



Central Africa Regional  
Program for the Environment

## CARPE Technical Toolkit Workshop

May 15 – 16, 2013

Summary Report

Submitted by Sherise Lindsay

Training Resources Group, Inc.



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



**FCMC**   
Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities

# Table of Contents

---

Executive Summary.....	1
I. Introduction .....	1
The full participant agenda can be found in the Appendix.....	2
II. National REDD+ Strategies and Action Plans .....	3
III. RSAPs, LEDS and MRV .....	4
IV. National, Regional and Landscape Level Tools and Analyses .....	6
V. Group Discussion .....	14
VI. Landscape and Jurisdictional Level REDD+ Activities Presentations .....	16
VII. Environmental and Social ‘Safeguards’ Monitoring and Reporting at Landscape and Higher Levels ..	18
VIII. Gaps and Priorities.....	21
IX. Way Forward   Ken Creighton, USAID .....	28
Appendix: Participant List .....	29
Appendix: Participant Agenda .....	30
Draft Objectives .....	30
Draft Agenda .....	30

# Executive Summary

---

From May 15 to 16, 2013, representatives working with USAID's Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE) program gathered at the TetraTech AMT offices in Arlington VA for a two day technical toolkit workshop. A total of 42 people participated during the two days.

This report gives an overview of the meeting proceedings and highlights the sessions that had Q&A discussion, as well as outputs reflected in flipcharts. Soft copies of all the presentations will be shared on the CARPE website (<http://carpe.umd.edu/>). The author tried her best to identify the names of speakers for each discussion. Statements are attributed where possible.

## I. Introduction

---

### 1. Objectives

Prior to the workshop, CARPE Regional Climate Change Advisor Ken Creighton, FCMC Stephen Kelleher and TRG consultant Sherise Lindsay collaborated to identify workshop goals and designed the workshop. The following objectives were identified:

- a. **To better understand current CARPE goals and objectives** with respect to biodiversity and climate change mitigation and how to achieve the greatest impact from existing tools toward these ends;
- b. To introduce **key elements of the National REDD+ Strategies and Action Plans (RSAPs) and Low Emissions Development Strategies (LEDS)** and examine how CARPE partner tools can relate to those key elements;
- c. To understand how **landscape and jurisdictional level REDD+ activities link with national level processes** for monitoring, reporting and verification to identify the "two-way" flows of information needed to achieve effective synergy between these "nested" levels of action;
- d. To **determine how tools developed by CARPE partners to support biodiversity conservation and climate mitigation processes that are underway in the Congo Basin (including landscape level REDD+ projects, RSAPs and LEDs) complement and connect with each other** with emphasis on how biodiversity monitoring and participatory land use planning experience can inform development of national MRV systems for carbon stock changes and Safeguard Information Systems for tracking environmental and social impacts as well as accelerate progress with landscape level implementation of REDD+ measures; and
- e. To **surface gaps in information, connectivity and complementarity as well as potential additional applications of analytical tools and methods** to support national processes for biodiversity and climate change management that are getting underway now and will be under implementation during the next phase of CARPE.

### 2. Participants

See Appendix.

### 3. Agenda

DAY 1	DAY 2
National REDD+ Strategies and Action Plans MRV, RSAPs and LEDS National and Regional level tools and analyses	Landscape and jurisdictional level REDD+ activities and presentations  Environmental and social 'safeguards' monitoring and reporting at landscape and higher levels
LUNCH	LUNCH
Landscape level tools and analyses	Gaps and priorities  The way forward

The full participant agenda can be found in the Appendix.

### 4. Getting Started Activity

As an opening activity, each table was asked to discuss and create a Tweet that describes what excites them about their work with biodiversity conservation and climate mitigation.



- Securing the world's future by saving large landscapes, forests, wildlife and lives
- CARPE WKSP 2 Day will increase connections betw/ bioD +GCC 4 the benefit of Africans – Follow me 4 news
- Figuring out how to promote human development while maintaining ecological integrity of high conservation value forests and ecosystems
- Keen on using Earth obs & other tools/tech to build capacity 4 preserving natural places & ensuring eco. & social benefits
- Renewed excitement in forests; technology, networks & methods better able to respond
- Investment in forest conservation in CA will significantly reduce GHGs and save 3 of 4 great apes
- Excited about #Biodiversity/conservation #climate change: Forest is magical, resourcefulness, creativity, working with people in Central Africa
- Biodiversity + climate mitigation essential to ecosystem services for healthy communities + sustainable development
- Protecting biodiversity & natural resources in an important global area that is highly threatened. Pathways 2 LEDS. #Paradigm\_Shift
- Using sound science to ID bio-d, ES, and human dimension target smart finance & institution building #CARPE

## 5. Welcome | Ken Creighton, USAID/CARPE Regional Climate Change Advisor

Thank you all for coming to today. To give you background, I am a climate change specialist with USAID working mainly in Africa now, and I have worked on many international projects for mitigating climate change and maintaining biodiversity. CARPE is one of the most productive programs in the Environment sector that dates back over 15 years. It was established to identify areas with greatest biodiversity conservation value and to build management capacity for maintaining biodiversity in the Congo Basin that is linked with reducing forest loss and degradation.



## II. National REDD+ Strategies and Action Plans

### 1. **CARPE Overview and Historical Perspective | Tim Resch (USAID)**

By way of introduction I was asked to give some historical perspective of CARPE effort over time. As far back as the early 1990s when we produced the “green book” Central Africa: Global Climate Change and Development with people like Chris Justice and Dave Wilkie we have been using remote sensing and GIS to understand land use change in Central Africa. In 1995 we approved the CARPE project, a five year \$3

million per year effort intended to (1) test and demonstrate conservation approaches, (2) build capacity in relevant African institutions, (3) analyze and disseminate conservation information, and (4) promote regional planning and donor coordination. After five years, CARPE quintupled in size (\$15 million) and scope and became CARPE 2a and b, using the 3Cs (conservation, concessions and communities) approach addressing threats to biodiversity in and outside of protected areas from a landscape perspective. Now, we are on the cusp of CARPE phase 3, an eight year USAID strategy with a proposed annual funding level of \$22M. The product of this workshop will feed into CARPE 3 implementation. It is important to recognize the efforts and achievements CARPE has made over the past 20 years. We want newer folks entering the field to know that tangible improvements that have been accomplished over this interval and use the tools and understanding developed by CARPE and other investments to carry us forward.

### III. RSAPs, LEDS and MRV

---

#### 1. Building National and Regional MRV | Danae Maniatis, FAO

*[Presentation on the success indicators FAO in building national and regional capacity for MRV.](#)*

UN-REDD document on National Forest Monitoring Systems (NFMS):

[http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com\\_docman&task=doc\\_download&gid=10305&Itemid=53](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=10305&Itemid=53)

This document explains the UN-REDD Programme approach to NFMS. The English version is currently being translated into French and Spanish. Check <http://www.un-redd.org/> for updates

The official Democratic Republic of Congo Ministry of the Environment NFMS online web-portal: [www.rdc-snsf.org](http://www.rdc-snsf.org)<<http://www.rdc-snsf.org>>. A demonstration video of what it aims to do:

- English: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0yQyiQLQLBk>
- French: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4lpx8lMB8zU>
- Spanish: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jZ8TnM2CtG4>

#### **Q: What is the role of INPE?**

Danae – We signed an MOA with Brazilian space agency 3 years ago. The Brazilian system is one of the few operational national forest monitoring tools. They support countries in the Congo Basin. For example, their technicians adapted the TerraAmazon system to national circumstances for the DRC system (called TerraCongo). They have an open data sharing philosophy, available to anyone over the internet. Cooperation spans to DRC Country technicians being sent to Brazil for training and so on.

#### **Q: UN-REDD framework - What would be the scope?**

Danae – The scope of the National monitoring system is wider than Carbon. It can link to other systems and information and is a sustainable forest management tool in general. It can monitor and show data on various layers. On MRV side, the scope is strictly related to Carbon.

**Q: Please elaborate on international, multilateral and bilateral activities.**

Danae – FIP for example, UN REDD and FCPF working together.

At the country level, although some of it depends on the person, we all share as much as possible and support each other.. Every partner works together. When multi or bilateral comes, we share information quite freely.

UN REDD policy board invites members of FCPF and other stakeholders. Connect various stakeholders to cooperate. France is another important partner. Also depends on the country.

**Q: Paula – From my understanding, FAO is working on developing socio-economic indicators as part of forest assessment. Wondering whether any country in Congo Basin has been incorporating this?**

For the moment, no. In DRC, World Bank study looked but did not include socio-economic indicators. When we do inventory, we have to think about how to scale up to national level.

## **2. USG-GoG Partnership for Enhancing Capacity for Low Emissions Development Strategy (LEDS) in Gabon | Jason Ko, USFS**

*[Presentation on USFS' LEDS \(Low Emissions Development Strategy\) in Gabon, covering overview, work plan components, SilvaCarbon and Land Use Activities.](#)*

**Q: What kind of design system did you use?**

Chip – We had one hundred 100m X 100m plots across the country. We funded them to add satellite subplots to help optimize the integration of imagery and ground sampling. We will evaluate this sample to determine how best to conduct the second round of sampling.

What we try to do with each country is ask them what their objectives and monitoring questions are and what they need to measure to answer those objectives. Countries are most interested in carbon, then timber, and then biodiversity.

**Q: Tim – I liked the indicators. National indicators are progressive. Wondering if CARPE has attempted to do score card of countries using these indicators? As for the regional indicators, it doesn't cover individual, center capacity.**

No score card yet. Global canopy program has REDD desk where they have indicators on their MRV RPP etc.

There was a score card for REDD+ readiness that was conducted in mid-2012. There will be a forthcoming paper that measures capacity of REDD+ readiness and MRV. We visited all 10 countries and did an evaluation. Then we linked that with financial status and information of each country.

We were re-designing how regional capacity has been building, particularly in the Congo Basin.

**Q: Paula – Has there been any work in community based MRV?**

Comment: Ken – There is a window of opportunity when personnel change, it can increase communications.

Jason – we recently did a highly successful workshop in Douala regarding the forest planning guide.

We had a national workshop in Gabon as well, not only Ministry of Forestry but across all concerned Ministries. Landscape guide was somewhat a political topic, but forest planning was well received.

**Q: From my understanding, Gabon is not involved in the national level process of developing a REDD+Strategy and Action Plan . What is Gabon’s strategy?**

Landing – Yes, they are not participating on the national scale. There is MRV and they are using REDD+ as a tool but it is not wholly accepted yet.

The way it was put was that they do not need outside help and they can do it on their own.

Danae – REDD + as a tool. Gabon felt they had capacity to do that. Gabon does have that leadership. We have tried to reach out to the government.

## **IV. National, Regional and Landscape Level Tools and Analyses**

---

### **1. National and Regional Level Tools and Analysis | Landing Mane, OSFAC**

*Founded in 2000, OSFAC is an NGO that helps central African countries in preserving biodiversity by providing free satellite imagery, capacity building training in RS and GIS, and M&E. [Presentation covered OSFAC involvement in REDD projects and the tools they use.](#)*

**Q: Is there any collaboration with the Regional Forestry School? I thought it would be a good way to get good human capital.**

There are many students from all over Africa. Used to be French only, but now English courses are available. More than 50 MA students and 5 or 6 PhD students. Our labs are linked. We provide training for students for a few of the engineering departments, geography sciences and agronomy. We are working and improving the work we do, we provide well trained technicians around Congo Basin in countries like Congo, Cameroon, and Central Africa.

**Q: Ken– We have been talking about developing a business plan for OSFAC. How practical and realistic is it for some of the on-going exercises (like FAO or UN-REDD) to contract for services with OSFAC? Use the capacity that is already there.**

We are trying to have a Business or strategic plan for sustainability of OSFAC. Currently, 90% of funding comes from USAID. We do not know what will happen in the coming years. We are trying to strategize for the long run.



## 2. University of Maryland REDD+ Related Monitoring Research | Matthew Hansen, UMD

*Presentation on UMD REDD+ related monitoring research. Specifically, explaining earth observation science and their Landsat data and how they automated the process to clean imagery data for advanced land use monitoring.*

**Q: When will the global product be available?**

August or September

**Q: How do you differentiate between primary and secondary forestry?**

Secondary forestry looks at Spectral difference. GLAS validates our map that is based on spectrum.

**Q: FACET to be used for historical deforestation rates. When FACET is composited I heard you use different scenes next to each other. Can FACET be used to monitor temporal changes when scenes can be 5 years apart? Should it be used for temporal analysis?**

Goes back to challenge that before 2000, there are years with no data. It is a fundamental difference in data collecting. But technically you can. Even with Landsat 5, there were issues. Landsat 7 is much faster and Landsat 8 coming out soon.

**Q: One of the main drivers of deforestation in Congo Basin is subsistence agriculture. Do you have any idea on socio-economic alternatives to subsistence farming?**

You see this in parts all over the Congo Basin. That is a very big question.

Shifting cultivation was raised in REDD+ and we are actually working on that issue (report to come out in late June to early July). Tradeoffs and alternatives are considered in that report. Remember cassava as alternative, but no farming is only subsistence these days; there are always some kinds of market connections.

**Q: Have you digitized maps to get socio-economic information into the datasets?**

Community based mapping is available.

**Q: Ken Andrasko – Regarding degradation, how close are we to assessing degradation using FACET data? Can we use proxies?**

Degradation is a cryptic disturbance we don't see at Landsat scale. You have to have 30% canopy removal and acquisition to directly see it. Congo Basin has fewer disturbances. We have to use proxies; we do have a method for indirect proxies as well. I don't think we can give a definitive answer since we use proxies, and we have to find actual data in the field, and we should look into them, but it is a long way to being operational.

### 3. Monitoring Land Use Allocation and Forests in the Congo Basin | Matthew Steil, WRI

*[Presentation on Forest Atlases \(monitor land use allocation and extraction activities\) and Global Forest Watch 2.0 \(monitor forest cover change\).](#)*

**Q: What kind of difficulties do you run into?**

The forest atlases are a national level application that supports management and monitoring of land use allocation. We have not incorporated data that are non-national in nature. We are talking with government agency partners and others to further develop methods to include mapping of lands occupied by communities at the national level. It is one of the main pieces missing when thinking of land usage. We do not have national dataset about where people are living and the amount of area they are currently using to meet their resource needs. Depending on the country, we have data on most other major land use allocations, such as logging oil, mining, agriculture, protected areas, etc. It would be everyone's benefit to have information about community lands on the same platform as other major land use allocations.

Mapping of where people are using land and resources today is only part of the picture – we recognize that any land use zoning, must need to be able to take into account future needs as well.

We have tried participatory mapping. But this does not take into account future aspirations. Need to note it is only current and is subject to change.

**Q: Global Forest Watch is an amazing tool. The one thing we need to be aware is how countries will perceive this. On a political level, how do you get countries on board? Useful for us scientists, international organizations and NGOs, but the countries need to see it useful to be used on the ground.**

We have been thinking about that issue. Some countries like Indonesia are working directly with us. Clearly we need to outreach and provide technical assistance. Not all countries will come on board at the same time. Some may want to dive-in while others may want to take more time. We want to do outreach in the next half year to get more countries on board.

We have on-going MOUs with all 6 countries in Congo Basin under the initiative. We want to link forest atlases with the global forest watch platform and other initiatives such as TerraCongo to use forest atlas as platform to scale up to the global, from the national level.

We want to provide ministries a powerful tool to better manage their forest resources – by having on the one hand easy access to planned land use allocation (where forest and land should be used for different activities) and to combine this with a near real time monitoring of where forests are being cleared or re-growing - that would be one of the immediate applications of this tool. GFW can be used as a type of check and balance to governments, private sector and civil society.

**Q: GIS shape files in central Africa, need to use same reference. WRI has shape files for protected areas.**

This is particularly the case for protected areas in DRC, which continue to go through a revision process led by WWF and ICCN to determine which the officially designated protected areas for that country are. Anytime data is to be released with the government, we first hold multi-stakeholder validations between the government and other forest sector stakeholders to work towards consensus on the best available dataset – even while acknowledging the issues with any dataset. Multiple datasets on land use allocation are less of an issue for other countries besides DRC.

Everything that comes out of WRI and ministry is made publicly available. Before they become publicly available, they go through National validation process involving multi stakeholder participation.

**Q: How comprehensive is the dataset?**

The datasets are made in cooperation with ministries in charge of land use allocation and management. Comprehensiveness varies depending on land use type and country. To our knowledge, the ones we publish are the best datasets available.

**Q: How often is the database updated?**

As changes occur at the ministry level, but published only annually

#### **4. USFS Land-use and Management Planning Guides | Jason Ko, USFS**

*[Presentation on Land-use and Management Planning Guide developed by USFS.](#)*

**Q: Do you use any tools that allow you to achieve multiple objectives within a space? How do you configure your space?**

Not aware of specific economic evaluation type of tools, but the Guide talks about desired condition of the landscape. Developing communities and stakeholders should be nested in the process.

We do follow the guides; African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) used it to define zones in different usages.

**Q: Do the tools really have an effect for decision making on the ground?**

There are many Guides out there. We have been using them to achieve the results we want. Now strategically, we need to think of how to make these universally useful for people at all levels. Gabon for example, used the guide on five parks to improve efficiency.

**Q: I can see the guides being useful when there are clear desired outcomes. What happens when there is less willingness? Do the Guides help push the conversation forward?**

Guides are only useful if someone uses them. Hopefully, we can get them institutionalized so people can use them when needed. Having trainings and embedding the process would be ideal.

**Q: How generalizable are planning materials for community CBNRM areas? Seems there are 2 levels. National planning and then land tenure, more local. 1) What do people on the ground recognize? 2) Cadastral recognition. If you want to take it to next level, don't you need second tier evaluation?**

Started at regional level but got push back from central government to avoid being too specific, especially land tenure issues are sensitive. We would like to use the guides to develop that second level guide.

Tim Resch: Community mapping methods are well developed. We have used some more robust ones in 'CARPEland'. We know how to do this but we need to get expertise out there and we also need government buy-in to conduct this.

## **5. A Rapid Update on GEO FCT, GFOI and SilvaCarbon | Doug Muchoney, USGS**

*[Presentation of Global Forest Observations Initiative \(GFOI\), GEO Forest Tracking Task \(FCT\), SilvaCarbon and international coordination.](#)*

**Q: From what I understood from Jason, is soil carbon part of SilvaCarbon?**

Yes, and SilvaCarbon helps process in general.

Comment: As Doug said, SilvaCarbon rose to address capacity building in developing countries in a coordinated fashion. SilvaCarbon looks different for each country. We have reached out to other institutions and opportunities. Now we expand more, beyond USG and work with FAO/UN REDD so there is less redundancy.

**Q: Method and guidance – Is it additional? Does it fill gaps vis-à-vis what is already out there?**

A: GEOFCT is a sourcebook, no lack of guidance out there,

**Q: Do you see any progress in USTC program? Last year, we made many plans but not much has happened since. Where are we now?**

It is a process to come up with work plans for each country. Interests from our agencies within the US and outside does make it take a while, going back and forth. These things take time. I hope we can come up with a plan at least for Congo Basin.

**Q: Felipe – how do you envision coordination between SilvaCarbon and other USAID projects? We want to collaborate more effectively, especially in capacity building aspect. So we don't double up on same issues.**

I am not sure of the specifics but I understand your concern. For example, Degradation component has many actors and we do want to coordinate. We have started talking with Winrock at least.

**Q: Organizing follow up to Brazzaville, possibly in Kinshasa. Not sure of boundary between GEO and SilvaCarbon.**

What was formerly GEO FTC is now GFOI. They come in handy some times, like for political reasons, we can say you are part of GEO, so this is not for US. I find it quite practical. I have not heard of any meeting in Kinshasa.

## **6. Measuring Deforestation: A Statistical Approach | Jeremy Freund , Wildlife Works**

*[Presentation on the Biomass Emission Model \(BEM\) to measure deforestation.](#)*

Comment: this is great because it makes it easier for people to access. It has all sorts of positive ramifications.

**Q: Please elaborate how you analyze relationships between two points.**

This does not analyze spatial relationships. Variograms are map of variance over spatial space. Logistic regression shows relationship between one state and another state, over time, moving from forest to non-forest. Not a linear comparison. Logistic regression is not a spatial but a temporal model. It looks at each point's transition over time. It is a departure from traditional model. Criticism is, it does not cover land cover change and it can inflate the baseline.

Comment: Marc – some of the critiques are about methodology since you use different approaches on applying reference area rate, sampling questions etc.

**Q: You use a visual interpretation approach. You want an approach that is easily replicable without too much expertise. In your approach, how do you keep interpretations consistent over time?**

I don't consider this to be MRV. We consider this as baseline measurements. I appreciate multiple methods. We have validated this approach rigorously, going through multiple iterations to reach this point.

We can train people to be consistent across places and people. You are right in that this needs to be done correctly (training of people). The main issue we are dealing with is cloudiness and costs. We came up with this approach within these limitations.

Comment: Approach for baseline and monitoring should be same.

Comment: Matt – when we automate things for mass process, it loses details.

Comment: Danae – start thinking of what countries are doing at national level and thinking of what projects are doing. Reasons for wall to wall in most countries are to follow measures on the ground for policy reasons. I think it falls into the M part of the MRV and is useful data. Countries can use it on national level.

## 7. Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Carbon Calculator –ACC | Felipe Casim, Winrock

*[Presentation on simple web-based calculator that was developed to measure USAID climate change mitigation activities.](#) [www.afolucarbon.org](http://www.afolucarbon.org)*

Comment: To add context to why USAID requested this, back in 2004, before many of our climate change work, we wanted to measure what USAID projects were achieving and to measure impact on our Missions. Important to understand that many cases were not intended for climate change but this helps us measure across projects and implementers.

Felipe – we are transitioning concept behind this calculator to include more spatial data.

**Q: How do we effectively communicate to the outside world what we are accomplishing in CARPE? Extending calculator to other activities.**

When this initiative started in 2004, the only thing covered was area. We needed to calculate carbon with just area but that forced us to think outside the box. We are in the process of developing quantifiable indicators.

## 8. Landscape Carbon MRV Online Tool | David Skole, MSU-UNEP

*[Presentation about MRV Online enterprise-wise tool for M&E. Funded by GEF, implemented by UNEP and MSU and other partners.](#)*

*Presentation about MRV Online enterprise-wise tool for M&E. Funded by GEF, implemented by UNEP and MSU and other partners.*

The Michigan State University-WWF tool for carbon measurement, reporting and verification was developed collaboratively with the United Nations Environment Programme, with funding from the GEF through the Carbon Benefits Project. The aim is to provide the “enterprise-wide” technical, organizational and computational infrastructure to support carbon projects for a range of user-types from governments, NGOs, or international organizations. The functionality follows accepted IPCC guidelines, and much of the tools are framed around the Winrock International report , *Integrating Carbon Benefits Estimates into GEF Projects* (2005). Web site for the tool: [cpb.carbon2markets.org](http://cpb.carbon2markets.org)

This toolbox supports an organization’s needs for developing, managing and reporting carbon projects at the national or project level. It provides an enterprise-wide solution of on-line tools for planning and development and management of carbon projects across all of your organization’s offices and units, and enterprise training and capacity-building. The Toolbox supports planning, tasking and implementation, and its distributed web-enabled approach allows managers in one office to communicate and interact with field offices and other offices or cooperators across the organization. The tool contains a Content Manager that provides a structured way to organize all project documentation. It also contains a system

for Mapping Geographic Information, organized in a hierarchical design around Project-Parcel-Plot structure. The Tool contains a system for Managing Carbon Inventories from national or project scale field data, which is linked to the mapping system. Field data are uploaded into the system and all carbon calculations are performed using standard or custom allometric equations. These data are then linked to the tool's Emissions Calculator, for a range of ex-ante or ex-post computations using both Tier 3 and Tier 1 calculations of emissions scenarios.

**Q: Is this fully paid for by GEF?**

Yes, for the basic system. Now we are also working with Forest Survey of India under a USAID project, India Forest PLUS to expand the capabilities. It is a co-development process also with WWF. We are also working with the Thai and Indonesian governments. It is also being tested through a group of about a dozen different organizations.

**Q: Doug – You spoke of the next set of functions which include social indicators and costs analysis. Will you also have tools for uncertainty analysis and project design? I have consulted with SilvaCarbon on MRVs. It's good to know when to quit adding functionality.**

A: With respect to sample design and uncertainty analysis, it's important to note that this tool will not make a bad scientist into a good scientist, or a poor sample design into a good sample design; it is agnostic to your own science design. However we recognize the need to characterize uncertainty. But there may be limits to what we can do in the near term. Some uncertainty is inherent, such as the inherent error in the allometric equations themselves. Chained error propagation from all the measurements taken together is important but is going to be a more complicated.

**Q: If it cost so much to get field level forest inventory data or high resolution satellite imagery, how do we gauge those costs? Is there a cost calculator for project developers?**

Not yet. But we have a plan to do that.

**Q: Classification systems. How sensitive are the IPCC guidelines?**

A: There is plenty of room to talk about both accuracy and precision in using IPCC Tier 1 data versus Tier 3 field data. But the IPCC nonetheless provides a current and consistent standard, so we include all IPCC default values if the user wishes to use them. But the main agent behind the tool is that it allows for the collection, organization and computational use of local data.

**Q: Uncertainty and error – it is assumed that the less error you have, the better for future financial incentives**

We have done this on project scales and I think it is applicable to national scale. There is much interest in the uncertainty part of measurement. Do we need to include this in all discussions? There is a lot of stuff here. Basically we know that for forest measurements we will have error and uncertainty issues, but it's also not necessarily true that for carbon finance the error terms need to be minimized to the minutia. Financial instruments can be developed and used which include these uncertainties and use discounting and other financial tools to accommodate it.

**Q: In terms of project level work and planning tools, how does this incorporate baseline reference emission levels?**

There are 2 pieces to question of REDD –Measurements and the Protocol for how to deploy measurements and what to compute. You need to use the emissions calculator to measure past and future, but this will not give you protocol. This tool does not prescribe the protocol for computing a reference emission level (REL). That must be negotiated within the carbon program or convention. However, the tool contains all the necessary computational functions one needs to implement the REL calculations.

**Q: Felipe - regarding scope, is it only forest degradation that the tool computes emissions for? Are there other components?**

No, it computes deforestation and degradation emissions and removals. The Emissions calculator also lets you set up scenarios for a range of land use changes including agriculture. It uses parameters for carbon stocks in soil, above and below ground vegetation, combustion factors, non-CO2 gases, management etc. It can convert between different land uses and covers, kind of like the FAO EX-Act tool does. The difference is you can put in much more detailed parameters. It uses the gain-loss method.

Comment: Scenario basis comparison is fantastic. Big question is, what are you going to do with all of the land uses that are actually going on in the field?

Comment: I would be a little worried about moving toward a mega-tool that do everything, rather than interfaces with other tools. Could you import this tool’s output into a separate financial analysis tool? Might want to be careful.

**Q: Is this available to everyone or proprietary to GEF?**

It is openly available. Only caveat is requires at least a one hour training session (webinar), but we can assist new users because we have a support team.

## V. Group Discussion

---

To wrap up the learning from the presentations, a group discussion session was held to answer the following question:

*“Given the presentations and discussions today, what are some of the pressing opportunities for enhancing synergies and information flow between national, regional and landscape tools?”*

Comments and Answers:

- I haven’t seen David’s online MRV tool before and I want to use that tool. I would like to input everything in David’s tool and compare across the board.



- This forum providing all of this information is fantastic and I want to provide our project as a guinea pig.
- What struck me is the absence of a portal. There are many useful tools but there is no digital toolbox for these tools. One of the things that might come out of this process is a better road map.
- We may be able to use CARPE website to list all the tools with simple explanations. It does not have to be endorsed. We can put a disclaimer like “these do not express the views of the US government”. Perhaps it is good to put a 250 word explanation for each tool and not just links.

## VI. Landscape and Jurisdictional Level REDD+ Activities Presentations

---

### 1. AWF Maringa-Lopori-Wamba REDD Pilot Project, DRC | Kathleen Fitzgerald, African Wildlife Foundation

[Overview presentation of AWF activities on climate change in Africa, focusing on the Maringa-Lopori-Wamba REDD pilot project in DRC.](#)

**Q: How far along are you in your project development? Which methodology are you using, VCS or CCB?**

Initial analysis told us our target is VCS and CCBA. 0009 is what we are looking at. We are talking with Wildlife Works.

**Q: Regarding linkage, did you consider water corridors?**

Yes, we looked at restoration links to corridors.

Comment: Notice your challenge on degradation. Just for your information, at Winrock, we are about to publish new way of looking at degradation, especially from looking at logging which doesn't require high resolution images.

Comment: As part of tracking degradation, we should also figure out restoration and re-vegetation.

A: We have case studies about encroachments of communities. When we do threat based analysis, we do various levels of analysis. Unfortunately, we haven't embarked on restoration yet.

**Q: You promote agriculture. What is the process and how do you balance that with other land use?**

Using satellite imagery, we have seen decrease in forest fire in this landscape, which is a track success. Huge landscape, again, we can see in satellite images.

We do Agriculture intensification through partners who are experts in agriculture. They do increase diversification and crop production. Of course, the flip side is what was discussed yesterday on how agriculture production and population growth contributes to deforestation. However, they get this in exchange for forest protection and we believe this is the only way this will work.

Comment: looking at your project and REDD, It is interesting that we can now do this in terms of climate, although that's not primary objective. But it is great that we can do something we couldn't do 10, 20 years ago.

Decrease in habitat is exponential. The amount the communities will generate is 10 times more (carbon credits) than agriculture production.

**Q: What are the legal implications?**

We all work on these land use plans. So what? Who enforces? Our approach is first, it has to be acknowledged at national and local level and second, this has to be coupled with incentives. If we do not have these recognition, regardless of how legally sound it is, it won't work unless you have local buy-in. We are working on that now. We hope this will feed into the micro-zoning process happening at the national level.

**2. Mai-Ndombe REDD+ project ERA - WWC | Jean Robert Bwangoy, Wildlife Works**

*[Presentation of the Mai-Ndombe REDD+ project and their carbon accounting methodology.](#)*

**Q: Would you be willing to share metric/formula you developed? I ask since there's not too much information on agriculture. Also, what was the rationale for keeping the strata separate?**

We developed this with UC Berkeley. Please email me and we can work out something.

About the different strata – these 2 strata are in different locations, spatially separated. They come from very different type of forests, like this one has more small trees while this one is mostly large trees and so on.

**A: It never hurts to stratify more.**

From a carbon perspective, sometimes it makes sense to group multiple strata, it can help reduce cost.

**Q: I have 3 questions. 1) Can you talk about land tenure? 2) Define conservation concession? And 3) How are you getting benefits to local communities, assuming they are part of the process?**

Starting from last one, we have carbon rate agreement with government of DRC. We give local communities 0.5 dollars for every ton for first 3 years, and 1.5 dollars thereafter. And then, after removing our cost and what the community receives, we share the remaining revenue with government.

Land tenure – we have problem in DRC since government claims land belongs to government but local community says otherwise. We have to talk to both. They are organized by clans. We did participatory mapping exercise with each of the clans in the area. Total of 52 clans in project area. We recognize their right to land and discuss with them. We also respect forest code. We manage to work on both. Now, we have a partner in the process and they manage the chiefs of the clans.

**Q: What is your institutional arrangement? Is this part of a larger program?**

We are part of the REDD program, on the management team with WWF and government of DRC. We are among those who prepared the ERP. We work closely with government and stakeholders. On ERP we did not specify methodology used but it will likely be VCS general methodology. Our project will be

nested under jurisdiction. Right now, ERP will go out, we have hopefully OSFAC and DRC to oversee the program.

### 3. CI - Marc Steininger

*Presentation on Conservation International and their activities.*

## VII. Environmental and Social 'Safeguards' Monitoring and Reporting at Landscape and Higher Levels

---

*Panel session covering the social side of environmental protection. Q&A and discussions were done after the two presentations.*

Panelists: Paula Williams (FCMC), Kirsten S. Siex (WCF), Anila Jacob (MI consortium), Natalie Elwell (Gender Specialist, USAID)

Moderator: Diane Russell (USAID)

### 1. Social and Environmental Soundness, Safeguards and Safeguard Information Systems | Paula Williams, FCMC

*[Presentation covering overview of various safeguards and standards, and explaining systems and mechanisms to ensure social and environmental soundness.](#)*

### 2. Forest Cover Associated With Improved Health and Nutrition Outcomes in Malawi | Kiersten Johnson, MI Consortium

*[Presentation on DHS](#) (Demographic and Health Survey, a USAID program: [www.measuredhs.com](http://www.measuredhs.com)) and the role of ecosystems services on human health outcomes.*

**Q: Did you see a difference in total calorie intake related to deforestation?**

The best we can do is capture what the children eat which was not quantified in calories.

**Q: Does your data have distinction between charcoal production and other cooking fuels?**

We can find out if they collect fuel wood for cooking vs. dung paddy.

**Q: What do we need to do to get your data?**

The data is freely available on [www.measuredhs.com](http://www.measuredhs.com)

Comment: CIFOR is doing similar study and might have more robust data in the near future.

**Q: Can you tell me about conceptualizing this in context of DRC?**

It is very complex in DRC. Many organizations working in DRC so the process have been much longer due to complexity. Even adding one question takes time. It helps to have political constituency. There is a higher threshold to get thing on now. But many non-traditional users are interested in our data too and we do want to have them involved.

In terms of DRC, we have a map and we want to map against CARPE sites.

We did this because we wanted to engage the global health community with biodiversity conservation. Global Health has much more funding and works in larger scale projects. It would benefit both sectors to create this linkage.

**Q: Can you tell me about population distribution within DRC? Are the survey sites proportional to population?**

Yes, they are. Sampling frame based on national census.

We do a lot of biological testing in the field and they will be included in upcoming CARPE DHS data.

Matt Hansen: During Peace Corps, I noticed that the less connected and less developed a place was, they did better in terms of health.

**Q: To follow up on Malaria, a person I met was investigating different strains of Malaria in Cambodia. Do you work on similar issues?**

We do work in Malaria. It is on our radar but I don't know how much data we have on Cambodia specific.

**Q: Marc – I think what you say is forest change more than forest cover, which is not the same thing. Wondering if you can do sub-national data inferences based on this, I would take as a grain of salt due to resolution.**

**Also, what is the causality between forest change and people's health? I hear a lot of diet data, but I do not understand the causality. Do you have a sense of causality or correlation?**

Comment: Matt – I agree with Marc about scaling of change dynamic. We use MODIS as change indicator, but that's not to say it can't be done at a certain threshold or pixel.

Comment: Regarding the causal pathway, as people's distance from ecosystem services and food items increases, the opportunity cost to access these services increases while available quantity decreases. This can have an impact on dietary diversity. Again, we have not seen correlation in this but this study can set a precedent to more detailed studies.

Diane –The study sets up the next phase to focus what we want to do on the ground next. For example, diarrheal diseases are more about water quality. We can see if increased segmentation shows increased salmonella in water. If we look at that closer, we can see the causality.

**Q: I am having difficulty connecting Malawi example with the circumstance in the Congo Basin. First, what is the definition of forest you use in Malawi? Second, with the striking correlation with health indicators, are they controlled for household income?**

Definition of forest: Context will vary from country to country wherever you go. These relationships may hold true holding all else equal, but we all know its' not that easy, so we will have to look into that by a country by country basis and by regions in country. We have to explore more carefully.

Household Income – DHS does not collect household income data, but along with World Bank Economists, we have developed a score card using household assets. We use a principle component analysis and each house gets a score so we can control for income differences that way.

Diane – CI will be developing tools for biodiversity safeguards, building on what CARPE has already done. Challenge is how we link that back to remote-sensing data. How we better integrate biodiversity into Atlas and other things.

Ken - One of the challenges is the internal inconsistency within USAID and how programs are managed. The DRC AID Mission just mapped out where they will focus their programs ( mainly in health, education, economic growth, but these areas are not aligned to CARPE activity areas.



## VIII. Gaps and Priorities

---

Small group session addressing the following questions:

1. How do you wish you could connect your tools to other tools to add value?
2. What synergies do you need across the tools?
3. What are the priority gaps in complementarity of deployed analytical tools, methods & processes for achieving regional and national objectives
4. What are the suggested next steps for addressing those priority gaps?
5. What are the 2 most pressing opportunities for enhancing synergies & information flow between national and subnational actions?

### 1. Group 1

Members: Paula, Anila, Matt, Danae, Alice, Kiersten

1. How do you wish you could connect your tools to other tools to add value?
  - Inventory of tools
    - Who's doing what
    - How things link together
  - Mapping out the tools people are using geographically
    - facilitates gap analysis; facilitates leveraging for new uses
  - Challenges: continuity of efforts, coordination (requires donor mandate and allocation of resources), lack of culture of sharing data
2. What synergies do you need across the tools?
  - Decision tree for use of tools
  - Data standards to facilitate synergy (stop displacing GPS data!)
  - Inventorying datasets and connecting them
3. What are the priority gaps in complementarity of deployed analytical tools, methods & processes for achieving regional & national objectives?
  - Consistent data policy across partners (open standards are needed)
  - Maintaining freely available tools (sustainability plan)
  - Lack of translation of materials to French
4. What are suggested next steps for addressing those priority gaps?
  - Build into project planning & budget the translation of materials to French
5. What are the 2 most pressing opportunities for enhancing synergies & information flow between national & subnational actions?
  - Data compatibility – same definitions, indicators, measurement methods, etc. used at all scales

- Open source/data & methods transparency across all scales

## 2. Group 2

### 1. Connecting tools to add value?

- Using LCC outputs into modeling and C calculation tools
- Approaches /tools to coordinate field monitoring of LCC / C and SES indices.

### 2. Synergies across tools?

- See above, as question is similar
- RS to target field surveys, especially for unplanned degradation
- Inter-operability / data exchange among tools
- Crowd-sourcing validation data for LCC, etc. (e.g. w/Moabi interface)

### 3. Priority gaps?

- List of types of tools needed for REDD, tools w/in each type, post info on web
- Understanding major capacity-bldg efforts in region (UNREDD, EU? Norway, France, JICA, etc., can refer to AGRC review)
- Review of NRT / alert system potential
- Review of potential for integrating socio-econ monitoring in MRV
- Review of community-based MRV possible roles of communities, what makes sense in different countries, how to link to community management?
- Understanding quality and costs of socio-econ data for use in SES indices (e.g. sometimes very qualitative)
- National REDD+ project registry? And what data can be made available from those other than minimal project location, etc.

### 4. Next Steps?

- Conduct review of types of tools, and then specific tools w/in each type; describe / compare them briefly -> publish and put on web
- Conduct assessment of major capacity building efforts, conduct conf call w/key contacts re: what could be best CARPE contributions
- Compare some RS methods? (e.g. semi-auto defor mapping meths, baseline modeling meths)
- Conduct review of potential for integrating socio-econ monitoring in MRV
- Conduct review of quality and costs of socio-econ data for use in SES indices (e.g. sometimes very qualitative)

### 5. Most pressing opportunities?

- Explore integration / synergies across tools, are they operating at common scales, other barriers to integrating, etc.
- Linking more detailed local inventories into national inventories
- ... All opportunities can be seen as high priority and potentially most pressing



Other items:

- Topics we didn't discuss:
  - RS for near-real time / alert system apps, links to governance, adaptive management and seeing monitoring as more than just delivering MRV C outputs.
    - E.g. using MODIS to target higher-res NRT
  - Community-based MRV – just UNFCCC words so far, case studies and countries trying out different things. Reviews exist, more needed?

## Discussion

Registry for REDD+ – in December, Indonesia Ministry of Forestry. There was no knowledge management capacity in the ministry. What's the point of a registry unless you want to do something?

If you have registry, can't you synthesize that?

In Indonesia, they opened the door to the international community but each actor acted individually.

Mark – I think each country should at least have a polygon registry. What you say sounds more like lack of local government ownership.

Paula – there is experience in the forest sector. For example, in Bhutan, all forestry projects had quarterly meetings and identified best practices to use nationwide. It should be the government to chair some kind of processes to share approaches.

Chip – we also talked about using the registry to make data publically available.

Landing – in DRC we have registry about REDD, which project acting where.

Danae – Registry in DRC is linked to national forest monitoring system, has project data sheet on all REDD projects. One difficulty is some of the projects have a clause in their contract about sharing data. It will be a challenge we will be facing in other countries too. It is important for international partners to start thinking about which data they can share.

Paula

– In Latin America, there is uncertainty, particularly among rural communities, to what is a legitimate project and who are legitimate project developers. This could be another possible use for the registry.

### 3. Group 3

Members: Doug, Landing, Jean-Robert and others

#### Q1 and 2: Tools

- Google Earth engine
  - Promote sharing in the cloud
  - Standards
  - Inter-operability
  - Open source
- Promotion of available data and products and tools
- End user designed tools – tools designed for specific outcomes/needs
- Gap analysis for tools
- Simplification of tools –to adapt to what end users need (e.g. SMART)

#### Q3: Gaps

- Raw data – needs to be freely available – now and into the future (continuity of data sets)
- Increase capacity within the region via hubs
- Increase availability of equipment and licenses within the region
- Bridging gap in spatial scales – e.g. changes in rates of deforestation and activities on ground (cause/effect) “the why”
- Socio-economic data not available/not collected in standard way

#### Q4: Next Steps

- Important roles of donors to...
  - increase standardization of data collected/indicators
  - increase availability of data
  - development of new tools

(e.g. CARPE and Biological monitoring)
- Agree on definition of degradation and how to detect/quantify
- Standardization of names/classes/definitions
- Continue using correct tools/data to do so

#### Q5: Opportunities

- Increase capacity and availability of equipment and data to region
- Increase communication between national and subnational actors
- Need to ensure data informs policy/decision making
- Engage civil society

## 4. Group 4

Members: Matthew Steil, Michael Masonjones, PV Sundaraeshwar, Jason Ko, Felipe Casarim

### Q1: Connecting Tools to Add Value

- Connect the tools through platforms
  - Share data/knowledge/challenges/standardize format/comparable/replicable
- Promote local ownership of tools for improved forest management, including REDD+ strategies
- Promote assistance to help defining basics towards REDD+ implementation
  - Link landscape to national levels tools

### Q2: Synergies Across Tools

- Compatibility
  - Output
  - Platforms
- Accessibility to underlying data
- How are they coming together to properly inform and be used by decision-makers

### Q3: Priority Gaps

- Gaps:
  - Capacity
  - Data
  - Application of tools/platform
- Support cross-sectorial coordination within national governments
- Linking subnational to national

### Q4: Next Steps

- Enhance capacity and ensure ownership
- Raise awareness
- Promote outreach/respect sovereignty
- Scale-specific standardized protocols
- Positively incentivize
- Promote continuity

### Q5: Opportunities

- Promote communication across various advisors and tool developers
- Engage in development of tailored tools/ownership
- Increase opportunities for positive incentivize to land use management

## Comments

Comment: I think there is over proliferation of tools and we need to build more capacity of governments.

Ken – Just for discussion sake, there is a tendency that non-government does better in continuity.

Government has responsibility and authority but capacity building does not necessary mean within civil society.

Evan – To build on that point, we can see many examples that data doesn't get used to decision on forest. We have to try to understand how we leave the data, where it would be most effective.

Danae – building capacity within government is a huge challenge. But imagine government using data that they cannot explain, that would be ludicrous. Yes need scaling up capacity in general. We need to do both.

How do we increase capacity in country, on any topic? We need to think ways of bringing it in country, whether through academia or government, we need to bring it in. If we are all working on same thing with same vision, we have to work within ministry for certain thing and not for others, we need to think as a community to make most use of what we bring in.

So many actors, we recognize this and started monthly meetings within 6 organizations that does capacity bldg. so there is some coordination, but I agree, it is a challenge.

PV – One of the issues is that technology has to be appropriate. Also each project and region has different protocols so there should be ways to standardize ways to bring to national level. We have to ask ourselves how can we harness these various tools so they are implemented effectively, and to apply these in a uniform way across countries?

Landing – to compliment Terry, we do many capacity building for government. The problem is how to make people stay there after training. Sometime, they leave for other opportunities. Then have to train again. I think we need to train many more. I really think this is the most important question.

Felipe – to follow up on this discussion, it is hard today in this globalized world to stop people from moving to other opportunities. At Winrock, we try to work with government where appropriate and also develop training curriculum so it stays even after the person moves. However, that only will not solve problem. I think we all need to work more collaboratively towards a common goal.

## 5. Group 5

Members: Vinaya, Terry, Tim, Janet, Kathleen, Scott and Dave

### Q1: Connecting Tools to Add Value

- Various tools have different spatial scope. Which tools are appropriate at what scale
- **Inventory, awareness, access, usability**
- Succinct inventory of tools, their uses, circumstances for use, and spatial scope
- Summarized in general terms so all can be aware of tool's value (e.g., tool function should be understood by non-spatial people)

Inventory

Tool	Who should use?	How should it be used?	Under what circumstances?	Usability? (cost, access, etc.)	Spatial resolution	Etc...

### Q2: Synergies Across Tools

- Making sure the **appropriate level of technology** is used for national buy-in.
- **Synergy comes from the users** and not the tools themselves. **Participatory** and **community-based tools** should synergized with int'l fixed standards of practices.
- **Linking tools** for a more holistic (REDD+) approach to monitoring changes in GHG emissions. (e.g., linking Terra Congo and Global Forest Watch to give a carbon content for a polygon – combining land use and carbon)

### Q3: Priority Gaps

- Governments need to be able to use these tools themselves as REDD continues into the future.
- Communities need to be involved in tools, especially in ground measurements (i.e., more participatory)
- Level of data precision should be 'good enough' for management decisions. This may have to be 'bridged' to a higher level of precision for acceptance on an international stage.
- Uneven knowledge associated with audience (tool designer or tool user)
  - When to call in specialists and skilled technicians (e.g., spatial / GIS experts)
  - Range of tools, none of which are turnkey. Use of a particular tool may require a workflow management
- Shift from REDD+ to AFOLU (evolving from exclusively looking at CO<sub>2</sub> as a GHG to the entire realm of GHG in a variety of ecosystems)

### Q4: Next Steps

- Adaptable and flexible standards and tools with active learning
- Expanding toolkit for AFOLU and adapting tools for a more complete understanding of GHG emissions in a variety of environments
- Having an inventory of tools
- Integrating complimentary tools and data for more cross-cutting data exploration
- Establish net GHG flux and carbon accounting at a national level for baselines

#### Q5: Opportunities

- Establish net GHG flux and carbon accounting at a national level for baselines
- Expanding toolkit for AFOLU
- Pulling together land use planning from multiple levels (pilot sites to national land use allocations)
- US to step up involvement as signatories to the protocol that replaces Kyoto

## IX. Way Forward | Ken Creighton, USAID

---

This is the first time I've seen formal and informal partners of CARPE come together like this. I think the outcome and output of this workshop will be helpful as we move towards the next phase. Addresses questions such as how do we measure and identify results? To me, REDD is quantitative and can be linked to various areas such as finance, environmental integrity on the ground etc. It will be useful to pull together all of these ideas.

Thank you everyone for coming here, especially for those of you from abroad. We are just beginning a new 5 year phase of CARPE and we expect a range of collaborating organizations. We will do our best to make information available from this session and look forward in following up. One of the challenges will be how we carry questions into practice and engagement with our partners in the region. We will need to put some thought into this. As someone said, there is plethora of organizations in the Congo Basin now and it is crowded.

Thank you all once again and I hope to remain available to move these processes along and be a focal point.

## Appendix: Participant List

	Name	Organization
1	Kathleen Fitzgerald	AWF
2	Scott Berendt	AWF
3	Marc Steininger	CI
4	Danae Maniatis	FAO
5	Paula Williams	FCMC
6	Stephen Kelleher	FCMC
7	Arjun Khosa	FCMC
8	Ken Andrasko	FCPF
9	Michael C. Masonjones	Jadora
10	Heather Masonjones	Jadora
11	Vinaya Swaminathan	MI Consortium
12	Kiersten Johnson	MI Consortium
13	Anila Jacob	MI Consortium
14	Dave Skole	MSU
15	Landing Mane	OSFAC
16	Kumiko Murata	TRG
17	Sherise Lindsay	TRG
18	Alice Altstatt	UMD
19	Janet Nackoney	UMD
20	Matt Hansen	UMD
21	Sasha Tyukavina	UMD

	Name	Organization
22	Maria Rivera	UMD
23	Patrick Lola Amani	UMD
24	Chris Justice	UMD
25	Giuseppe Molinario	UMD
26	Diane Russell	USAID
27	Evan Notman	USAID
28	P.V. Sundareshwar	USAID
29	Tim Resch	USAID
30	Ken Creighton	USAID
31	Natalie Elwell	USAID
32	Chip Scott	USFS
33	Jason Ko	USFS
34	Douglas Muchoney	USGS
35	David Wilkie	WCS
36	Kirstin S. Siex	WCS
37	Jean-Robert Bwangoy	Wildlife Works
38	Jeremy Freund	Wildlife Works
39	Felipe Casarim	Winrock
40	Fred Stolle	WRI
41	Matthew Steil	WRI
42	Terry Brncic	WRI

## Appendix: Participant Agenda



### *Technical Toolkit Workshop*

*May 15-16, 2013*

TetraTech AMT  
1515 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1100  
Arlington, VA 22209

### Draft Objectives

- f. To better understand current CARPE goals and objectives with respect to biodiversity and climate change mitigation and how to achieve the greatest impact from existing tools toward these ends;
- g. To introduce key elements of the National REDD+ Strategies and Action Plans (RSAPs) and Low Emissions Development Strategies (LEDS) and how CARPE partner tools relate to those key elements;
- h. To understand how landscape and jurisdictional level REDD+ activities link with national level processes for monitoring, reporting and verification to identify the “two-way” flows of information needed to achieve effective synergy between the levels;
- i. To determine how partner tools for biodiversity conservation and climate mitigation processes underway in the Congo Basin (inclusive of REDD+, RSAPs and LEDs) complement and connect with each other with emphasis on how biodiversity monitoring and participatory land use planning experience can inform development of national MRV systems for environmental and social “safeguards”; and
- j. To surface gaps in information, connectivity and complementarity as well as potential additional applications of analytical tools and methods to support national processes for biodiversity and climate change management now and during the next phase of CARPE.

### Draft Agenda

#### Day One

TIME	TOPIC	PRESENTERS
8:00	Arrival	
8:30	Welcome Introductions, Getting Started, Objectives, Agenda and Guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CARPE</li> </ul>
9:45	Break	
10:00	<b>National REDD+ Strategies and Action Plans:</b> Presentation on purpose and content of plans, points of connection with CARPE tools and the challenge of improving RSAP connectivity with CARPE’s broad scale and landscape-level tools. This will be followed by Q&A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CARPE</li> </ul>
	<b>MRV:</b> Presentation on success indicators for building MRV national and regional capacity followed by Q&A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAO</li> <li>• USFS</li> </ul>



	<b>RSAPs and LEDS:</b> Presentation on RSAPs' and LEDS' purpose, indicators and elements that would benefit from an integrated set of tools followed by Q&A	
	<b>National and Regional level tools and analyses:</b> Presentations on the purpose and key elements of national level biodiversity and climate tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSFAC</li> <li>• UMD</li> <li>• WRI</li> <li>• USFS</li> <li>• SilvaCarbon</li> </ul>
<b>12:30</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
<b>1:30</b>	<b>Landscape level tools and analyses:</b> Presentations on the purpose and key elements of landscape level biodiversity and climate tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife Works</li> <li>• Winrock</li> <li>• MSU-UNEP</li> </ul>
	<b>Regional, National and Landscape scale REDD+ Activities Stations:</b> Opportunity to speak with presenters and have individual questions answered about the tools and their applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSFAC</li> <li>• UMD</li> <li>• WRI</li> <li>• USFS</li> <li>• SilvaCarbon</li> <li>• Wildlife Works Carbon</li> <li>• Winrock</li> <li>• MSU-UNEP</li> </ul>
<b>5:00</b>	<b>Close</b>	

## Day Two

TIME	TOPIC	PRESENTERS
<b>8:00</b>	<b>Arrival</b>	
<b>8:30</b>	<b>Landscape and jurisdictional level REDD+ activities:</b> Presentations on currently existing tools at the landscape and jurisdictional levels, challenges to tool use, and opportunities for connections to national tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AWF</li> <li>• Wildlife Works</li> <li>• CI</li> </ul>
<b>10:00</b>	<b>Break</b>	
<b>10:15</b>	<b>Landscape and jurisdictional level REDD+ activities Expo:</b> Opportunity to speak with presenters and have individual questions answered about tools and their applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AWF</li> <li>• Wildlife Works</li> <li>• CI</li> </ul>
	<b>Environmental and social 'safeguards' monitoring and reporting at landscape and higher levels:</b> Panel discussing tools for monitoring social safeguards, linkages and stakeholder outreach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• USAID</li> <li>• FCMC</li> </ul>
<b>12:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
<b>1:00</b>	<b>Gaps and Priorities:</b> Emerging issues coming out of the first 1.5 days of discussions and presentations (including gaps, incompatibilities, complementarities, connection opportunities, priorities and questions of scale)	
<b>3:45</b>	<b>The Way Forward:</b> Highlights from the two days and immediate next steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CARPE</li> <li>• USAID</li> </ul>
<b>4:00</b>	<b>Close</b>	