



Warsaw, November 18, 2013

Dear delegates,

The below signed organisations would like to draw attention to the 16 September 2013 statement from the 16th BASIC Ministerial Meeting on Climate Change, which represented Brazil, China, South Africa and India, and was attended by Argentina, Fiji (as Chair of the G-77 & China), Paraguay, Peru and Venezuela. In paragraph 12 of this statement, “Ministers underlined the imperative that REDD+ ensures environmental integrity and, in this regard, stressed that results-based payments shall not be used to offset mitigation commitments by Annex I countries.”¹

Any finance arrangement for REDD+ which allows developed countries to use forests to offset mitigation commitments undermines climate mitigation. Due to problems of additionality, accounting uncertainties and risk of reversals, treating emissions from forest loss as equivalent with emissions from fossil fuel undermines global reductions. In order to combat climate change parties must agree on strong measures to reduce deforestation *and* reduce industrial carbon emissions. Allowing REDD+ to be used as an offset would simply replace emissions from one source with another and not reduce overall emissions levels.

We note that SBSTA 39 did not reach a decision on carbon markets, due to parties’ serious concerns over lack of environmental integrity and the inability of carbon markets to raise finance.

Given the criticisms of offsetting, the EU and other countries have proposed a move to ‘beyond offsetting’. This consists of conservative accounting approaches (such as ‘incentive levels’), to deliver ‘net mitigation benefits.’ It is important to note that the use of an ‘incentive level’ simply means the number of offset credits produced are less than the amount generated. This reduces the volume of offsets, but also reduces the scale of finance which can be generated, and requires

¹ https://www.environment.gov.za/mediarelease/16thbasic_ministerialmeeting_climatechange

domestically funded developing country mitigation action (termed 'own efforts' by the EU). Any form of accounting which allows developed countries to reduce mitigation commitments due to action taken elsewhere is a form of offsetting.

In this context, we call on countries who support the BASIC Ministerial Statement to ensure that the REDD+ decision on finance does not allow results-based payments to be used to reduce mitigation commitments, whether through offsetting, or a 'net mitigation' approach to accounting. We have made a similar request to the co-chairs.

Sincerely,

Centro de Planificación y Estudios Sociales, Ecuador (CEPLAES)
Climate Justice Programme
Federation of Community Forestry Users, Nepal (FECOFUN)
Forests of the World
Friends of the Earth Flanders and Brussels
Friends of the Earth Norway
Friends of the Earth US
Green Development Advocates (GDA), Cameroon
Greenpeace International
HuMa
IBIS – Education for Development
NGO Coalition for Environment, Nigeria (NGOCE)
POINT, Burma
ProNatura – Friends of the Earth Switzerland
Rainforest Foundation Norway
Third World Network (TWN)