effects of the Conservation Reserve Program. American Journal of Agricultural Economics 82 (4): 979-992.