

Proposals to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation in Developing Countries (REDD) and their impacts on women



A neoliberal market-based approach to forest conservation:

- Give forest environmental values marketable asset prices and let markets do their work
- Pay countries or communities for “the environmental service” of not deforesting, and that will reduce deforestation



“Including forest conservation in carbon markets will be effective and equitable”:



- *If all forest values are properly accounted for*
- *If the benefits are equitably distributed to the proper “owners”*
- *If the market is properly regulated*
- *If those regulations are effectively enforced*
- *If there is an equal level playing field so that all players can participate equitably*

So what do we do on planet earth?



“Ifs” that don’t exist: the inconvenient truth about financing reducing deforestation through carbon trade:

- Valuation: Uncertainty about carbon sequestered by forests, and interaction of forests with climate
- Baselines and additionality are impossible to verify
- Equitable privatization: Markets cannot work without privatization. Do we need to privatize and put a price on all forests to make markets work? Is this feasible? Equitable? Ethical?
- Carbon finance is instable and unpredictable
- A “Kyoto Forest” might have little to do with the forest we like to see.....



A non-Kyoto forest....Proper carbon accounting only includes “human-induced change” (human efforts), but letting forests grow back naturally might be preferable. Women depend on natural forests for their livelihood



Markets or regulations?

- **The Costa Rican experience is considered a success story, but their carbon market only developed as a result of government intervention, donor aid and other governmental support.**
- **Moreover, the success of the Costa Rican PES scheme might have been the result of the fact that deforestation was illegal.**
- **The efficiency of PES as a conservation instrument can be disputed: Command and control measures like deforestation moratoria have proven to be more successful (83% reduction in Paraguay between May 2004 and May 2005).**
- **Do we need to pay people to comply with the law?**

¿Property/sovereignty = a right to destroy?



- **Women suffer disproportionately from both deforestation and climate change, and they own much less forest land than men as they often do not have former land title**

Proposals to “compensate” countries for reducing deforestation

- Idea developed by Prime Minister of PNG who wanted to be compensated for complying with conditions of a World Bank Loan to the PNG forestry sector
- Those conditions related to good governance: addressing illegal logging and corruption.....
- They found an unlikely ally in Costa Rica, which still tries to sell its PES scheme at the international carbon market as this expensive scheme is chronically underfunded.
- And other forest countries that were interested in the billions World Bank, FAO, UNEP and IUCN experts promised them

Three main proposals



- Public fund (Brazil, India, Tuvalu)
- Include nation-wide reduction commitments in carbon trade (Rainforest coalition)
- Include projects in carbon trade (most South American countries)

World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

- “To reduce the costs of emissions reductions for industrialized countries”
- Making countries “ready” for the carbon market plus “pilot projects”
- Priority for countries that have high deforestation rates or threaten to deforest
- Uses public money to promote markets: conflict of interest
- No participation of, and respect for rights of Indigenous Peoples
- Previous WB investments in forests and non-forest sectors have lead to massive deforestation and other negative impacts on women

Two Big “Carbon Markets benefit Forests” lies

- “Forests are not part of the climate regime”
- “Financing reducing deforestation through carbon markets will contribute to mitigating climate change”
- The 1992 Climate Convention obliges all countries to reduce deforestation and obliges developed countries to give new and additional funding for helping developing countries to do that. Northern forests are in Kyoto.
- Per definition, reducing deforestation through carbon finance will not contribute to mitigating climate change as one extra ton carbon will be emitted for every ton saved

Additional Lies

- “Leakage (deforestation shifting to another area or country) can be addressed through proper selection, verification or other “mechanisms”
- “CDM experience was positive”
- We need stable and predictable resources, so forests should be included in carbon markets
- “We need to start pilot projects”
- As long as demand for products that impact upon forests is unchallenged, there will always be “leakage”
- CDM has proven project-based forest offsets are a disaster-nobody is interested in forests or Indigenous Peoples, carbon traders prefer to invest in large Chinese factories or tree plantations
- Per definition, carbon markets will provide an unstable, unpredictable and inequitable source of funding
- There are MILLIONS of existing projects to reduce deforestation, some paid with new and additional financing. We don't want more human guinea pigs....

Crucial convenient Lie: “Carbon Markets will Benefit women (and men)”

- Most carbon credits will come from reducing deforestation: typical women’s activities do not destroy forests, so they cannot reduce their deforestation (Same is true for countries)
- Women seldom manage large projects (no economies of scale)
- Women often lack marketing skills, language skills



Paraguayan PES Experiment



- The Law on the Valuation and Retribution of Environmental Services, adopted in September 2006. Artificial Regulation adopted in 2007, real regulation being elaborated at the moment
- The Secretariat for the Environment has to annually value all Paraguayan environmental services
- Promotes biodiversity offsets for, amongst others, soy expansion. Forest conversion was already illegal since 2004 in Eastern Paraguay
- All credits can be freely traded in international carbon market: strong Paraguayan interest to promote “flexibility”

Main problems with the Paraguayan PES Law 3001/06

- The law stipulates that **all** owners of **land** and its natural components that generate environmental services **will have a right** to corresponding compensation for the provided services.
- There has been no calculation of the total budget this would require (compensation for soy: 1500 USD X 700.000 hectares = approx. 1.05 billion USD per year for Eastern Paraguay alone)
- Most of the funding will come from biodiversity offsets: This provides a major incentive for the (governmental and non-governmental) conservation sector to allow and even promote destructive projects. Including CO2 emissions...

Additional problems with the Paraguayan PES law

- Paraguay has the most inequitable distribution of land on earth: The overwhelming majority of funds will go to large landholders.
- The law will frustrate land reform programs and ongoing land rights claims of Indigenous Peoples as it will increase the value of land.
- Specifically, it will stimulate the establishment of false private reserves that are set up to criminalize land occupations.
- The system will most likely be subject to serious governance problems: It is likely that politically influential groups will have far better access to the funds than politically marginal groups like Indigenous Peoples and small farmers: Bad governance and market-based conservation mechanisms are a risky combination



Impacts of biodiversity offsets on Mbya Guarani communities in San Rafael

Impacts of soy:

- Freshwater resources are dangerously contaminated due to the surrounding soy plantations
- Due to increased land pressure there are regular invasions: The forest of the Arroyo Claro community was cut by invading farmers

Impacts of private reserves:

- 90% of Indigenous lands have been privatized
- Hunting areas have been severely restricted, leading to overexploitation and malnutrition
- Current land rights claims are being frustrated by the perspective of PES for private reserve owners
- The property of these private reserves is disputed by the Mbya, who consider the entire area as their "tekoha", which they have always managed sustainably.



Could Mbya women benefit from PES?



Mbya Guarani might be able to claim PES themselves, but:

- Language barrier and lack of legal and marketing skills
- The requirement to obtain an Environmental Impact Assessment will also inhibit the participation of poor landholders in the system
- Bad governance and PES is a fatal combination
- Changing the currently mainly non-monetary economy into a monetary one will devastate cultural values and traditions
- Money will not buy them uncontaminated water - the distances to paid services are too large
- Women are likely to suffer most, as they are underpaid in formal labour and responsible for providing clean water and other non-monetary services for the family

Indigenous environmental refugees (climate change, soy expansion): Mbya Guarani people on the streets of Asunción



Meanwhile, long time ago, in 1992,
we agreed that....

- ALL governments would reduce their emissions AND conserve forests (*FCCC Article 4.1 (d)*)
- Developed countries would contribute new and additional financial resources (0.1% GNP) to reward developing countries for the incremental costs of providing global environmental benefits. (Agenda 21)
- ...maybe it is time to implement this agreement?

CUT EMISSIONS AT SOURCE!!!

Need to address underlying causes of forest loss

- Economic causes (e.g. agrofuels)
- Institutional causes (lack of law enforcement, corruption)
- Technological causes (e.g. other agriculture)
- Cultural causes (other approach to forests)
- Demographic causes (prevent intrusion of Indigenous lands)



Support sustainable, democratic and well-enforced public governance of biodiversity, including through redirecting perverse incentives, supporting women's conservation efforts through different incentives, banning deforestation and safeguarding Indigenous rights (UNDRIP).

"The majority of areas where we stopped deforestation in Brazil are Indigenous lands" (Adriana Ramos, FBOMS)



www.globalforestcoalition.org

