

Ole Mertz¹ | Maya Pasgaard¹ | Daniel Müller^{2,9} | Maria Brockhaus³ | Louis V. **Verchot³** | Zhanli **Sun²** | Thomas **Sikor⁴** | Meine **van Noordwijk⁵** | Cornelia Hett⁶ | Jean-Christophe Castella⁷ | Thilde Bech Bruun⁸ | Dirk Pflugmacher⁹ | Finn Danielsen¹⁰

Lessons for REDD+ from complex mosaic landscapes

The GLP endorsed research project I-REDD+ (Impacts of reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks) ended formally in December 2014. Six main lessons emerge from the research conducted mainly in Southeast Asia and they all indicate a rapidly closing window of opportunity for REDD+. This is especially the case in mosaic landscapes where many types of mature and degraded forests co-exist with agriculture and other land uses and where land use changes are occurring very rapidly.

1) Reference emission levels may not predict uncertain futures

Sudden or unanticipated changes in land systems make it challenging to establish credible reference emission levels that allow for prediction of 'business-as-usual' changes in future carbon stocks as a benchmark for compensating emission reductions. Therefore, the current approach to market-based national level REDD+ relying on performance-based payments and prediction of future carbon dynamics is highly risky and may not lead to the expected emission reductions. Payments or investments in better forest management and co-benefits may be more efficient than a mechanism based on emission reductions compared to unknown future emissions.

2) Drivers of deforestation and degradation are difficult to address

Many underlying drivers of carbon emissions from tropical land–use change originate from the global level and are beyond the control of national or sub-national institutions (e.g., demand for rubber, palm oil and other globally traded cash crops). Interventions to mitigate emissions that are an indirect result of increases in world market prices are costly and difficult to tackle by the currently proposed REDD+ interventions. Moreover, these drivers are mostly decoupled from the forestry sector and expansive land development of cash crops often co-occurs with efforts to promote REDD+ without cross-sector coordination.

3) Carbon stocks in mosaic landscapes and secondary forests may be underestimated

Large areas of forests in the tropics are secondary and still being used occasionally for cultivation. Carbon stocks in such mosaic landscapes may be larger than what has been previously assumed in allometric equations because high belowground biomass under secondary forest is not captured. Small trees in these forests often reveal large underground root and horizontal stem systems, from which they are resprouting and that are not proportional to their small aboveground stems.

4) Forest degradation must be monitored at different scales

The use of dense Landsat time series for temporal analyses of individual pixels is recommended for mosaic landscapes as it can better capture forest degradation associated with felling and regrowth of secondary forests over large areas. It has also been demonstrated that measuring sub-national and local carbon-stocks – needed for verification of broader national measurement efforts – can

Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management, University of Copenhagen, Øster Voldgade 10, 1350 Copenhagen K, Denmark, email: om@ign.ku.dk

² Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies (IAMO), Theodor-Lieser-Str. 2, 06120, Halle (Saale), Germany

³Center for International Forestry Research, PO Box 0113 BOCBD, 16000, Bogor, Indonesia

⁴School of International Development, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom

⁵World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), 16000 Bogor, Indonesia

⁶Centre for Development and Environment (CDE) NCCR, University of Bern, Hallerstrasse 10, CH-3012, Bern, Switzerland

⁷ Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, UMR GRED – PO Box 5992, Vientiane, Lao PDR

⁸ Department of Plant and Environmental Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Thorvaldsensvej 40, 1871, Frederiksberg, Denmark

⁹Geography Department, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, 10099, Berlin, Germany

¹⁰ NORDECO, Skindergade 23, 1159, Copenhagen K, Denmark

include community-based measurement for enhancing feasibility, efficiency and potential equity benefits. Community members can monitor above ground carbon as accurately as professional foresters and should be considered in local REDD+ projects, but also if national REDD+ integrate sub-national approaches to monitoring. With repeated rounds of measurement, both the reliability and the cost-effectiveness of community monitoring increase.

5) Just benefit distribution needs elements of both state and community control

Benefit distribution mechanisms for REDD+ are important in relation to effectiveness, efficiency, equity and their trade-offs. From the local perspective, the combination of state and community control is considered more just, while top-down state control is more effective, but only where states commit significant resources in the form of specialized staff and operating budgets. However, state control performs badly from a justice perspective in terms of distribution, participation and recognition. Decisions about payment distribution at the local level should take into account tenure arrangements (private or collective), which affect the tolerance and perceived equity of payment methods. The risk of elite capture and harming the poorest households, who rely the most on forest resources and have limited power in local actor-networks, remains high in many potential REDD+ countries and should be addressed openly before REDD+ is implemented.

6) Locating REDD+ activities should match desirable qualities for REDD+

Desirable qualities for REDD+, both at national level and for localized interventions, include a high degree of dense forests, low population density, low level of losses from foregone opportunities, high biodiversity benefits, high poverty reduction potential and commitment to engage in REDD+. However, so far locations for REDD+ pilot activities have typically been selected on the basis of specific interests of the external implementing agencies and other powerful players – with or without the potential to reach the intended climatic, ecological and social objectives in REDD+. This is likely to remain an issue if national REDD+ has an important subnational/nested component.

REDD+ activities on the ground in the four countries studied by I-REDD+ are still under preparation. However, there is considerable scope for co-design and co-production of new research as local Pilot REDD+ programmes are being implemented and if an international REDD+ agreement will make national REDD+ programmes get off the ground. This is especially relevant for monitoring systems, which have been set up in many areas and countries, but need to be evaluated jointly by researchers and implementing agencies once they are operational.

References

Ankersen J, Mertz O, Fensholt R, Castella JC, et al. (2015): Vietnam's forest transition in retrospect: demonstrating weaknesses in business-as-usual scenarios for REDD+. Environmental Management, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00267-015-0443-y

Brofeldt S, Theilade I, Burgess ND, Danielsen F, et al. (2014). Community monitoring of carbon stocks for REDD+: Does accuracy and cost change over time? Forests 5(8): 1834–1854.

Danielsen F, Adrian T, Brofeldt S, van Noordwijk M, et al. (2013). Community monitoring for REDD+: international promises and field realities. Ecology and Society 18(3): 41.

Fox J, Castella JC, Ziegler AD (2013). Swidden, rubber and carbon: Can REDD+ work for people and the environment in Montane Mainland Southeast Asia? Global Environmental Change 29: 318-326.

Mertz O, Müller D, Sikor T, Hett C, et al. (2012). The forgotten D: challenges of addressing forest degradation in complex mosaic landscapes under REDD+. Geografisk Tidsskrift-Danish Journal of Geography 112(1): 63-76.

Müller D, Sun Z, Vongvisouk T, Pflugmacher D, et al. (2014). Regime shifts limit the predictability of land-system change. Global Environmental Change 28: 75-83

Sikor T (2013). REDD+: Justice Effects of Technical Design. Pp 46-68 in Sikor T (ed.) The Justices and Injustices of Ecosystem Services. London: Routledge.

Vongvisouk T, Broegaard RB, Mertz O, Thongmanivong S. (In review) Rush for cash crops and forest protection: neither land sparing nor land sharing. In review in Land Use Policy.

Yuen JQ, Ziegler AD, Webb EL, Ryan CM. 2013. Uncertainty in below-ground carbon biomass for major land covers in Southeast Asia. Forest Ecology and Management 310: 915–926.

See all I-REDD+ publications on http://www.i-redd.eu

11 GLP news

NEWSLETTER OF THE GLOBAL LAND PROJECT

GLP - A joint research project of IGBP & Future Earth



ISSUE Nº 11 | APRIL 2015



Contributing to a more sustainable world requires more integrated and socially relevant science. This is especially true for land systems. How can academics and non-academics interact to produce joint knowledge on the land? This issue presents some experiences of co-design and co-production of knowledge related with land systems.

Scientific Steering Committee – SSC

Peter Verburg (Chair of GLP, 2011-2015)

Institute for Environmental Studies - VU University Amsterdam De Boelelaan 1087 - 1081 HV Amsterdam - Netherlands **Email:** peter.verburg@ivm.vu.nl

Roy Rinku Chowdburry

Department of Geography - Indiana University (IN) Student Building 120 - 701 E. Kirkwood Ave. - Bloomington, IN 47405 United States of America **Email:** rroychow@indiana.edu

Patrick Meyfroidt

SST/ELI - Earth and Life Institute (ELI) - ELIC - Earth & Climate (ELIC) - Université Catholique de Louvain (UCL)

ELIC - Place Louis Pasteur 3 bte - L4.03.08 à 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve - Belgium **Email:** patrick.meyfroidt@uclouvain.be

Allison M. Thomson

Science and Research Director Field to Market, The Alliance for Sustainable Agriculture 777 North Capitol Street, NE, Suite 803 Washington, DC 20002

Email: athomson@fieldtomarket.org

Souleymane Konaté

IUCN –Central and West Africa - University of Abobo-Adjame UFR-SN/CRE, 02 BP 801 Abidjan 02, Côte d'Ivoire - Ivory Coast **Email:** skonate2@yahoo.fr

Karlheinz Erb

Institute for Social Ecology - University of Klagenfurt Schottenfeldgasse 29/5t - A-1070 Vienna - Austria **Email:** karlheinz.erb@aau.at

Nancy Golubiewski

Land Use Carbon Analysis System (LUCAS) - Ministry for the Environment – Manatu Mo Te Taiao 23 Kate Sheppard Place, PO Box 10362, Wellington 6143 - New Zeland **Email:** golubiewskiN@gmail.com

Jonathan Morgan Grove

Northern Research Station - USDA Forest Service 5200 Westland Blvd. TRC 171 - MD 21227, Baltimore - United States of America **Email:** mgrove@fs.fed.us

Andreas Heinimann

Centre for Development and Environment - University of Berne Hallerstrasse 10, 3012 Bern, Switzerland **Email:** andreas.heinimann@cde.unibe.ch

Harini Nagendra

Azim Premi University - PES Institute of Technology Campus Electronics City, Hosur Road, Bangalore - India **Email:** harini.nagendra@apu.edu.in

Erle C. Ellis

Dept. of Geography & Environmental Systems - University of Maryland 1000 Hilltop Circle, Baltimore, MD 21250 - United States of America **Email:** ece@umbc.edu

Lin Zhen

Institute of Geographic Science and Natural Resources Research, Chinese - Academy of Sciences Deputy Director of Research Unit for Resource Ecology and Biomass Resources 11A Datun Road, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100101- PR China **Email:** zhenl@igsnrr.ac.cn, linlinzhen@yahoo.com

Neville D. Crossman

Senior Research Scientist, Team Leader, CSIRO Ecosystem Sciences CSIRO Ecosystem Sciences, Private Bag 2, Glen Osmond, SA, 5064 - Australia **Email:** neville.crossman@csiro.au

Ole Mertz

Department of Geography and Geology, University of Copenhagen, Oster Voldgade 10, 1350 Copenhagen K. - Denmark **Email:** om@geo.ku.dk

Patrick H. Hostert

Head of Geomatics Lab, Deputy Director of Geography Department Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Geography Department / Geomatics Lab Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin - Germany **Email:** patrick.hostert@geo.hu-berlin.de

Héctor Ricardo Grau

Instituto de Ecología Regional - Universidad Nacional de Tucumán-CONICET Casilla de Correo 34, (4107) Yerba Buena, Tucumán - Argentina **Email:** chilograu@gmail.com



Coverpage

Rural builders in Waka Playa, Bolivia Photo by Sébastien Boillat

GLP News is a newsletter of the Global Land Project

Editors:
Sébastien Boillat
Fabiano Micheletto Scarpa
Peter Verburg
Jean Pierre Henry
Balbaud Ometto

International Project Office - GLP IPO

National Institute for Space Research - INPE

Earth System Science Centre - CCST

Av. dos Astronautas, 1758 CCST Building, 1st Floor, Room 22 Jd. Granja - 12227-010 São José dos Campos São Paulo - Brazil

Office phone: +55 12 3208 7938 www.globallandproject.org

Dr. Jean Pierre Henry Balbaud Ometto

INPE Liason Researcher
Office phone: +55 12 32087903

Dr. Sébastien Boillat

Executive Officer
Office phone: +55 12 3208 7931

Dr. Fabiano Micheletto Scarpa

Project Officer

Office phone: +55 12 3208 7942



CONTENTS

Perspective

Urban Experiences from the U.S. Long Term Ecological Research (LTER) Network.

J. Morgan Grove | Rinku Roy Chowdhury | Daniel Childers.

Feature - Article

RegioPower - an online platform for interactive tools for participatory landscape assessment and planning.

Susanne Frank | Christine Fürst | Anže Japelj | Primož Simončič | Kyle Eyvindson | Annika Kangas | Jussi Rasinmäki | Renats Trubins | Ljusk-Ola Eriksson | Robert Barkowski

Co-innovation for water management in New Zealand.

MS Srinivasan | Graham Elley | Denise Bewsell

Climate Related Risks (droughts and floods) on Agriculture: Awareness on building resilience and increasing mitigation in Côte d'Ivoire.

Pauline A. Dibi Kangah | Moussa Koné

GeoBolivia, the public geographic data portal of the Plurinational State of Bolivia: a tool for the coproduction of spatially explicit knowledge.

Louca Lerch | Fernando Molina

The co-production of ecosystem service knowledge: experiences from large inter- and transdisciplinary projects.

Christoph Görg | Josef Settele | Joachim H. Spangenberg

A legal tool for participatory methods in land systems science: the Thai model of Health Impact Assessment and the consideration of zoonotic diseases concerns into policies.

Claire Lajaunie | Serge Morand

Lessons for REDD+ from complex mosaic landscapes.

Ole Mertz | Maya Pasgaard | Daniel Müller | Maria Brockhaus | Louis V. Verchot | Zhanli Sun | Thomas Sikor | Meine van Noordwijk | Cornelia Hett | Jean-Christophe Castella | Thilde Bech Bruun | Dirk Pflugmacher | Finn Danielsen

Tools for Co-Creation of New Knowledge for Transformation to Sustainable Urban Landscapes.

Aliyu Salisu Barau

Transition to sustainability: are participatory multi-scale scenarios a useful tool?

Ana Paula Dutra Aguiar

News

Global Land Project
Asia Conference 2014

GLP endorsed by Future Earth
Three GLP Nodal Offices created

Noticeboard

The Kwongan Foundation:
Bridging community needs and
biological conservation

Hans Lambers

Announcements

Publications

Conferences





GLP International Project Office

National Institute for Space Research- INPE Earth System Science Centre- CCST

Av. dos Astronautas, 1758 Earth System Science Center (CCST), 1st floor, room 22 Jd. Granja - 12227-010 São José dos Campos - São Paulo - Brazil

Fone: +55 12-3208 7931/7942 www.globallandproject.org

Graphic design: Luciano Urizzi, Magno Studio, Brazil

GLP is a joint research project of the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP) and Future Earth.





GLP International Project Office is thankful for the financial support from the National Institute for Space Research – INPE, Brazil, the Earth System Science Center (CCST) and VU University Amsterdam (VUA)





