



I want to provide a brief overview of the GCF – where it came from; what it is; where it's going

GCF grew out of the 2008 MOUs signed between California/Illinois/Wisconsin; the Brazilian States of Amapa, Amazonas, Mato Gross and Para; and the Indonesian provinces of Aceh and Papua

GCF was formally established in Belem in 2009 – Acre joined the GCF at that time – bringing the total to 10 – founding members

Over the last 2 years - 6 other states and provinces have joined the GCF

East, West, and Central Kalimantan in Indonesia

Campeche and Chiapas in Mexico

And Cross River State in Nigeria

More than 20% of the world's tropical forests are in these states and provinces; including 3/4 of Brazil's and more than half of Indonesia's



What is the GCF – the GCF is a unique multi-jurisdictional collaboration between these 16 states and provinces that is seeking to build the architecture and the programs to bring forests into climate policy

Over the last two years GCF member states and provinces have been working quietly to establish the elements of high-quality REDD programs that can protect tropical forests at scale and to create viable pathways for REDD

This is the GCF Org Chart -

Substantive work is happening thru the task groups

Key role of partners and stakeholders in everything the GCF does

Think of the GCF as REDD Proof of concept

Learning by doing

Iterate and innovate - new approach to climate policy



GCF Objectives for 2010 and 2011 are organized around 4 task groups – I will go thru these briefly and how they relate to each other

- (1) Subnational REDD Frameworks: Building a platform for state/provincial REDD programs and linking them with emerging compliance markets and other pay-for performance schemes
- (2) Securing REDD financing for GCF states and provinces and establishing an innovative, rapid deployment GCF Fund
- (3) Building a web-based, transparent knowledge database of all REDD-related activities in GCF states and provinces
- (4) Enhancing stakeholder processes and providing a model for transparency



The first objective - task 1 - is to develop a

Common platform approved by all GCF members representing "state-of-theart" thinking on key elements and design options for subnational REDD+ frameworks



Issues to be addressed include -

- crediting pathways,
- accounting and MRV;
- REDD infrastructure;
- · social and environmental safeguards and
- linkage arrangements

Process -

- partial draft was discussed at Santarem;
- taking input from recent workshops in Indonesia and Brazil and from other stakeholders and hope to get another version out to the GCF community and on the website for comment/feedback in early 2011;
- Goal is to have version to be approved by members at the 2011 GCF meeting in Indonesia next year



The overall goal is to establish the elements of a common platform that draws on all of the innovative work happening in GCF states and provinces – and that can be used to build and enhance REDD+ programs that can access multiple market and non-market opportunities – emerging compliance markets such as California; voluntary markets; other market opportunities such as the commodity roundtable efforts; and pay for performance public finance for REDD



Second objective is to access REDD public finance for GCF states & Provinces and to establish a GCF Fund that would provide an innovative model for REDD+ finance –

The GCF states and provinces are an obvious and natural fit for many of the objectives of so-called fast-start REDD financing – very important that some of this financing find its way to these states and provinces that must be the foundation for any workable approach to REDD

The GCF Fund would be fully independent of the GCF members and the Secretariat – the intention is to create a small, fully transparent funding facility that would be able to rapidly deploy funds to address and support

- (1) To address collective needs identified through the GCF database effort this will provide important economies of scale in addressing these needs and building capacity
- (2) And to support competitive proof-of-concept grants for activities in GCF states and provinces

Staring small –looking for about \$6 million for the first round – a small sum compared to the billions of dollars in fast-start financing

Strong commitment to transparency and MRV of all funding.

See this not only as a way to build and enhance high-quality REDD programs across GCF states and provinces but also as another opportunity for the GCF to develop innovative approaches and proof of concept for REDD



The third objective is to build a GCF Knowledge Database - this would be an open, webbased source of information from GCF members on

- · current status and trends regarding land use and deforestation;
- forest carbon accounting efforts and methodologies;
- · REDD implementation activities; and
- · REDD related financial flows

Over the last year, we have been working to collect key information in all of these areas from the individual GCF states and provinces. The initial reports from the members are going up on the website.

And we are now in the process of working with a database designer to build this into a fully-functional, open, transparent database. I have some of the initial designs that I want to show – but this is all very preliminary – and will be refined and updated during early 2011



This is a mock-up of the initial landing page – showing the GCF states and provinces

Facts about the GCF and REDD up in the top right

Recent developments across the top – California's proposed regulations, Acre's new law, UN REDD support for Cross River, new members

Ability to pull up different maps at bottom left

Ability to do different call-outs for the states and provinces

This shows the top 5 subnational jurisdictions by tropical forest carbon stocks

Amazonas with 9.4% of the total - truly massive



Same page – just demonstrating the ability to do a so-called "mouseover" that would pull up an individual state like Cross River – and then go into the database for that state --

Home About Us	Regions & States REDD Dat	tabase Events Documents		
« Global View				
Cross R	liver, Nigeria 22	2,342 Km ² Total Land Area 32.1% of Nigeria is F	Land 1.5% Increase of Deforestation Torest 2.1% Reduction in Nigeria	
State Overview Carb	oon Accounting REDD Implementati	ion Financing		
		Demographics	Economy	
Enugo Mala Cross River cabba		2,824,877 Produition 1.8% of Nat Uters vs. Rard Population 70.3% Part Population, 2008 30,1% Uters Population, 2008 Social Groups Etc. 2 9:56		
Akwa Ibom	a the	Bete 18.2% Ejagharn 18.2% Ekoi 15.3%	Purchasing Power Parity 0.511 Human Development Index	
Deforestation Satellite Deve	elopment	Other 12.3%	Developing	
Forest Status				
	nt Forest	Original (Pre-Human) 310 V	m ² Per Year Average Deforestation	
7,300 Km ² Curren Area	About 50	Original (Pre-Human) Forest Area Remaining 319 K	Cm ² Per Year Average Deforestation Rate, 2001 Flasse Est.	10.
Forest Typologies		Forest Management	Forest Types and Change '91-'01	, 20
11418-1	24.6% Tropical High Rain Forest	Cross River 2,955.1km ² 40 National Park	0.0% Tropical Rain Forest +522.1% Open Forest +7.0%	Drce
1,546 Km2	15.6% Swamp Forest	100% Federally Managed	Swamp Forest +0.9%	skfo
	11.6% Mangroves	Forest Reserves 2,773.8km ² 38	Mangrove Forest -0.6% 8,6% Regenerating Forest -0.7%	t Ta
7200 K - 2	10.3% Savannah Woodland	Individually Managed: Afi FR 26.5%	Oil Paim Plantation -2.0% Rubber Plantation -2.2%	ore
7,300 Km ² Current Forest Area		Agoi FR 19.2% Cross River North FR 14.2%	Ometina Plantation -8.4%	P
No. Frendlandlar		Cross River South FR 11.2%	Farm / Other Land -12.5%	a
Non-Forest Land Use	72.6% Intense (crop) Agriculture	Gabu FR 2.2%	Reserve Deforestation '91-'01	mate
11,546 Km2	10.6% Extensive (grazing)	Ikrigon FR 0.9%	Ikrigon FR 36.6%	Gir
	Agriculture	Oban Block FR 0.5%	Oban Block FR 12.2%	nors
	Plantations 10.3% Urban (major + minor)	Umon Ndealichi FR 0.2%	Ukpon FR 10.1%	Gove

This is the State Overview page for Cross River State – again – this is just an initial design – still under-development

Ability to pull up different maps at different scales

Basic land use and forest information across the top - comparing Cross River to Nigeria

Basic state-level information - economy; demographics

And then some summary information on forest status and deforestation – forest typologies; forest management; status of forest reserves

« Global View		EDD Database Events Documents	
ACRE,			6.4% Reduction of Deforestation 2005-2009 % Reduction of Deforestation in Brazil
State Overview Car	bon Accounting REDD Imp	lementation Financing Registry	
		Demographics	Economy
La la	⊆ ≡ Amazonas	732,793 Population 0.38% of National Population	\$6.7 Billion State GDP (2008 Est.) Brazilian Real
Cruzeiro do Sul		Urban vs. Rural Population	GDP Breakdown
Marechal Thaumaturgo	Fejó Lug Sena Madureira	72% Rural Population, 2008 27.4% Urban Population, 2008	69.0% Services 12.4% Industry
	Rio Branco		18.6% Agriculture
Peru	1 Carton	Social Groups Multiracial 67.7%	R\$ 9896.16 Per Capital Brazilian Real
and the second	Bolivi	Black 4.7%	0.751 Human Development Index
Low Moderate Deforestation Satellite Dev		treme Indigenous 0.6%	Main Exports Wood, Wood Products
Forest Status 147,262.7 Km	2 Current Forest Area 164	A,221.3 Km ² Original (Pre-Human) Forest Area 319 Km Forest Management	Per Year Average Deforestation Rate 2005-2009 Average Deforestation Rates (em2)
147,262.7 Km	24.6% Open Forest,	Forest Management many Uprotected Forest 82,109km ² 50.0%	
147,262.7 Km	24.6% Open Forest, Bamboo, som	Forest Management Terrest Management Terrest Management Terrest Management Terrest Management Terrest	Average Deforestation Rates (km2)
147,262.7 Km Forest Typologies	24.6% Open Forest,	Forest Management Uprotected Forest Uprotected Forest Unmanaged, Unprotected Forest	Average Deforestation Rates (km2) Acre Brazil Avg.
147,262.7 Km Forest Typologies	24.6% Open Forest, Bamboo, some 13.1% Open Forest, Palms, some	Forest Management Uprotected Forest Unramaged, Unprotected Forest Unramaged, Unprotected Forest Conserved 50,245km ² 30.6% 14.1% Indigenous Territories 16.5% Federal Reserve	Average Deforestation Rates (imt) Acre Brazil Avg. 595 3 319 1995-1999 2000-2004 2005-2009
147,262.7 Km Forest Typologies 40.546 Km ² 147,262.7 Km ²	24.6% Open Forest, Bamboo, som 13.1% Open Forest, Palms, some forest 13.6% Open Forest,	Forust Management Uprotected Forest Uprotected Forest Unmanaged, Unprotected Forest Ummanaged, Unprotected Forest Unmanaged, Unprotected Forest Ummanaged, Unprotected Forest Unmanaged, Unprotected Forest Unprotected S0,245km ² 30.6% Federal Reserve Fully Protected S6% Federal Reserve 16,159km ² 9.8% 56% Federally Managed	Average Deforestation Rates (km2) Acre Brazil Avg. Brazil Avg. 325 731 795 450 319
147,262.7 Km Forest Typologies	24.6% Open Forest, Bamboo, som 13.1% Open Forest, Palms, some I some Dente F 13.6% Open Forest, Palms, some I 10.3% Open Forest, Palms, some I	Forest Management Uprotected Forest Unmanaged, Unprotected Fully Protected Soft Federally Managed and Conserved Sustainably Managed Conserved Cons	Average Deforestation Rates (imt) Acre Brazil Avg. 595 3 319 450 1995-1999 2000-2004 2005-2009

Here is a design for the Acre Overview page – same overall approach

Ability to pull up different maps - this one shows deforestation pressure across the state

Comparisons between state and national along the top and down in the bottom right corner

Overview Page – to be followed by additional pages on Carbon Accounting; REDD Implementation; REDD Financing; and, perhaps, a Registry

Distair View ACRE, BRAZ State Overview Carbon Accounting Suc	LT% of Bazity Total Area LT% of Bazity Total Area ting REDD Implementation Financi Immary	27% of Brazil is Forest 8.1	5,4% Reduction of Collectation 2005/2008 National of Ordersation is based National Ordersation is based Data Inferences National Ordersation is based UA CODED 2008 Detection Mayor National Ordersation Mayor UA CODED 2008 Detection Mayor National Ordersation Mayor UA CODED 2008 Detection Mayor National Ordersation Ordersation UB MC 2008 Assessment Octowerlaw of Productor?
Deforestation Dynamics Monitoring An Current Degraduation Dynamics Monitoring Personal 12,4% Personal Displayers And Andrewski Personal Displayers And Andrewski Personal Degraduation Dynamics Monitoring	Direct and underlying causes and drivers of deforestation UNDERSE The majority of the deforestation in Acre occurs along primary and secondary roads as well as news. The main deforestation where in Acre scatte benefing (20% of deforestate) area in 1989 and 81% in 2005. Read More Read More	Monitoring methodologies and accuracy to compare the second second second second test and the second second second second second test second second second second second second deforstation setmates in the Brazian Amazana since 1978. The method uses a Record More	Needs identified for deforestation monitoring water and the second second second second monitoring and approximately provide monitoring and approximately provide monitoring and approximately approximately monitoring maintain holds with second the distance monitoring monit
In control Department Partially 121.34 Km ² Department, 2016 to 4, BVF Assessment 122.8 Km ² Preference Carlon Stocks Countification	all inters of toches deglatation 1/1/1/2019 Logging and mainly forest files (oggnavated by externe doughts such as 2005 and 2010). The main cause of forest files that cours as a result of the parkicle of burning to comp pattures and orops Read More	Monitoring methodologies and accuracy Urbono DECRAD method from MPE. - LANDSAT and CBDS image (minimum scale 6.23 hottens are enhanced for constart - image described in fairly arbitrary Read More	Needs identified for degradation monitoring structure Capacity building in Forest degradation monitoring methodologies using LDAR.
An Constitution of the second	Ter 1 Ter 2 Ter 3 The IPCC Cood Practice Cuber Control Cood Practice Cuber provide recommendations on methods and default values for assessing Carbon Read More	Methods used and accuracy Sensors Simple methodology based on vegetation mapping and genural-based annexits, with a none technically demanding method based on remote sensing. Arrill Stomass stocks were demanded by papitya along- tric equation (Brown, 1997) using Read More	Needs identified for forest carbon quantification UNDADDO • Needs to iscouse the accuracy of this information. Therefore the State is currently tooling for funding to acquire a tool thread the pacthon stock membring such as LDAR Read More
Baseline references in REDD program and methods used 8/4/0010 Historical period 1996-2005, 602 km ² , reviewed every 5 years.	82% CO_Reduction Deforestation Goals for the State and for REDD program by 2020.	164 M Savings Tons CO, Slavings Per Period by 2020 (using average carbon stock 123 IC/ha)	Needs identified to improve baseline definition 84/0010 Refinement of baseline and emission reduction targets will be addressed with Cetulio Vargas Foundation analysis.

This is a mock-up of the Carbon Accounting page – I know there is a lot here – just want to highlight a couple of things:

Summary would show where the state is with respect to the different IPCC Tiers for forest carbon assessment

Sections on Deforestation and Forest Degradation Monitoring – Information on Drivers; on Methodologies and Sources of Data; and on Specific Needs

Section on Forest Carbon Stock quantification (Progress with respect to IPCC Tier 1, 2, 3); information on methodologies; and on needs

KEY POINT: the database will directly link to all sources of data and the methodologies used for these assessments – examples – top right corner and along the side – different estimates and underlying data sources -- want this to be fully transparent, open and publicly available – need feedback on how to make this better (see Feedback link)



Finally, Here is a mock-up of the REDD Implementation Page for Acre – again, just want to point out a couple of features:

Recent developments across the top – Acre just enacted a comprehensive law for a State System of Incentives for Environmental Services

Progress on Current REDD Program

Plan – Developed

REDD Related Laws - under implementation

Zoning and Land Registry efforts

First Column – Deep Dive on the State REDD Program – three tabs – REDD Program Overview; Legal Framework; and REDD Projects

Second Column – Deep Dive on Social and Environmental Safeguards – three tabs right now – Protection or Rights and Interests; Transparency & Participation; and Benefits Sharing – highlighting what the state is doing and the features of the state program that address these issues – MRV of safeguards and any other certifications, audits, etc. would be here – innovative benefit sharing approaches such as what Amazonas is doing with the Bolsa Floresta Program would be highlighted here – other relevant state, national, and international laws, policies and programs would be here –

Also want to have the ability to highlight particular groups and the size and nature of those groups would also be highlighted – so Acre has done a bunch of REDD and safeguards related work with a group of 12,000 families in a high-pressure area – building this out to the broader rural population



4th objective for 2010-2011 is to enhance the GCF commitment to stakeholder involvement and transparency

GCF has made a lot of progress in this area – but still have work to do – trying to move fast – to iterate and innovate – but in a way that draws upon the input of a robust stakeholder process – we have opened up GCF meetings to stakeholders; the task groups are open to stakeholder participation – and everything that the GCF does goes up quickly on the website – working hard to have everything translated quickly -- please check out all of the content up on the website

The GCF knowledge database and the fund are both intended to provide models of transparency for other REDD efforts going forward



This is just a partial list of the growing number of GCF stakeholders and partners – GCF would not be possible without the efforts of this group and many others – as GCF grows, we want to reach out and engage a broader set of stakeholders and partners – a big thank you to all of these groups and others who have helped the GCF get off the ground



And finally, NONE of this would have happened without the support of the Moore Foundation, The Packard Foundation, and the ClimateWorks Foundation – big round of applause for these foundations – Thank you!

