Project *brief*

Thünen Institute of International Forestry and Forest Economics 2020/14a

Towards ending natural forest loss by 2030: UNFCCC REDD+ and deforestation-free supply chains

Yvonne Hargita[1], Lukas Giessen[2], Sven Günter[1]

- **The present study is a timely and strategic effort to compare UNFCCC REDD+ and DFSC with regard to a spatial linkage of both concepts, especially in the light of the 2020-2030 timeline on commitments from the public- and the private sector.**
- **Besides multiple potential synergies, as for permanence, leakage, and monitoring systems, subsistence driven deforestation could become a blind spot outside the scope of both concepts with negative consequences for affected communities.**

Background and aims

Transnational REDD+ under the UNFCCC, and deforestation-free supply chains (DFSC) for agricultural commodities from the private sector, are the two most promising concepts to tackle global deforestation. Linking both concepts conceptually and in policy practice could provide for synergies and enable more effective approaches against global deforestation. To operationalise such a linkage, a prerequisite is the knowledge of both concepts' key characteristics, as well as resulting similarities and differences. On the basis of an extensive literature review, we compared both concepts along 13 key characteristics and deduced policy recommendations for further political input.

Key findings

The study's analysis of key characteristics covered technical aspects (forest definition, monitoring, permanence, leakage, scale), contributing factors (the drivers commercial and subsistence agriculture, degradation, opportunity costs, forest tenure), and characteristics which are mentioned in the context of increasing the acceptance among those affected: stakeholder participation, rights of indigenous people, and environmental co-benefits (provision of ecosystem services, biodiversity conservation, enhancement of natural resilience).

We found that a spatial linkage of UNFCCC REDD+ and DFSC provides multiple synergies, e.g. a harmonized forest definition and an accompanying monitoring system promise financial synergies and cost savings with potential implications on reduced opportunity costs of avoided deforestation. Governmental REDD+ can close several loopholes of DSFC as permanence and leakage, since they are not inherent parts of the horizons of business operations. On the other hand, with focus on agricultural commodities DFSC tackles one of the most important drivers of deforestation that could not directly be considered under the REDD+ negotiations. As a challenge, we identified the resulting pressure on subsistence-driven or illegal deforestation, which could even be exacerbated under the light of increased migration resulting from political and environmental crises. Restricted access to forests and no-deforestation zones can threaten the livelihood and food security of affected local and migrating communities.

Advice for policy-makers

Concepts aiming to combine DFSC and REDD+ merit more support of the international community, e.g. in the framework of international negotiations or public-private partnerships. However, special attention is required establishing safeguards for food security and avoiding subsistence-driven deforestation.

Further Information

Contact

[1] Thünen Institute of International Forestry and Forest Economics
Yvonne.Hargita@thuenen.de
www.thuenen.de/en/wf

[2] European Forest Institute (EFI) Governance Programme, 53113 Bonn, Germany & IPB Bogor Agricultural University, 16680 Bogor, Indonesia; Lukas.Giessen@efi.int

Duration

06.2017-12.2020

Project-ID

1994

Publication

Hargita Y, Giessen L, Günter S (2020) Similarities and differences between international REDD+ and transnational deforestation-free supply chain initiatives - a review. Sustainability 12(3):896

Support

With support from Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture by decision of the German Bundestag

DOI:10.3220/PB1587381393000