



## Chapter 4

# What is the right scale for REDD?

Arild Angelsen, Charlotte Streck, Leo Peskett, Jessica Brown and Cecilia Luttrell

### 4.1 Introduction

Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) is a proposed financial mechanism which would provide developing countries with incentives to reduce forest sector emissions. REDD could become part of the international climate agreement currently being discussed within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). A key question in the debate concerns the geographical level (spatial scale) for accounting and provision of incentives for REDD activities should be offered. Should REDD accounting be at: (i) subnational (or project) level; (ii) national level, or (iii) both levels (nested approach)? This chapter first describes the three approaches to REDD and then assesses the carbon effectiveness, cost efficiency and equity ('3Es') implications of each.


The differences between subnational, national and nested approaches are often blurred. One reason for this is that 'spatial scale' means different things in different proposals. In this chapter, *scale refers to the accounting level of an international funding mechanism*. The level of *accounting* would typically be closely linked to the level of *crediting* (payment), although credit-sharing

arrangements between national and subnational levels may haze the distinction between scales. The level of *implementation* is of secondary importance: implementation at the national level may include both nationally-implemented projects and a national REDD strategy that credits projects implemented by others. Similarly, a subnational project approach to implementation can be backed-up by good national policies that make achieving project objectives easier.

## 4.2 Three options for the scale of REDD

### 4.2.1 Subnational approach

Figure 4.1 illustrates the difference between the three options. The subnational approach proposes that REDD activities would be implemented in a defined geographical area, or as projects by individuals, communities, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), private companies or national or local governments. As with all three approaches, crediting REDD activities would require internationally agreed rules for monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV), a system for crediting (payment), and institutional arrangements at both the national level (e.g. a designated national authority or similar entity that approves all projects) and the international level (e.g. a supervisory body and a centralised project and credit registry).



**Figure 4.1.** The three approaches to REDD accounting and crediting  
 Note: Arrows indicate money from the international buyers and information from the (sub)national entities.

The modalities and procedures developed for the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) under the Kyoto Protocol could serve as a model for the institutional set-up. The CDM allows developed (Annex I) countries to offset their greenhouse gas emissions by supporting projects in developing countries that reduce emissions. In the forestry sector, only afforestation and reforestation (A/R) projects are currently eligible and, so far, only one project has been approved. The CDM has proved more successful in other sectors, particularly in energy. CDM had a primary market value of USD 7.4 billion in 2007 (Hamilton *et al.* 2008). Progress of A/R CDM projects is slow because the complex rules, methodologies and registration costs make transaction costs very high. Other obstacles are the lack of transferability of the temporary credits assigned to projects and the exclusion of temporary credits from the EU Emission Trading System (ETS). The ETS is by far the largest carbon market, with a volume of USD50 billion in 2007, or 78% of the global carbon trade (Hamilton *et al.* 2008).

Another example of a subnational approach is the voluntary carbon market in projects for preventing deforestation. The transactions in the voluntary carbon market reached USD330 million in 2007 (forestry-related projects comprising 18% of market share), which was less than 5% of the CDM primary market. Eighty per cent of the transactions in the voluntary carbon market involved private sector buyers (Hamilton *et al.* 2008).

Given the relative success of CDM in other sectors, its established institutional structure and the difficulties some countries may have in taking a national approach to REDD, some Parties to the UNFCCC argue that a project-based mechanism should be included in the global REDD framework, e.g. the recent submission to UNFCCC by Paraguay on behalf of Argentina, Panama, Peru, Paraguay and Peru (see Appendix). The post-2012 negotiations under the Kyoto Protocol (Article 3.9) also include discussions on REDD in CDM. However, the negotiations should recognise that the limited success of A/R projects suggests that a project-based REDD approach cannot simply replicate the CDM model.

### **4.2.2 National approach**

Most country submissions to UNFCCC advocate a national approach. This reflects their previous experiences with leakage and transaction costs in project approaches. The national approach also addresses sovereignty issues. It acknowledges that combating deforestation entails broad policy changes and thus has the potential to achieve larger-scale and more permanent reductions than subnational or nested approaches.

Governments taking a national approach would establish a national system for MRV and would be rewarded for emission reductions measured from an established reference level (discussed in Chapter 6). Reductions would be rewarded by allocation of tradable carbon credits, financial transfers from a global fund or other mechanisms. In the national approach, no direct credits would be issued *internationally* for activities that reduce emissions at the subnational level.

In order to access international incentives, each participating country, depending on its circumstances, would be responsible for implementing policies and measures to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation over its entire territory. Policies and measures might include a system to provide credits (payment for environmental services, or PES) to local communities. A major advantage of the national approach is that governments can put in place a broad set of policies and actions to reduce deforestation and forest degradation.

### **4.2.3 Nested approach**

Given the diverse national circumstances, a number of UNFCCC submissions suggest integrating subnational activities into a national accounting framework through a ‘nested’ approach (first presented coherently by Pedroni *et al.* 2007). Taking this approach, countries could start REDD activities at any level. Those that decide to start at the subnational level could scale up to a national approach as they strengthen their capacity and improve governance. Transition to a national approach would be mandatory, either within an agreed time frame or when an agreed percentage of forest area is covered by REDD projects, whichever comes first.

Although the transition to a national approach would be obligatory, it would still be possible to credit individual project activities. The nested approach therefore has two unique features: Firstly, the capacity to scale up from a subnational to a national approach over time. Secondly, countries have the option to account for and receive international credits at subnational and national levels simultaneously (see Figure 4.1). Also, different countries could use different crediting mechanisms at the same time.

In a nested approach, where accounting and crediting takes place at both subnational and national levels, procedures for MRV and setting reference levels would need to be harmonised. An arrangement for sharing credits between the two levels could be modelled on the Kyoto Protocol Joint Implementation (JI) mechanism. At the end of each accounting period, the country would have to deduct all credits issued and committed at subnational level from national credits for country-wide emission reductions (see Box 4.1).

Should the national level fail to deliver carbon benefits, independently validated and verified subnational activities would still be credited.

#### **Box 4.1.** How a nested approach might work

A project generates 1000 tonnes of carbon dioxide emission reductions during the accounting period. The country's overall reduction (carbon credits) is 5000 tonnes during the period. The 1000 tonnes already credited to the project have to be deducted from the national balance. To allow for project-level leakage, monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) costs, and the risk of non-permanence (higher emissions in the future), the government may retain a certain share of the carbon credits assigned to the project. Thus, the government and the project might make a deal that the project keeps 70% of the credits while the government keeps 30%. In this scenario, the project would keep 700 credits and the government 4300 credits.

Even under an exclusively national approach, a country could also allocate some of the national credits to projects. This would reduce deforestation and degradation, and compensate districts, communities and farmers for the cost of forest conservation. In other words, a country could establish a national system for Payments for Environmental Services (PES) that extends the global REDD system to the local level. In a nested approach this would be considered part of the international agreement, whereas it would *not* be in an exclusively national model.

## **4.3 Assessment of the three approaches**

The merits of the three approaches can be assessed in relation to the '3E' framework, elaborated in Chapter 2: Is the mechanism achieving its greenhouse gas emission targets (carbon effectiveness)? Are these targets achieved at the minimum cost (cost efficiency)? What are the distributional implications and co-benefits (equity and co-benefits)? This section assesses each criterion, and is summarized in Table 4.1.

### **4.3.1 Effectiveness**

In terms of carbon effectiveness and emission reduction goals, the differences between the three approaches can be assessed in three main dimensions: (i) ability to deal with leakage and additionality; (ii) overall level of participation, which will influence overall emissions reductions achieved; and (iii) broad policy reforms, which will influence the depth, cost and permanence of reductions.

**Table 4.1.** Pros and cons of subnational, national and nested approaches

| REDD model                  | Criteria  |  |   |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|
|                             | Effectiveness   | Efficiency   | Equity and co-benefits  |
| <b>Subnational approach</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Broad short-term participation</li> <li>+ Attractive to private funders</li> <li>- Domestic leakage a problem</li> <li>- Does not trigger the required policy changes</li> <li>- Weak involvement of host countries</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>± MRV costs lower overall but higher per CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent</li> <li>+ Differentiated incentive payment possible: lowers costs</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Easier participation by poor countries and those with weak governance</li> <li>+ Can target poor domestic groups and create more opportunities for community participation</li> </ul>  |
| <b>National approach</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Broader set of policies pursued</li> <li>+ Captures domestic leakage</li> <li>+ Stronger host country ownership</li> <li>- Unsolved issues of reference levels (additionality)</li> </ul>                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Lower MRV and transaction costs per CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent</li> <li>+ Low-cost (non-PES) policies available</li> <li>- Potential for policy and governance failure</li> </ul>                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Potentially larger overall transfers</li> <li>+ Better alignment with national development strategies</li> <li>- Favours middle-income countries</li> <li>- Risk of high level and elite capture ('nationalisation' of carbon rights)</li> </ul> |
| <b>Nested approach</b>      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Combines strengths of other two approaches</li> <li>+ Flexibility based on national circumstances</li> <li>+ Potential for larger overall transfers</li> <li>- Unsolved issues of reference levels (additionality)</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Differentiated compensation pay and low-cost broad policies</li> <li>- High MRV costs (requires disaggregated national data)</li> <li>- Challenges in harmonising national and subnational</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Increased country participation and larger transfers to poor countries</li> <li>+ Possible to target poor groups</li> </ul>  |

National approaches must set credible national reference levels (credit baselines) and address questions of permanence and liability (discussed in Chapter 8). International negotiations have not yet resolved all the issues associated with doing this. There is a real risk that, because so many criteria for setting baselines are being discussed (e.g. national circumstances), baselines may be

inflated, which will generate ‘tropical hot air’ (no additionality) (see Chapter 6). This would undermine the effectiveness and also the long-term credibility of national systems.

The geographical scope of national and nested approaches is potentially much larger than the scope of subnational approaches, thus addressing the problems of domestic leakage in accounting and thereby achieving greater effectiveness (M-Co Consulting, 2008; see also Chapter 7).

Currently, most developing countries cannot take a national approach because their MRV infrastructure is inadequate. This raises the problem of international leakage. The flexibility of the nested approach should permit most countries to participate sooner, either taking a (temporary) project approach or a national approach, or by pursuing both simultaneously. The choice will depend on their capacity for MRV, whether or not they have institutions in place to handle REDD funds and the nature of their national REDD strategy. The flexibility of the nested approach and the scope for broad participation should result in lower emissions compared to the other approaches.

Private investors may be reluctant to buy emission reductions from countries. They may prefer to invest in ‘tangible’ forest projects, which are directly associated with emissions reductions and other benefits, such as conserving biodiversity and reducing poverty. Because they have limited or no control over host country risks private investors are also less likely to invest upfront in emission reductions at the national level than directly in forest projects. This could exacerbate the problems of limited country participation.

Reforms such as changes to land tenure and improving governance could be key elements of a national REDD strategy. However, it would be difficult to trace the effects of such reforms to particular geographical areas. Also, these kinds of reforms would generally not fall within the scope of a subnational or project-based approach. Thus, national approaches are likely to encourage broader and more strategic policies compared to subnational approaches, and lead to deeper and longer-term emissions cuts.

### **4.3.2 Efficiency**

The cost efficiency of the three approaches to REDD is likely to be affected by: (i) the costs of monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV); (ii) the costs of implementing policies; and (iii) opportunity cost payments.

A national MRV infrastructure has significant economies of scale. This means that the national approach is likely to be more efficient than nested and subnational approaches in terms of cost per unit of carbon dioxide emission

reduction or area covered. For example, an exclusively national approach would not necessarily require disaggregating data to regional or district levels, reducing the number of sample plots that need to be monitored. The nested approach costs more than the national approach because monitoring and accounting must be at both national and subnational levels (disaggregating national level data is costly).

A second element affecting efficiency is the cost of implementing REDD policy. Implementing a system to credit subnational units (a national PES system) incurs costs such as the cost of registering projects with central institutions, the costs of validation and verification, and the costs of administering contracts. Economies of scale favour nationwide implementation. However, while a national system may have the potential to generate greater emissions reductions at lower cost, bureaucracy and corruption could make a national system inefficient. A subnational approach may have higher overall transaction costs per unit of emission reduction, but may be run more efficiently. Subnational approaches would typically take the form of small projects managed by private entities that have experience in carbon market mechanisms and that prioritise cost efficiency.

National approaches may include broad policy reforms. Many of these will be cheaper to implement than payment for environmental services (PES) schemes. In some cases reforms might even generate savings, such as by removing subsidies that stimulate deforestation and degradation.

The opportunity costs of forest conservation (typically the profits from agriculture and timber harvesting that could be generated from the land) vary greatly among those who hold rights to use forests. If rights holders could be compensated according to the specific opportunity costs they incur, overall costs would be substantially lower. In a study from Brazil, Börner and Wunder (2008) estimate that perfectly differentiated payments save 45-75% compared to uniform compensation.

Introducing differentiated payments might be more realistic in a subnational approach than in a national system where the transaction costs of doing so would be higher. However, introducing differentiated payments does raise equity issues as some of the poorest rights holders also have the lowest opportunity costs. The difficulties experienced in excluding non-additional activities (leading to inefficient payments) can be seen in the national PES system in Costa Rica (Karousakis 2007).

### 4.3.3 Equity

Equity is an issue that needs to be addressed between countries (international) and within countries (intra-national). The latter is to a large extent determined by national REDD strategies and policies. Although an international REDD agreement is likely to be ‘implementation neutral’, in the sense that it will not specify which national policies are to be implemented, the global REDD regime will have implications for domestic distribution of benefits and costs.

At the international level, a regime allowing only national approaches to REDD could exclude most of the low-income countries on grounds that they have inadequate infrastructure for MRV and poor governance. Thus, the international flow of money could be skewed towards a few middle-income countries, such as Brazil. However, subnational approaches might not necessarily be better in this regard, as illustrated by the CDM experience. In 2007, 73% of all CDM credits sold were ‘made in China’ (Hamilton *et al.* 2008). This points to the need – irrespective of the approach chosen – to strengthen national capacity and institutions and, more generally, to improve governance and accountability to ensure participation of the poorest countries.

In terms of intra-national equity, a centralised national approach could limit the participation of rural communities in the design and implementation of REDD. This could result in inequitable sharing of benefits and the ‘nationalisation’ of carbon rights. Large new financial flows may increase the risk of corruption and be captured by the state, preventing the benefits from reaching the poor. Governments also have decidedly mixed track records in promoting inclusive decision-making processes (Foti *et al.* 2008) and may have little incentive to ensure broad local participation in REDD. If processes in national approaches are inequitable, they may result in inequitable outcomes. On the other hand, a national approach may align with national development strategies and bring long-term development benefits.

Smaller scale subnational and nested approaches may be more flexible than larger scale national approaches in responding to needs in specific contexts. Evidence from some carbon-credit forestry projects suggests that they can strengthen local capacities, participatory decision making and community-based resource management (Corbera 2005). However, private investors and conservation NGOs have a mixed track record when it comes to factoring community concerns into their projects. Carbon markets are driven primarily by global climate protection objectives, rather than local socio-economic objectives. Both subnational and national approaches are likely to face challenges in this area, but the drivers shaping the level of participation, along with the actors and processes involved, will be different.

## 4.4 Summary and concluding remarks

Three approaches to the geographical level or scale of REDD accounting and incentive mechanisms are under discussion: direct support to projects (subnational level), direct support to countries (national level), or a hybrid ('nested') approach combining the two.

A subnational or project approach allows for early involvement and wide participation, and is attractive to private investors. However, this approach may suffer from leakage (increased emissions outside project boundaries) and cannot address the broader forces driving deforestation and forest degradation.

A national approach allows pursuit of a broad set of policies, addresses domestic leakage and creates country ownership. In the short to medium term, however, this approach is not feasible for many countries. It is also susceptible to governance failures, and may be less likely to mobilise private investment or involve local government.

A nested approach is the most flexible. It allows countries to start subnational activities and gradually move to a national approach. The nested approach allows both approaches to coexist in a system where REDD credits are generated by both projects and government, thus maximising the potential of both subnational and national approaches. However, a challenge in a nested approach is to harmonise the two levels.

## 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](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 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. Chapter 5 *In*: GOF-C-GOLD. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries: a sourcebook of methods and procedures for monitoring, measuring and reporting. GOF-C-GOLD Report version COP 13-2. GOF-C-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: Murdiyarsa, 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., Murdiyarsa, D., Schlamadinger, B. and de Souza 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., Murdiyarsa, 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](http://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\\_eggleston\\_ipcc.pdf](http://unfccc.int/files/methods_and_science/lulucf/application/pdf/080625_tokyo_eggleston_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](http://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, Penicuik, 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](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](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 revegetation 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/gpplulucf/gpplulucf\\_contents.html](http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpplulucf/gpplulucf_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](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](http://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](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](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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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](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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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](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](http://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](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](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](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](http://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](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-CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse gases in climate change mitigation: Long-term scenarios for the 21<sup>st</sup> 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](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., Ciccacese, 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., Ciccacese, 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](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 Technological 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.
- UNFCCC 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 28<sup>th</sup> 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<sub>2</sub> 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](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.