The Economics of REDD+
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Expected Learning Outcomes

This module will provide an overview of the various economics and financial aspects of REDD+. In particular you will learn:

Part 1
The Green Economy in the context of REDD+

Part 2
Demystifying results-based actions (RBA) and results-based payments (RBP)

Part 3
Policies and measures for results-based actions (RBA)

Part 4
Summarizing this module
PART 1

THE GREEN ECONOMY IN THE CONTEXT OF REDD+
Overview part 1

• Integrating REDD+ in a broader Green Economy
• The challenges
• Different means that can lead to results-based actions and payments
  – Level 1. Market value forest-carbon
  – Level 2. Forests in a Green Economy: different means to achieve REDD+
  – Level 3. Exogenous factors affecting forests
• Summary
• Exercise: differentiating between spatial costs and benefits of REDD+.
Integrating REDD+ in broader Green Economy

• Green Economy: “an economy that results in improved human well-being and social equity, while significantly reducing environmental risks”

• Using forest resources in a more sustainable way are an important way for countries to move to low-carbon, resource efficient and equitable economy.

• Need to decouple economic growth from ecosystem impacts and the creation of (green) jobs that are based in sectors that extract fewer resources for the same value added
The Challenges: decouple economic growth and human development from environmental degradation

• “In the coming 40 years we need to produce as much food as we produced in the last 8000 years” WWF

• 3 billion more middle class consumers by 2030

• 40% water shortfall by 2030

• > 100% increase in real commodity prices since the year 2000
The Challenges: decouple economic growth and human development from environmental degradation
The relationship between ecosystems and the economy

Source: Trucost
REDD+ can support the transition to a Green Economy

- **Economic performance**
  - Growth of income and employment

- **Social performance**
  - Improved well-being and social equity

- **Environmental performance**
  - Reduced environmental and ecological scarcities
VIDEO

FORESTS – HEART OF A GREEN ECONOMY
Different means that can lead to results-based actions and payments

REDD+ vehicle to financially reward developing countries for their verified emission reductions and removals of greenhouse gases through a variety of options.

Creating a substantial (long-term, credible, light) market value on forest carbon and other (forest) ecosystem services is a positive incentive to protect and sustainable use forests. In that sense, REDD+ is both a means (the price signal is “the vehicle”) to the “end” (which is a reduction in deforestation).

There are several means to reduce deforestation and generate results-based actions (RBA) that generate results-based payments (RBP). This can be done through changes in fiscal or trade policy, by stimulating private finance towards conservation and sustainable forests management, tackle illegal deforestation, stimulate governments to include the value of their (forest-related) natural capital in their national accounts and for private companies to reflect on their balance sheet, etc – are all different “vehicles” to tackle the drivers of deforestation.

The means vary nationally/locally, but the end result is what counts: verified (MRV) reductions or removals of forest carbon emissions compared to a reference emission level (FREL/FEL) that complies with Cancun safeguards.
The core of REDD+ is to put a higher value on "standing forests" thereby creating a 'positive' incentive for countries to reduce deforestation.

Vehicles to tackle the drivers of deforestation (accounting, fiscal incentives, leveraging, private finance, etc).

Level 3. Exogenous factors

External/exogenous factors Affecting deforestation (agricultural prices, fossil fuel prices, exchange rates, etc)

Level 2. Forests in a Green Economy

Level 1. Direct positive incentive

Price /market value on forest carbon

Changes fiscal and trade policies (taxes, tariffs, subsidies)

Forest conservation policies

Forest Landscape restoration

Enabling conditions SFM / increase supply of legal timber

Strip deforestation from financial and productive supply chains

Incorporate value of forests in national accounts & on balance sheets companies

Level 3. Exogenous factors

External/exogenous factors Affecting deforestation (agricultural prices, fossil fuel prices, exchange rates, etc)
Level 1. REDD+: a direct positive economic incentive

- Problem with deforestation has its origination in that our current global can national economic systems hardly value forest ecosystems (beyond timber). Hence its value is perceived to much lower than alternative land-uses.
- In economic terms forest ecosystem services as regarded as externalities.
- The basis for REDD+ to provide a positive financial incentive (results-based actions, RBA, leading to results-based payments, RBP) for governments and ultimately for local communities and (other) private landowners to conserve and sustainably use forests.
- REDD+ has the potential to be a global-scale Payment for Ecosystem Service scheme (whether in the form of direct payments between governments, via the Green Climate Fund or through a market).
REDD+ RBA Abatement Cost Curve: a potential model for results-based payments

Compare various results-based actions that countries can take in terms of the potential to reduce forest-carbon emissions compared to FR(E)L and the costs it takes to implement them, while trying to maximize non-carbon benefits each option generates. See scheme below (for illustrative purposes).

Source: Mulder, UNEP
Level 2. Forests in a Green Economy: different means to achieve REDD+

• A positive financial incentive to conserve forests may not be sufficient by itself. It needs to be embedded in a country’s broader transition to low carbon, resource efficient and equitable Green Economy.

• It needs to be part of national efforts to increase the value of natural capital to address the long term impact of climate change, which will heavily impact on development of in particular developing countries located in the tropics.

• A country has various ways how it can reduce forest emissions levels. They will require 1) different efforts from governments and/or companies; 2) each option may receive different levels of support or opposition; 3) will have different effects on the economy.

• Enabling conditions or means to reduce forest emissions levels include but are not limited to:
  – Stripping deforestation from productive and financial supply chains
  – Conservation policies
  – Target illegal logging and stimulate the legal supply of timber
  – Fiscal and trade policies (subsidies, tariffs and taxes)
  – Incorporate natural capital in a country’s national accounts and on the balance sheets of companies
  – Forest landscape restoration
  – Avoidance of forest fires
  – Improved management of peatlands (e.g. in Indonesia)
“Wall of finance” currently moving in opposite direction

REDD+ Readiness Funding:
Annual average of $1 billion USD a year for the fast start finance period 2010–2012

Future REDD+ Payments Phase (estimate, as of 2020):
$30 billion USD per year

Global Subsidies for Biofuels:
$24 billion USD in 2011

Global Subsidies for Fossil Fuels:
$480 billion USD in 2011
Level 3. External factors affecting forests

- Often shaded from our eyes there are major financial forces that indirectly affect forests in a massive way.

- These include exchange rates, sovereign ratings, international market price of (soft) commodities, etc

- Some are (partly) affected by national governments: for example central banks’ monetary policy affect exchange rates.

- Some are shaped by markets, including prices for soft commodities (palm oil, soy, beef, etc), metals, etc.
Level 3. Exogenous factors: price commodities

Higher price of (soft) commodities leads to higher pressure to clear forests

Source: GMO, 2012

Note: The GMO commodity index is an index comprised of the following 33 commodities, equally weighted at initiation: aluminum, coal, coconut oil, coffee, copper, corn, cotton, diammonium phosphate, flaxseed, gold, iron ore, jute, lard, lead, natural gas, nickel, oil, palladium, palm oil, pepper, platinum, plywood, rubber, silver, sorghum, soybeans, sugar, tin, tobacco, uranium, wheat, wool, zinc.
Level 3. Exogenous factors: price commodities

Source: INPE, IMF, The Economist
Part 1: Summary

• **Positive economic incentives needed (REDD+)** needed to turn the tide of (tropical) forest loss.
• REDD+ has the **potential to be a significant economic force** for conservation and sustainable use of forests.
• **Pre-requisite**: Countries will have to **implement the 4 component of the Warsaw Framework** – the ‘rule book’ – in order to be eligible for results-based payments
• There are **many large financial (exogenous) forces affecting forests and the broader landscape**. Without understanding these, results-based payments for forest emission reduction may not be as effective as they could be.
• **Transitioning to a Green Economy means addressing the drivers of deforestation**. A transition requires broad support from civil society and private sector but requires the Government (across different ministries, including agriculture, central planning, finance, etc) to lead and provide incentives to change behaviour.
Questions & Answers
PART 2

DEMystifying results-based actions (RBA) and results-based payments (RBP)
Overview part 2

- Green Economy integration in National REDD+ Strategies
- Results-based actions (RBA) and results-based payments (RBP)
- Scale of funding
- REDD+ funding pledged (donors) and received (recipient countries)
- Carbon markets
- Summary
Towards a systematic REDD+ Green Economy Approach in National REDD+ Strategies

Towards a systematic approach

- Support countries to **complete the 4 components of the Warsaw Framework** work towards **RBP**.
- **Manual** with a **step-by-step approach** how REDD+ can be part of **broader economic and development objectives**.

Critical elements

- Options for **economically-attractive and nationally supported ways** to achieve results-based actions (RBA) that lead to results-based finance (RBF) as part of National REDD+ Strategies
- Private sector: Develop actions, policies and measures, as part of National REDD+ Strategies, which **shape private sector operating models** that deliver emission reductions
- Acceptance about REDD+ **across ministries** to increase chance of success.
How REDD+ Green Economy and Private sector engagement fits with UNFCCC Warsaw Framework

Fit in a country’s broader economic and development plans (e.g. Sustainable Development Goals, Conventions, etc)

Include as part of development of National REDD+ Strategies/Action Plan, and possibly through Safeguard Information Systems

Results-based actions

Results-based payments

Green Economy

Private sector engagement
National REDD+ Strategy

- Economic performance
- Environmental performance
- Social performance

Private sector engagement
Economic valuation of environmental services
Identification and mapping of multiple benefits
Development of national approaches to safeguards

National REDD+ Strategy
Examples (from NY Climate Summit)

• **Brazil** has demonstrated huge progress. By 2013, Brazil had reduced deforestation by 71% compared to the 1996-2005 annual average, while at the same time increasing agricultural production and rural incomes (but in 2013 it increased again with 29%)

• **Indonesia** has embarked on comprehensive reforms to land use policies, customary land rights, regulations and law enforcement to meet its pledge to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 26% by 2020 (41% subject to international support).

• **Colombia** is making progress on its Amazon Vision – an ambitious plan towards meeting the zero net deforestation goal in its Amazon region by 2020.

• **Mexico** has adopted a law on climate change that incorporates the goal of reaching zero net deforestation.

• **Ethiopia’s** Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) Facility sets the goal of reaching middle income country status by 2025 with net-zero greenhouse gas emissions growth while building resilience to climate shocks.

*Most of these are pledges. It now comes down to implementation!*
Integrate REDD+ at inter-ministerial level: use key analysis to embed REDD+ across ministries

- Ministry of Forestry / Environment: Lead in implementing REDD+ at national level
- Ministry of Planning: Multiple benefits/spatial planning
- Ministry of Finance: Finance sector regulation; deforestation from financial supply chains;
- Office of Statistics: e.g. Scenarios for RBA leading to RBP; National/corporate natural capital accounting
- Ministry of mining: Embed ecosystem compensation as part of mining development; smart planning
- Ministry of Agriculture: e.g. Strip deforestation from agricultural supply chains

Identify how REDD+ can be integrated & accepted across ministries
Engagement private sector

• Main objective: support countries develop National REDD+ strategies with actions, policies and measures that shape private sector operating models so that they deliver sustainable REDD+ results.

• Main outcome of consultations: the UN-REDD Programme can create a safe space for public-private engagement and also develop the tools to assist developing countries in crafting effective and efficient actions, policies and measures to create an enabling environment that will shape private sector operating models.

• UNEP Finance Initiative and UNDP Green Commodities Programme key supporting organisations.
On-going work on private sector engagement

1. **Convening public-private dialogues to inform the development of REDD+ Programmes and Strategies.** For example:
   - Identifying **policy bottlenecks hampering private financial flows to sustainable business models in agriculture and cattle ranching** compatible with REDD+ objectives (Paraguay)
   - Supporting countries in efforts to determine the **role of the private sector in REDD+ financing and implementation** (Costa Rica, Panama, Paraguay)

1. **Identifying drivers of business as usual and options for change.** For example:
   - Supporting countries in examining the **implications of their fiscal frameworks on deforestation** (how are these affecting private sector operating models, cost structures and investment decisions) and identifying levers for change (Indonesia, Ecuador, Peru and Ghana)
   - Exploring mechanisms for linking **sustainable supply chains in commodities with REDD+,** in general and with Results-Based Finance in particular (Indonesia)
   - Supporting countries in their efforts to **structure interventions that contribute to REDD+ objectives** (Paraguay’s market for environmental services compensation)
On-going work on private sector engagement

1. **Working with private sector.** For example:
   - Developing models to **account for corporate and financial “hidden” risk** related to deforestation and forest degradation (focused on Indonesia)
   - Working with commodity buyers to **review their purchasing policies** to ensure that these are compatible with REDD+ objectives (global)
   - Working with financial institutions to **develop investible products** to mobilise private finance to companies with “zero net deforestation” footprints (investment indexes and bond)

2. **Work on economic valuation and accounting**
   - National level **forest economic valuation** studies for Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia, Rep Congo, Panama, Indonesia
   - **Natural capital valuation and accounting** is about to be started in Ethiopia and Nepal
REDD+ Activities

The five designated ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from forests

1. Reducing emissions from deforestation;
2. Reducing emissions from forest degradation;
3. Conservation of forest carbon stocks;
4. Sustainable management of forests;
5. Enhancement of forest carbon stocks;
Results-Based Actions

- Referred to in the UNFCCC text in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 73
- Policies and measures that lead to a verified reduction or removal of forest carbon emissions compared to a forest reference (emission) level (FREL) and that complies with the Cancun Safeguards.
- Basically:
  - Show actual reductions/removals in carbon emissions compared to a benchmark (FREL)
  - Verified through measurement, reporting & verification (MRV) system and periodic monitoring
  - Make sure it complies with environmental and social safeguards (Cancun)
  - The means are not important. Countries are completely free to choose what policies, measures and actions they choose. The end result is important
Results-Based Payments/Financing

The ability of recipient countries to receive results-based payments/finance (money) based on successful results-based actions undertaken a (sub)national level.
Scale of REDD+ funding

- Norway, USA, Germany, Japan and the UK provide 75% of total funding to date (20 REDD+ donors).
- Brazil and Indonesia together receive 40% of allocated funding (80 recipient countries in total).
- Global public and private finance pledges USD 8.7 billion (between 2006 and March 2014)
- Public funding: 90%. Private funding: 10%
UN Climate Summit Norway announced US$ 450 million for Peru (US$ 300 million) and Liberia (US$ 150 million).
Norway also announced support in the amount of US $100 million for indigenous peoples
Brazil and Indonesia together receive 40% of allocated funding (80 recipient countries in total).
Global public and private finance pledges USD 8.7 billion (between 2006 and March 2014)
Public funding: 90%. Private funding: 10%
Scale of REDD+ funding

- Indonesia and Brazil most important recipient countries. Mexico important too. DRC and Tanzania among the important African recipient countries
Scale of REDD+ funding: domestic finance emerging

- Increasingly, emerging economies prioritise REDD+ in national budgets:
  - Allocate domestic funds
  - Co-finance international REDD+ funding
- Mexico: domestic contributions of US$ 433 million or 43% of total REDD+ finance
- Ghana: US$ 39 million or 37% of total REDD+ finance
- Wide ranges of domestic funding: e.g. US$ 10 billion/year (Streck and Parker, 2012); US$ 1.6 billion across 39 countries (REDD+ Partnership)
Overview REDD+ funding pledged by donor countries
Pledging, depositing.....disbursing

- Donors have deposited about 72% (US$ 2.2 billion) of the US$ 3.1 billion pledged to multilateral development banks.
- 59% of the funds are committed
- 29% of the formally approved
- 11% actually distributed
Carbon markets: developing faster then ever before
Forest carbon markets: US$ 900 million in total to date

Source: Ecosystem Marketplace
Average forest carbon price: US$ 7.8/tCO₂
CCB premium: US$ 0.2 – 0.5 (for VCS)

Source: Ecosystem Marketplace
VCS/CCB dominant methodology, CDM almost non-existent

Source: Ecosystem Marketplace
Europe: dominant buyer forest carbon credits

Source: Ecosystem Marketplace
Carbon markets: developing faster than ever before

Source: World Bank
Part 2: Summary

- **Results-based actions** are policies and measures that lead to verified (MRV) reductions or removals of carbon emissions compared to a forest reference emission level (FREL/FRL) that complies with Cancun safeguards.
- **Results-based payments** or finance is the ability of recipient countries to be rewarded for results-based actions.
- Private finance through voluntary carbon markets have accounted for about 10% of total funding pledged (which is about US$ 9 billion)
- **5 country donors** (direct – bilateral deals with countries – and indirectly through multilateral financial institutions) account for 75% of REDD+ funding to date.
- **Indonesia and Brazil** receive/have been allocated about 40% of REDD+ funding pledged to date.
- **Voluntary carbon markets** not sufficient to counter funding needed for REDD+ (estimated at US$ 30 billion per year from 2020 to half deforestation)
Questions & Answers
PART 3

POLICIES AND MEASURES FOR RESULTS-BASED ACTIONS
Tools and enabling conditions towards results-based actions

• There is a whole suit of **tools and frameworks available** through the UN-REDD Programme and via other sources to support countries to embed REDD+ in broader objectives of a Green Economy transformation.

  • Forest economic valuation & accounting to understanding the importance of forests for the national economy and link to national account
  • Spatial analysis of costs and benefits to implement REDD+
  • *Value at risk* of soft-commodity companies due to deforestation
  • Integration natural capital risk indicators in loans, equities and bonds, etc.
  • Integrated Assessment models

• These enable different ministries to understand the value of REDD+ beyond the Ministry of Environment or Forests, but also Ministry of Planning, Finance, Economic Affairs, etc.
Example: Parties driving change towards reduced forest loss in palm oil sector

Exposé negative behaviour
Advise companies
Liaise between stakeholders

Determine good practice
Agree REDD+ incentives mechanism

License to operate/ penalties for non-compliance
Prepare and implement REDD+ mechanism

Set import restrictions
Provide climate finance

Divest
Restrict access to credit
Access to credit on preferential terms

Impose license to operate
Provide resources to support others’ transition

Provide resources
Veto development

Demand without price premiums
Demand with price premium

Source: UNEP FI
Desired impact
(tackling climate change, protect biodiversity & livelihoods, creating sustainable economic growth)

Potential payments for lower levels of forest emissions compared to benchmark: FREL/FRL verified through MRV

Lower net forest impacts by tackling drivers of deforestation across the economy using a variety of tools

Stripping deforestation from productive supply chains
- Forestry sector (incl. pulp and paper)
- Agriculture sector
- Extractive (mining, oil & gas)

Means/enabling conditions to RBA
- Forest conservation policies
- Enabling conditions SFM / increase supply legal timber
- Stripping deforestation from financial sector
- National & corporate natural capital accounting / valuation
- Fiscal & trade policies
- Forest landscape restoration

Underlying drivers of deforestation
Consumer behaviour, government policies & regulations, private sector impacts & dependencies on natural resources
## Tools and their potential use as policies, actions and measures for results-based actions

| National natural capital valuation & accounting | Acknowledgement value forests across ministries | A) Higher budgets  
B) Domestic funding REDD+  
C) Co-finance international REDD+ Programmes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value at Risk: visualizing environmental risks on corporate profits</td>
<td>Understanding by companies how environmental risks translates into financial risk</td>
<td>Stripping deforestation from productive and financial supply chains can lead to reduced impacts on tropical forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and trade policies</td>
<td>Incentive private and public sector operating models towards lower deforestation levels</td>
<td>e.g. incentivise use degraded land through subsidies; discourage unwanted business activities through higher taxes or tariffs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tools and their potential use as policies, actions and measures for results-based actions

Conservation policies to increase protection of tropical forests
- Laws / regulation to regulate use of tropical forests
  - Through direct enforcement, by working with e.g. financial regulators and others, reduce impact on tropical forests

Forest landscape restoration
- Financial incentives (the “+” in REDD+) to stimulate reforestation of degraded areas
  - Declarations and pledges like the Bonn Declaration to restore 150 million hectares have potential to restore major areas of degraded land

Increase supply legal timber / stimulate Sustainable Forest Management
- Incentivise through laws/regulation (e.g. through FLEG-T) to enhance supply legal timber
  - Reduce impacts on forests from illegal timber extraction & incentivise sustainable forest management
REDD+ RBA Abatement Cost Curve: a potential model for results-based payments

Compare various results-based actions that countries can take in terms of the potential to reduce forest-carbon emissions compared to FR(E)L and the costs it takes to implement them by a country. Also try to non-carbon benefits it generates. See scheme below (for illustrative purposes).

Source: Mulder, UNEP
Ghana: quantification of the potential of different landscape restoration interventions to sequester carbon

The bars represent different restoration interventions. Bigger shaded areas indicate higher carbon benefits for lower costs.
Countries have full flexibility to decide what actions, policies and measures are most effective in their country.

Those measures that are most economically attractive and have a high likelihood of generating actual reductions in forest-carbon emissions compared to FR(E)L are likely to be most interesting to implement.

Measures that are more direct have a higher likelihood of generating RBP if emission levels are reduced compared to FR(E)L than indirect measures.
TOOL

NATIONAL ECONOMIC VALUATION & ACCOUNTING: VISUALIZING COSTS AND BENEFITS THAT ARE HIDDEN

A) Higher budgets Min Env/Forestry
B) Domestic funding REDD+
C) Co-finance international REDD+ Programmes
Quantifying costs & benefits

Types of costs:
- **Opportunity costs**
  - timber
  - alternative land uses (e.g. agriculture)
  - $ per ton CO2 equivalent

- **Transaction & Institutional**
  - national consultation
  - reference levels
  - scheme planning
  - feasibility assessment

- **Implementation**
  - monitoring
  - reforestation
  - land use planning
  - forest protection
  - administration

Types of benefits:
Example: Economic valuation of Panama’s forests ecosystems

Benefits
• sales timber, land agriculture

Costs/losses
• forgone ecosystem benefits
  (water regulation, soil fertility, sedimentation, carbon emissions)

Note
Some losses borne by other sectors in the country (e.g. water regulation, Sedimentation, etc).
Others internationally (carbon emissions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>1992-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gains from deforestation</td>
<td>334.6</td>
<td>2,927.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losses from deforestation</td>
<td>606.4</td>
<td>6,628.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net losses from deforestation</td>
<td>271.8</td>
<td>3,700.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic value of Kenya’s forest ecosystems (‘Water Towers’)

The economic valuation study on the role and contribution of montane forests and related ecosystems to the Kenyan economy found that deforestation in the “Kenyan water towers” deprived the economy of KSH 3,652 million or USD 40 million in 2010. The report showed that the contribution of forests in conventional accounts is undervalued by 2.5%, and estimated that its annual contribution to GDP is around 3.6%.
MULTIPLE BENEFITS OF REDD+ IN THE LANDSCAPE

CURRENTLY AN AREA THE SIZE OF 25 FOOTBALL FIELDS IS BEING DESTROYED EVERY 60 SECONDS. REDD+ WILL ENSURE THAT FORESTS AND TREES ARE MORE HIGHLY VALUED IN DECISION-MAKING.

REDD+ is an effort to create a financial value for the carbon stored in forests, offering incentives for developing countries to reduce emissions from forested lands and invest in low-carbon paths to sustainable development. REDD+ goes beyond addressing deforestation and forest degradation, and aims to make forest management and land use more sustainable within the landscape, and promote conservation and restoration of forests.

When REDD+ prevents the loss or degradation of forests, this will result in multiple benefits in addition to protecting or enhancing carbon stocks. These include “ecosystem-based benefits” such as conservation of forest biodiversity, water regulation, soil conservation, timber, forest foods and other non-timber forest products.

Various factors affect the extent to which these benefits are delivered, the type, location and condition of the forest involved, which REDD+ activity is undertaken, how it is implemented, and the dependence of the local population on forest resources. REDD+ can also lead to direct social benefits, such as jobs, livelihoods, land tenure clarification, carbon payments, enhanced participation in decision-making and improved governance.

Biodiversity

Forests are the habitat for 87% of Earth's terrestrial biodiversity.

Trade

Trade in timber and other forest products, 133 billion dollars per year.

Electricity production

46% of our energy comes from non-renewable sources, and 70% of our electricity is supplied by burning fossil fuels.

Pollination

Food security

33% of the world’s food arises from the services provided by pollinator insects.

Wetlands

Food security

Wetlands provide healthy ecosystems services like $2,800 per hectare of ecosystem services per year.

Energy consumption

Indigenous Peoples

60 billion dollars per year.

Forest communities

1.5 billion dollars per year.

Fisheries

1 billion dollars per year.

Deforestation

33% of the world’s forests are under threat.

Biodiversity

33 of the world’s biggest cities rely on forest services.

Pharmaceuticals

No plants currently in use provide at least 25% of all prescription drugs.

Non-timber products

4 million people depend on non-timber forest products for their livelihoods.

Forest restoration

Doubling the area of forest land could provide a range of benefits to the economy and environment.

Flooding

Forest cover regulates the amount of water available to stabilize watersheds and control flooding.

Mangrove species

30% of the world’s population depends on mangroves for food, income, and livelihood.

UN-REDD programme
VIDEO

MAU FOREST, KENYA
EXERCISE

SPATIAL COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS TO DETERMINE SUITABLE AREAS REDD+ IMPLEMENTATION (UNEP-WCMC)
Natural capital accounting

• Two major flaws with GDP
  1. It only looks at economic performance in a given year: income. No information about the underlying assets and wealth.
  2. Poor representation of natural capital
• Poor representation of natural capital in GDP leads to unsustainable degradation
• Natural capital is a critical asset, especially for developing countries where it makes up a significant share (36%) of total wealth.

“A private company is judged by both its income and balance sheet, but most countries only compile an income statement (GDP) and know very little about the national balance sheet”
Joseph Stiglitz (Nobel prize winner in Economics)
Natural capital accounting

- Wealth accounting (including natural capital accounting) can provide detailed statistics for better management of the economy,

- UN SEEA framework on Experimental Ecosystem Accounting (EEA).

- Countries developing accounts: Botswana, Colombia, Costa Rica, Madagascar, Philippines.

- Indicators covered include water, forests land and ecosystems.
Value at Risk: Depreciation of Natural Capital Leads to Business Risks. A Case to Support REDD+?
Some examples to start with

- **Mine project in danger of being cancelled**: The project was suspended in 2011 at the request of Peru’s central government following protests in Cajamarca by anti-mining activists. Fears are that the mine will threaten water supplies. Cancellation of the project would have serious ramifications for Newmont’s growth prospects and revenue.

- **36 per cent decline in pre-tax profits**: The rising cost of raw materials, such as leathers, caused Mulberry’s gross margins to decline to 61.3 per cent in the six months to the end of September, from 66.2 per cent a year previously.

- **$9.6 billion cost to U.S. power sector of implementing new mercury emission limits**: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency finalized the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards for new coal and petroleum power plants. The emission limits are expected to cost the industry around $9.6 billion to implement and have already had an effect on the building of new coal-fired power plants in the U.S.

- **30 per cent drop in first-quarter net profits**: Cotton prices increased by 150% from 2010 levels. To keep their model of “cheap cash” H&M decided to internalise the increased input costs, rather than passing through to the consumer.

- **Share price falls 12% within a month**: Shares in Archer Daniels Midland, the world’s largest corn processor, fell as corn prices surged amid fears that a widening U.S. drought will trim size of the corn crop.

- **Shares fell 6% in a day**: Tyson shares fell after the company cut its full-year revenue forecast and posted quarterly earnings that missed analysts’ estimates as feed costs rose. Tyson said the 2012 drought in the U.S., which led to higher grain costs, is also leading to increased costs for hog and cattle producers.

Source: Trucost
Different ways how environmental phenomena affect corporate profits....the case of cotton

Source: Trucost analysis; H&M, Gap & Fast Retailing; Factset data
**Stranded assets**: potential for assets to decline in value due to (unforeseen) circumstances

**Value at Risk (VaR)** popular tool in the financial sector. Defined as *the maximum loss not exceeded with a given probability defined as the confidence level, over a given period of time.*

Increasingly being applied by environmental economists: *what is the chance that a company’s value is higher/lower because of currently unaccounted for environmental risk (carbon emissions, deforestation impacts, etc)*

Environmental externalities equate *50% of combined company earnings and 7% profits* (Universal ownership; PRI & UNEP FI)

“Unburnable carbon”: 60 - 80% of *proven fossil fuel reserves* of listed coal, oil and gas companies *cannot be utilized* (see picture); capex for new exploration efforts potentially wasted
Natural Capital Declaration (NCD): An initiative to integrate natural capital risk into financial risk

- The NCD does not aim to put a price on nature.
- It does aim to put a price on the (credit) risk that banks are exposed to through loans, investments and insurance and to catalyze the development of new products.
- It does not aim to be the next PRI or UN GC (in terms of # FIs or companies).
- The NCD does focus on the global financial sector. Engagement with wider private sector is through other platforms / organisations (WBCSD, NCC, CDP, CBD, etc).
- It does focus on tackling the technical challenges of calculating the business case and developing metrics for lenders, investors and insurers to embed natural capital.
Financial institution members of NCD Working Groups
We would like to thank the following signatories for providing financial contributions.

- 40+ institutions have endorsed the NCD at CEO level.
- Most have contributed financially (annual contribution, project contribution).
- A number of institutions have ‘observer status’.
- Growing number interested and committed to actively participate in one or more pilot projects.
- 5 FI representatives are part of the NCD Steering Committee.

Observers

40+ NCD signatories
30+ NCD supporters

- 30+ organisations support the NCD: crucial to create broader acknowledgement and support
- A number are part or (planned) pilot projects.
- 2 representatives are part of the NCD Steering Committee
E-RISC Phase II: Towards Market Readiness

• Develop and refine E-RISC methodology. **Objective: mainstreaming in sovereign credit risk analysis**

• Relevant for i) sovereign credit ratings; and ii) choice and weights of sovereign bonds in an investment portfolio; iii) country risk score

• **Trade-related risks** (how differences in supply-demand of natural resource risks) affect **trade-related GDP** under different price scenarios. Incorporate in macro-economic model to see how trade-related natural resource risks affect the overall economy.

• Will be tested by several participating financial institution, including a major credit rating agency.
E-RISC: hypothesis: environmental risks affect financial risk of sovereign bonds

- **Bad sovereign ratings** = **higher borrowing costs** (i.e. countries have to pay more when their sovereign credit rating deteriorates & vice versa)
- **Linking environmental risks** (e.g. overuse of renewable natural resources (forests, fishing stocks, crops, etc) to **economic and financial impacts**)
- **Why can environmental risks be financially material for a sovereign nation?** If countries *overuse and degrade* forest, fish and other renewable natural resources, they need to import more (negatively affecting trade-related GDP).
E-RISC: hypothesis: environmental risks affect financial risk of sovereign bonds

High yield: expensive to borrow

Low yield: cheap to borrow

Bond yield: price a Government pays to borrow money
> 6 million hectares of forests lost every year
20% of coral reefs destroyed (MA)
US$ 6.6 trillion in environmental costs externalized to society
USD$ 45 billion “cost of policy inaction” (TEEB) – ecosystem degradation

Science is sound, but weak financial argument
Environmental externalities equate 50% of combined company earnings (Universal ownership)
“Unburnable carbon”: 50% of proven fossil fuel reserves cannot be used (Carbon Tracker)
Mismatch between bond ratings utilities and water risks for water and power utilities in the dry US mid-west (Ceres)

Growing focus to quantify “hidden” risks
Are natural resource-related risks becoming systemic?
Major increase in sovereign debt

ESG vs financial analysis

Science on ecosystem degradation clear

Less “E” in Fixed income

E-RISC
Short-term natural resource risks

- Simulating a **10% rise in natural resource prices** leads to an effect on trade-related GDP of **0.2 – 0.5%**

- Not unlikely scenario as GMO (Grantham) study showed 70% price decline of 33 commodities 20e century was offset in 10 years (2000 – 2012).

---

**Exposure to resource price volatility (% of GDP)**

Data source: UNCTAD (for trade data), Global Footprint Network (for renewable resources) and US EIA (for fuels).
E-RISC Phase II: Towards Market Readiness

- Mainstreaming: direct integration in sovereign credit risk analysis (i.e. enhance sovereign credit risk analysis)
- How can it be used: i) sovereign bond valuation; ii) country risk (one factor for corporate loans/bonds) partly based on renewable natural resource risks (forests, fishing stocks, crops, etc); iii) sovereign credit ratings
Stripping deforestation out of productive and financial supply chains

• The ‘value at risk’ approach can be one measure to incentivize companies to rethink their dependency and impacts on tropical forests.

• Consumer Goods Forum: pledge by 400 large companies to ‘strip deforestation from productive supply chains’.

• CISL Banking for Environmental Initiative: aligned with the CGF to remove deforestation from financial supply chains.
Supply chains of ‘forest-risk’ commodities vary considerably but financial institutions are generally involved at different points along the chain in different capacities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soy supply chain example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seed production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Dominated by Monsanto, Dupont &amp; Syngenta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key trends in the soy industry
- Highly consolidated into four main companies
- Most companies are vertically integrated and thus control other segments of the supply chain—traders often provide seed and credit to growers for example
- Geographical differences:
  ▪ Private firms located in Asia and Latin America
  ▪ Public firms located in the US and America

Potential entry points for FIs
- Banks as:
  ▪ Providers of loans
  ▪ Underwriters of bond and stock offerings
  ▪ Research providers
- Investors as:
  ▪ Equity investors- can be active (such as putting forward shareholder resolutions) or passive
   ▪ Holders of corporate bonds/debt
- Insurers as:
  ▪ Providers of commercial, market and political risk cover
### Leading Companies in the Soya Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>HQ country</th>
<th>Company type</th>
<th>Total Revenue* ($M in 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cargill</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$107,882.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Archer Daniels Midland (ADM)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$85,779.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Noble Holdings</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$78,611.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bunge</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$55,024.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wilmar</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$42,588.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Akzo</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$21,162.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>China Agri</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$8,284.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Louis Dreyfus</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$7,925.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Amaggi</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$1,881.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Soya Hellas</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$542.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rasio</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$516.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Soya Mills</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$407.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Iberol</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$271.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Casa Olearia Italiana</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$238.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Oleificio Medio Piave</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$201.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total revenue figures are not soy-specific and represent all revenues from company operations.
## Capital Structure

Bonds allow companies to borrow money for longer period, at cheaper rates vs. borrowing from banks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Company type</th>
<th>Market capitalization ($M market value)</th>
<th>Total debt ($M book value)</th>
<th>% Debt</th>
<th>Credit rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilmar</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$25,686</td>
<td>$22,026</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$19,403</td>
<td>$9,497</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akzo</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$12,299</td>
<td>$4,495</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunge</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$9,020</td>
<td>$5,036</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>BBB-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble Holdings</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$6,111</td>
<td>$7,147</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>BBB-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Agri</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$3,137</td>
<td>$7,147</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Top Underwriters for large Soya producers: Overview of number of debt issues 2006-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ADM</th>
<th>Bunge</th>
<th>Cargill</th>
<th>Bank total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citigroup</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP Morgan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclays Capital</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAML / Bank of America</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSBC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Bank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Suisse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of issues per company</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total debt issued ($mm)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIDEO

CONSUMER GOODS FORUM
NEW YORK CLIMATE SUMMIT
CONSERVATION POLICIES: STIMULATE ENFORCEMENT OF POLICIES THAT REDUCE DEFORESTATION
Smart enforcement of conservation policies

• Since 2005, Brazil has reduced Amazon deforestation 70% below the historical average (even though from 2012 it increased again)

• Financial regulator, innovative approach to enforce conservation policies by not allowing commercial banks to extend credit anymore to farmers and others that do not comply with the law.

• Combination of conservation policies and favourable exogenous factors contributed to a major reduction in deforestation.
VIDEO

BRAZIL’S SUCCESSFUL EFFORTS (UNTIL 2012) TO REDUCE DEFORESTATION
An increasing body of work is looking at the cost benefit analysis of safeguards. WWF, MSCI and others look at the financial impacts of implementing the Principles & Criteria of Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)

### Primary Benefits
- Reduction in social conflicts
- Operational improvements through documentation and better management practices
- Improved staff morale and reduced labour turnover
- Increased revenues and access to markets and capital
- Improved yields for smallholders

### Primary Costs
- Identification and management of HCV areas
- The audit and certification process
- Engaging smallholders
- Segregation costs

### Conclusions
- Each category of benefit could potentially outweigh the RSPO implementation costs
- This often occurs through unexpected or indirect channels
- More evidence required- no ‘one size fits all’ solution

GCF: policy to remove deforestation from supply chains

Compliance to RSPO are low (average = 0.05% of total revenues)
• 47% of companies sourcing palm oil have not made any sustainability commitment.
• > 50% of companies will not meet target of 100% RSPO certification by 2015

Source: MSCI
NCD: stimulate financial institutions to develop soft commodity policies

- 47% of financial institutions evaluated encourage or require companies to avoid land use conversion in High Conservation Value (HCV) areas, and to respect the rights of local communities.
- 13% of financial institutions assessed have developed financial products and services aimed at promoting the production and trade of sustainable commodities.
- The International Finance Corporation (IFC), the Dutch development bank FMO, HSBC and Sumitomo Mitsui Trust Holdings have developed products and services to support the transition to sustainable commodities production and consumption, often through preferential terms.
NCD: stimulate financial institutions to develop soft commodity policies
The role of fiscal and trade policies

• Global, annual, subsidies for fossil fuels and biofuels are respectively US$ 480 billion and US$ 24 billion (in 2011) according to UNEP IRP report.

• About 6% would be sufficient to raise US$ 30 billion/year estimated to meaningfully reduce deforestation from 2020.

• Lowering tariffs for (conventional) palm oil between India and Indonesia to make it equal with RSPO (sustainable palm oil) would enable India to fully take up Indonesia’s sustainably sourced palm oil: 3.8 mega tons at a cost of around US$ 100 million.

• Assuming a that certified soft commodities (soy, beef, palm oil, etc) leads to a reduction in deforestation (in Indonesia) would this be one way how REDD+ funding can be used (e.g. through FREDDI?).
Sustainable forest-management and increasing supply legal timber

- US$ 100 billion market value: illegal felling of high value wood species such as mahogany, timber for furniture and building, wood for pulp and paper and charcoal.

- EU has embarked on a process to ban illegal logged wood products from the European market: FLEGT

- FLEGT = Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade.

- The EU's FLEGT Action Plan was established in 2003. It aims to reduce illegal logging by strengthening sustainable and legal forest management, improving governance and promoting trade in legally produced timber.

- VPA: Voluntary Partnership Agreement: ensure that timber and timber products exported to the EU come from legal sources
Sustainable forest-management and increasing supply legal timber

Implementing
Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ghana, Indonesia, Liberia, Republic of the Congo

Negotiating
Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Guyana, Honduras, Laos, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam

European Union
Forest Landscape Restoration

• Bonn Challenge: restore 150 million hectares of degraded land
• Focusing on the “+” in REDD+
• Case studies China and Ethiopia (video)
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SUMMARIZING: WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED?
Thank you!