

## パネルディスカッション

「REDD活動の推進に向けて各プレーヤーの力を最大限に活かすためには何が必要か？」

モデレーター：

松本 光朗（独立行政法人 森林総合研究所 REDD研究開発センター長）

パネリスト：

Sarah Walker（Winrock International）

Jonah Busch（Conservation International）

Naomi Swickard（VCS）

Omaliss Keo（カンボジア）

赤堀 聡之（林野庁研究保全課森林吸収源情報管理官）

（松本） このパネルディスカッションでは、この二日間のプレゼンテーションをバックグラウンドにしてさらに議論を深めたり、クリアになっていないところを解決したい。本日、このようなパネリストを選んだのは、このセミナーの目的が「多様なプレーヤー」を一つのキーワードにしているためだ。先進国側からの赤堀さん、途上国側のOmalissさん、民間のNGOのJonah Buschさん、国のアドバイザーあるいはコンサルタントを務めているSarah Walkerさんという多様なプレーヤーをそろえたつもりである。

## セーフガード

（松本） 最初に、皆さんの発表についてもう少し深めたい、聞きたいという幾つかの質問があった。

How can safeguard be assessed under the jurisdictional crediting scheme?

（Swickard） Safeguards come in in a couple of places in the VCS<sup>1</sup> recommendations for jurisdictional and nested crediting schemes. The VCS will require that there are both respect to safeguards and monitoring of the safeguards. The requirements stated at the moment follow the Cancun Agreement<sup>2</sup> text on safeguards, which are essentially high-level requirements to respect safeguards and to ensure there is transparency, stakeholder involvement, accountability, grievance mechanisms etcetera.

There are a few ways the requirements can be met. A country or a jurisdiction can develop their own framework for safeguards and for monitoring them, or they can follow, for example, the REDD<sup>3</sup> SES<sup>4</sup> requirements, which are being developed by the Climate Community and Biodiversity Alliance and CARE. In addition to that there is a requirement to monitor and report on those safeguards. As is planned by the jurisdiction, they will need to monitor and report on what is actually been achieved. Through that we will ensure that the safeguards are a part of any VCS jurisdictional approach.

## 二国間オフセット・クレジット・メカニズムのガイドラインへの感想

（松本） Naomiさんには私から一つ質問がある。私は二国間オフセット・クレジット・

---

<sup>1</sup> Verified Carbon Standards: <http://www.v-c-s.org/>

<sup>2</sup> [http://unfccc.int/meetings/cancun\\_nov\\_2010/items/6005.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/cancun_nov_2010/items/6005.php)

<sup>3</sup> Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation: <http://www.un-redd.org/>

<sup>4</sup> REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards: <http://www.redd-standards.org/>

メカニズムのためのガイドラインの話をしたが、VCSからはどう見えるのかいつも非常に気にしながら作業をしているので、感想をお聞きしたい。

(Swickard) I think in general, we are looking at many of the same issues for nested frameworks, such as, how additionality is addressed, how reference levels or baselines are set, how you deal with the potential for reversals in terms of both non-permanence and non-performance. I think in fact we are very much headed in a similar direction, and I would like to make sure that we continue that way because the VCS initiative is really meant to help establish what best practice for a nested framework would look like. I think as much as possible we want that to be harmonized with what is happening under the UNFCCC<sup>5</sup> with what is developing in Japan, Australia and other places. I think the greater degree of consistency across different programs the better it will be for the REDD space.

(松本) 少しほっとした。このガイドラインは独立したものではなく、VCSなどほかのスタンダードとのリンケージをいつも重要視している。

#### COP17後のMRVの動向とREDDプラスを早く進めるには

(松本) 赤堀さんに、交渉にかかわって、COP17<sup>6</sup>を受けてMRVの技術基準の方向性やスケジュールに関しての質問がある。また、限られた時間の中でREDDプラスの実施のスピードとUNFCCCの交渉の整合性をどう取るべきか。

(赤堀) COP17を受けたMRVとの技術的指針、基準の方向性、スケジュールだが、まず、1年前のメキシコ・カンクンでのCOP16で幾つか検討事項が列挙された<sup>7</sup>。リファレンス・レベルのモダリティ、モニタリングシステム、セーフガード情報とMRVの四つについてはCOP17で決める予定だったが、実際に決定したのはリファレンス・レベルのモダリティと、セーフガードの情報システムについてのみだった。MRVについては今回議論の時間がなかったので、引き続きCOP18に向けて議論することになるだろう。ただ、リファレンス・レベルのモダリティやセーフガードの情報システムについても大枠しかできていないので、これも今後、もう少し細かく決めていく場面があるのではないか。MRVのシステムについてはこれから各国が意見などを提出し、それを踏まえて議論することになっている。

限られた時間の中でのスピードと整合性については、非常に難しい議論だ。なるべく早くREDDプラスを動かしたいが、モダリティなどいろいろ細かいことも決めなければいけないということで、ずっとジレンマを感じている。皆さんも感じておられるかもしれないが、無理に交渉を早めることはできないが、各国がどのような取組をして、それがインプットとしてどのような形で全体の流れに貢献できるかが非常に大きいだろう。日本の場合は二国間クレジットシステムをこれから作っていくことになっている。その中でREDDも実施されると思うが、場合によっては国際的な枠組ではなく、ある意味でボランタリーな枠組になるかもしれないが、そういう形でやるということで若干、早くできる場所があるかもしれない。

---

<sup>5</sup> United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change: <http://unfccc.int/>

<sup>6</sup> 17th Conference of the Parties: <http://www.cop17-cmpdurban.com/>

<sup>7</sup> <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2010/cop16/eng/07a01.pdf> (p.12～13)

(松本) ダーバンでの決定では、REDDだけでなく大枠の話、例えば2020年からの新しい枠組の実施、そのための合意を2015年までに結ぶというスケジュールも示された。

#### 途上国からの見地

(松本) このような世界的な国際交渉の流れや今の日本の見解、取組について途上国側、そしてREDDのフォーカルポイントであるOmalissさんはどう考えられてそれにどう対応していくか。

(Keo) I think it is a big task to represent a developing country here, especially when I missed the COP17 also. However, I will try to express some views regarding that also. I think for this negotiation in COP17 is a bit desperate for developing country. First, now we have a task to reduce emissions where we are not a driver, but maybe as Cambodia is least developing country, maybe it is not too difficult to do it.

Second, for REDD<sup>8</sup> regarding finance, it is not clear. This is what we really try towards to convene developed countries to agree on the result-based action. We feel that for doing REDD, there are many conditions in that, especially when Cambodia has a lot of experience on the pilot projects where the projects – I share a similar views with WWF Indonesia also. It takes a long time for doing everything. First, you have to do a methodology development, which needs to be verified, validations, and then you do it on the ground, you request community to do it, they say, no it is not the right thing to do because there is a lot of standards. We do it again. It costs a lot of money because every time you invite international expert to come to help also.

The process is really complicated. I want to share the view with VCS here because we find it very difficult and cost a lot. The timeframe now is almost 5 years for us to do that. This is in a very small area, where the forests are owned by communities. This is really imbalance between technical and safeguard requirements, and the resources that communities have. I think we need to consider on that balance also because as the other presenters mentioned, if REDD is going to give value to forest and communities, we really need to make a really best design for that, but I did not see that yet. This will still be a question mark for Cambodia.

I am sure the other developing countries find it difficult also in that. But, we still hope for the negotiations. Hopefully that in the until 2015, we will see some other design probably finance or maybe by then we can see more fast-start fund, which will help demands, not the country, but the demands of the communities. They really need to do REDD and to protect the forest and others. We still have some hope, but we have concern also at the same time.

#### REDDは大きなインセンティブを与えられるのか

(松本) 先ほどのセッション3でも話題になったが、ここでまた違った点からの質問を紹介したい。

What do you think about the progress of REDD+ in terms of incentive scheme for forested countries, especially for south east Asian countries? In these countries, land-use changes very rapidly by development of oil palm plantation and rubber plantation and also gold mining. Land conflict is also big problem. Is it possible to provide economic incentive from REDD comparative

---

<sup>8</sup> REDD: Is the United Nations Collaborative initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation in developing countries. REDD+ goes beyond deforestation and forest degradation, and includes the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

all larger than those development projects?

プロジェクトから得られるインセンティブよりも大きな経済インセンティブを本当に得られるのか。それは例えばほかの産業の育成も含めてだろうが、そういう質問かと思う。REDDプラスのかなり根源的な質問になるかと思うが、これについてJonahさんとSarahさんに見解を聞きたい。

(Busch) To the question of, is it possible actually to have the scale of finance to provide incentives for reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation plus the other activities, the answer is yes. Because it is REDD – R-E-D-D. It is not SEDD – S-E-D-D. We are only trying to reduce the emissions from deforestation not stop entirely the emissions from deforestation. That means we are also not intending to stop the activities which are leading to deforestation. People will always need food; will always need minerals from mining. It is not at all realistic to think that those activities could be stopped through incentive payments. Rather, it is quite feasible indeed, I believe, that those activities continue, in a way, which lowers emissions. There is great scope to be growing agricultural products, food, not on the forest lands, on lands which are very low carbon. It is the same thing for other industries producing timber, producing minerals, in a way that has a much lower impact on the atmosphere than what we see now.

There was a question earlier about the opportunity cost. Someone mentioned a study that says, well the opportunity cost, the cost of agriculture or timber, I forget, is very, very high, so many dollars. Just to comment on that, those studies are quite a first cut and what they say to me is, well that says the finance needs to be very high as well. Developed countries really need to step up with much more than what we have seen to-date. A few billion pledged for fast-start is not enough. Our analysis in Indonesia, with the quartering of deforestation, shows that would take \$2 billion or more every single year in Indonesia.

The other thing about those figures, about the cost or this much money from oil palm and so forth, those are maybe averages. They hide a lot of variation. It is certainly true. There are places where oil palm is extremely productive, extremely valuable. Those places may not be the first ones to be involved in REDD. But, there are also places where oil palm is not as productive. It is marginal. It is far away from markets, or inaccessible, or really not good growing land, and so those are the places which are much more likely to respond to economic incentives. With the modeling that I presented here, we took into account the full range for potential for agriculture. Some places, very low dollar potential for agriculture; other places, very high. We found a very strong relationship that more money for agriculture led to more deforestation.

In fact, every \$100 per hectare per year was associated with 2% to 7% more deforestation. I believe that if there are forest carbon payments of the magnitude of billions of dollars per year that we would see every \$100 per hectare per year of forest carbon payments would lead to an equivalent 2% to 7% less deforestation per year. I think that is how I view this question anyway of, is it possible to create incentives to reduce emissions from deforestation and degradation.

(Walker) I agree with everything Jonah said. I can lead to some other things as well. One of the things I think is going to be true is REDD financing, as Jonah just said, might not be the best solution for all location. However, for some locations, carbon financing<sup>9</sup> can be used to remove a financial or resource barrier to implement activities that entities were interested in pursuing and/or that would benefit a local community for other reasons. For example, improve land use planning in a local community, or improving agricultural techniques. If that activity can also lead to a reduction

---

<sup>9</sup> Facilitates the financial reward through carbon credits for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by emitters in developing countries.

in emissions or an enhancement, that is where I think REDD will work.

I think if communities or people implementing REDD projects feel that the REDD activities will have a net negative impact on their lives, then REDD payments are unlikely to cause a permanent change in that location. If local communities are sacrificing something then I think REDD may be more difficult to successfully implement than in locations where the REDD activities are adding a net benefit to those local people. For example, a number of afforestation projects are implemented by private sector plantations that are going to gain money both from carbon and other commodities. The motivation is financial, although the activities may also include a community benefit.

In terms of palm oil and rubber plantations, in other sectors outside of REDD, there is quite a bit of movement to examine and regulate palm oil production to reduce indirect land use change impacts. Indirect land use change impact refers to the production of a commodity such as oil palm causing deforestation or other emissions in order to produce the oil palm. So beyond the REDD sector, there is going to be a push to limit the market for oil palm, for example, that is been generated in areas that were deforested in order to produce the palm oil.

(松本) 今の質問とその答えはREDDプラスのコンセプトそのものに対するものだったと思う。開発プロジェクトよりもREDDがより大きなインセンティブを与えることができるのかという質問に対して、かなりの人がそれだけでは開発プロジェクトを超えるものにはなかなかならないと思うが、それだけではないのだという話がしばしば聞かれるし、私自身もそう思っている。

#### 京都議定書離脱国間の協力の可能性

(松本) 日本は京都議定書から離脱して、同じく離脱しているカナダ、ロシアとREDDで協力するような考えがあるのかどうかという質問が届いた。

(赤堀) COP17の結果、確かに日本、カナダとロシアは第二約束期間の数値目標は設定しないという形になっている。ただ、それぞれの国がこれで温暖化対策の活動をやめるという話はしておらず、国際条約上は自主的な形になってしまうのかもしれないが、それぞれ活動するつもりでいる。例えば日本では、政府のエネルギー・環境会議で、夏に向けて2013年以降の気候変動の取組を策定しようとしている。この中に国内の吸収源やREDDがどのような形で入るかはこれからの議論になるが、個人的な思いでは全く入らないということは恐らくないだろう。

REDDプラスについてカナダ、ロシアと協力するかは、カナダとロシアがREDDにどのくらい興味があるかを私も存じ上げないが、全体的な枠組として京都議定書の外にいるけれどもいろいろやるというところでは、いろいろ協力していくのではないかな。

#### 政府と民間のREDDへの貢献

(松本) REDDプラスを日本の二国間オフセット・クレジット・メカニズムに取り上げて推進すべきだと私は述べたが、日本政府としてREDDプラスを二国間クレジットの枠組で本当に進めていくのか、あるいは、これを利用することによってどのようにREDDに貢献できるのか。

(赤堀) 温暖化対策は、外交面では外務省、産業からの排出という意味では経済産業省、環境条約ということで環境省、森林についてなど個別対応として農林水産省や林野庁

などほかの省庁が対応している。私が政府全体を代表して物申すことはできないが、これまで二国間クレジットに若干関与してきたが、日本がこれから特に2013年以降に気候変動対策をする中の一つの柱としてやっている。

わが国の立場としては、確かに京都議定書の外、UNFCCCの外かもしれないが、これを補完する形で行っていきたいと考えている。中身的にも全く独自のもの、誰も考えつかないような方法論でやるのではなくて、国際的、少なくとも地域的なところで考えられている方法論などにのっって行っていくことになるだろう。

(松本) 日本の企業の自主的活動はREDDプラスの制度構築や推進にどう貢献するのかという民間からの質問があった。

(赤堀) 特に二国間クレジットは二国間という話なので、やはり政府間のベースではあるが、経済産業省や環境省がフィージビリティスタディも幾つかやっていて、その中にREDD関係のものもある。そういう形で民間企業に実際REDDのデモンストレーション・アクティビティをしていただき、そういうものを基礎に二国間クレジットをやっていこうという形になっているので、政府としてはぜひ民間の方々にも参加していただいて、また調査などの知見をこれから生かして、方法論などを確立していきたいという方向で対応している。

#### カンボジアにおけるREDDの取組からの教訓

(松本) 特にカンボジアでREDDに取り組むに当たって、国内で森林減少の要因と対応策の成功・失敗事例から何か教訓は得られただろうか。

(Keo) Regarding to the cause of deforestation and forest degradations, we have identified some of the key causes like the other countries in the world also. It is about conversion of the forest to other land use, especially agricultures and industrial crop. Also, the degradation happens especially with the illegal logging also that we cannot control. The government takes very serious actions on doing law enforcement, especially strengthens the capacity of the government staff in skill doing law enforcement. This is supported by ITTO<sup>10</sup> also in the last few years. We tried to produce also the guideline and also mean to really control the crime also.

However, regarding to the success story that we have, especially in the protected of forest where we equip a lot of people on the ground, where they have also proper headquarters, equipments, law enforcement, patrolling daily in the forest mainly, not in the city. We find success in doing that. I think for Cambodia, it is about human resources on the ground, I mean in the forest, looking there with a proper protocol to monitor, and also in collaboration with the NGO<sup>11</sup> and also communities, it will help a lot. Regarding the REDD, I think most model way we want to follow is based on our experience in managing this protection of forest. It is important because this is high level commitment from the government to really do so. I think as you already know how we work on that. We will try to using existing policy and program that we have learned to build on that in the future.

(松本) 責任者として非常に重い言葉だった。カンボジアのREDDタスクフォース、

---

<sup>10</sup> The International Tropical Timber Organization: <http://www.itto.int/>

<sup>11</sup> Non-Governmental Organization

フォーカルポイントとして、ほかの海外からのプレーヤー、民間への期待や要望はあるか。

(Keo) I think Cambodia is maybe not different from other countries. We are happy to engage with all other stakeholders outside, especially private sector also and for sure the donors. For doing REDD, there will be a lot of demand, and this will be consistent with UNFCCC negotiation also, especially in the period where we do not have any decision yet on the finance. The fast-start fund from donor for the phase I is really key for us because if you look at the requirements for the first phase, the REDD readiness activity will be a lot. You will work a lot on the institutional arrangements. It is a big task. The REDD MRV<sup>12</sup> cost a lot, especially the national forest inventory is going to cost millions and millions on them; and then, stakeholders' engagement where you will have the bill starting from awareness raising, capacity building, and then consultation in the country. I do not talk about the FPIC<sup>13</sup> as a national yet because that is going to be in every province, every district, probably every community, hopefully not every village because it is going to be difficult. It will cost a lot. The role of the donor is really important. However, the private sector can bring us a lot of benefit also, especially on pilot scale, either the pilot project or the sub-national. Because REDD is new, we do not know what to do yet, especially with the methodologies that is why we engage with methodology development for – I think for Cambodia, it is probably the first methodology to start with the VCS verification and validation.

It will take a long time. It is good experience for us. It is useful, the investment. But in the future, the private sector here, it should be not only the investment, but also the private sector from the agriculture sector and others should also involve because if they are part of the driver, we should bring on board also, how altogether we can address the drivers. This has been discussed in the international forum also. How to bring not only the private sector who want to invest, but also the drivers? The banks and others should come together and discuss and find a solution.

---

<sup>12</sup> Measurement, Reporting and Verification

<sup>13</sup> Free Prior and Informed Consent