

Seminar “Biodiversity conservation and climate change in German development cooperation focusing on forests”

International Academy for Nature Conservation Isle of Vilm
12-16 July 2010

Summary and Conclusions

1 Introduction

Especially from a development perspective, climate change is a highly pressing issue: While most developing countries have very little historic responsibility in terms of greenhouse gas emissions, they are and will be even more affected by the changing climate. Their territories and respective ecosystems are very likely to suffer from climate change (increasing temperature, change in precipitation patterns, sea level rise and all secondary impacts) and their human populations are especially vulnerable.

While the sustainable management of ecosystems is of utmost importance (in terms of biodiversity conservation but also for global climate change mitigation and local adaptation), the developing countries' strive for economic development and their integration into global markets puts the natural environment at stake: natural resources laying the ground for value chains are threatened by unsustainable land-uses. This leads to deteriorating livelihoods, biodiversity loss and even more emissions. Mostly, developing countries' governments are not well equipped to manage these complex and dynamic situations.

Supporting partner countries governments and institutions to make informed and wise decisions for sustainable development, is the foremost task of development cooperation. In July 2010, 35 experts from the fields of development cooperation and biodiversity conservation gathered at the International Academy for Nature Conservation Isle of Vilm to discuss constructive ways forward. The **objectives** of the seminar “Biodiversity conservation and climate change in German development cooperation focusing on forests” were

- to give a detailed overview on the potential of German development cooperation (DC) in forests for mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change
- to discuss the potential, limitations and challenges of REDD+ in achieving climate change mitigation outcomes
- to explore synergies with the forests' contribution to adaptation to climate change
- to discuss the role of protected areas for climate change mitigation and adaptation.

The seminar was organized by GTZ (including the sectoral programmes “Implementing the Biodiversity Convention” and “International Forest Policy”), KfW, DED and the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN). Inspired by key note lectures and case study presentations, the participants explored and analyzed linkages between climate change and forest biodiversity in regards to development cooperation in both terms: mitigation of and adaptation to climate change. Discussions on policies and experience-based learning exercises on existing management instruments in development cooperation brought specific attention to the synergies with and needs from biodiversity conservation. The focus on forest ecosystems provided the necessary example to scrutinize recent approaches, such as REDD, in the light of international development cooperation's long-lasting experiences in the sector.

Definitions

Adaptation: Adjustment in natural or human systems to a new or changing environment. Adaptation to climate change refers to adjustment in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climatic stimuli or their effects, which moderates harm or exploits beneficial opportunities. (UNFCCC)

Baseline (Reference level): A REDD mechanism must specify how emissions reductions are being measured. The reference level defines the reference period and scale against which the activities within scope are measured. (Little REDDbook) The baseline can be based on historic or projected data.

Climate proofing: Systematic assessment of adaptation options in respect to a defined development goal or exposure unit.

Mitigation: A human intervention to reduce the sources or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases. (UNFCCC)

Protected Area: A clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the longterm conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values. (IUCN) IUCN has defined a series of six protected area management categories, based on the primary management objective, ranging from Category 1, Strict Nature Reserves, to Category 6, Managed Resource Protected Area, referring to protected areas managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems.

REDD: Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (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 deforestation and forest degradation, and includes the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks. (UN-REDD)

Sequestration: Plants capture carbon through photosynthesis.

Storage: Ecosystems store lots of carbon; ecosystem protection keeps it there and avoids emissions.

2 Biodiversity and climate change

Biodiversity conservation - as synonym for keeping intact natural ecosystems - and climate change relate in a twofold way:

- (1) ecosystem-based approaches to climate change mitigation (1a) and adaptation (1b);
- (2) adaptation of ecosystems in order to secure local livelihoods, biodiversity values and ecosystem services.

(1a) Ecosystem-based approaches to climate change mitigation

Ecosystem-based mitigation services distinguish "carbon storage", i.e. securing the biomass with its carbon stock as it is, and "carbon sequestration", i.e. capturing carbon from the atmosphere. Natural ecosystems nowadays sequester about 50% of all GHG emissions; major carbon stores exist in soil, forest, peat and inland waters, grassland, mangroves, coastal marshes and sea grass. Restoration of degraded ecosystems can be very important in enhancing or restoring the storage capacities of ecosystems. The Carbon and Biodiversity Atlas (www.carbon-biodiversity.net) shows the significant overlap of "carbon relevant" and "high biodiversity" areas. But only 12% of the terrestrial carbon is stored in pro-

tected areas (WCMC).

Other possible ecosystem-based mitigation activities include improved agricultural techniques (e.g. low emission tillage systems), adapted grazing practices, peatland rewetting, sustainable forest management and agro-forestry. Such activities can offer win-win solutions as they often also contribute to biodiversity conservation. Compared to technical engineering solutions, the ecosystem-based approaches are more affordable for local communities and need less external input. However, due to competing land uses, ecosystem-based mitigation options cannot completely replace but complement technical mitigation solutions.

(1b) Ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation

As defined above, adaptation aims to moderate the harm expected from climate change or even exploit possible benefits. *Ecosystem-based adaptation* relates to non-technical adaptation solutions, i.e. management, conservation and restoration of ecosystems to enable people to adapt to climate change. This could be e.g. flood plain restoration/conservation or mangrove restoration/conservation to prevent damages from increased storm surges (when the alternative would be building dykes). Other ecosystem functions, such as ground water supply, microclimatic effects, provision of food, increase the local populations' resilience and adaptive capacity. Compared to technical solutions, these activities are more affordable for local communities, might relate to community development aims and need less external input. They might therefore rate higher in priority setting during a climate proofing.

Ecosystem management approaches aiming to ensure both, biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation and adaptation, range from sustainable natural resource management to conservation and restoration. At various degrees they are aiming at:

- Promoting resilient ecosystems, e.g. through both ecological and social means
- Maintaining ecosystem services, e.g. through valuation of ecosystem services
- Supporting sectoral adaptation, e.g. through integration of biodiversity in land-use planning
- Reducing risks and disasters, e.g. through restoration of key habitats
- Complementing infrastructural measures, e.g. through maintenance of river flow in a dam re-engineering project

To a large extent *ecosystem-based solutions serve both mitigation and adaptation at the same time* as the following forest-related examples illustrate: Fire management preventing forest loss secures the forests' ecosystem services and at the same time prevents emissions from burnt biomass. Restoration and sustainable use of biodiversity-rich forests captures carbon from the atmosphere and enhances local livelihoods, ergo decreases the vulnerability of forest-dependent communities.

(2) Adaptation of ecosystems

Ecosystems are determined by climatic circumstances. Accordingly, their distribution, composition, structure, function, phenology, values and services undergo changes together with climate change. Climate change will exacerbate the effects of other existing stresses (habitat destruction, species loss, etc.). For some ecosystems, there is significant risk that they will reach "tipping points", and change into a qualitatively different state, e.g. tropical rain forest turning into savannah.

Adaptation of ecosystems is a precondition not only for keeping its biodiversity values but also their mitigation and adaptation services, ergo local and global social wellbeing. Maintaining genetic, species and ecosystem diversity as well as size and connectivity of populations by reducing fragmentation (expansion of protected area networks, establishment of ecological corridors) can contribute to resilience

and adaptation of ecosystems to climate change. However, these efforts are limited by the species adaptive capacity, the conditions at the change spots, and the already existing fragmentation of habitats.

Working with "natural solutions" to tackle climate change requires improved coordination between sectors that need to contribute to the conservation of the natural assets. All adaptation and mitigation measures (such as i.e. promotion of renewable energies) and other development related activities may have positive or negative impacts on the climate and on biodiversity as well as on socio-economic development. They therefore need to be assessed in a holistic manner.

GTZ -tools for climate change adaptation relevant to biodiversity conservation

The GTZ Climate Task Team developed a tool called "Climate Proofing for Development" aiming at systematic climate risk reduction and increase of adaptive capacity.

The "Climate Proofing" tool guides through the logical sequence of defining threats (climate change signals, exposure units and potential biophysical / socio-economic impacts), determining need for action and identification and prioritization of adaptation options. Within the assessment's frame-setting, ecosystems can be defined as exposure units (which would relate to option (2) above) as much as their adaptation services can be among the possible adaptation options (which would relate to option (1b) above). This general approach is being complemented by sector specific activities, such as the ecosystem vulnerability assessment developed by the GTZ's sectoral biodiversity program.

The GTZ-tools are related to the OECD Policy Guidance on "Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Development Co-operation" (2009). GTZ, on behalf of OECD has developed an according training, aiming to enhance capacity among development actors to take action on climate change adaptation.

3 Policy responses to climate change with significance to biodiversity and forests

The UNFCCC process

The *United National Framework Convention on Climate Change* (UNFCCC, 1992) assumed that appropriate mitigation efforts could stabilize the atmospheric concentration of GHG at a level low enough to prevent dangerous man-made effects on the global climate. This should happen in a time frame that would allow ecosystems to adapt naturally, ensure food security and still allow for sustainable economic growth. The *Clean Development Mechanism* was introduced, a facility for climate-friendly investments by developed countries in developing countries. Of relevance to biodiversity is the potential eligibility of afforestation and reforestation projects; but up to date hardly any projects have been approved due to the extremely complicated mechanism.

Having realized that the 1992 assumption of appropriate mitigation had not come true but additional large scale emissions occurred also due to deforestation in tropical countries, the Conference of the Parties (COP) 13 in Bali (2007) decided to integrate the emissions from deforestation into the future climate protection regime and proposed a global mechanism to stimulate actions to reduce emissions from deforestation in developing countries. Many developed countries committed themselves to support such a REDD-mechanism and various funds were established accordingly. E.g. the IKI (International Climate Initiative of the German Federal Ministry for Environment and Nuclear Safety, BMU) channels about 28% of its funds in 2010 (about 120m EUR) into conserving carbon sinks and carbon stores, seeking for synergies between climate and biodiversity protection.

At COP 13 in Bali an agreement on a timeline and structured negotiation on the post-2012 framework (the end of the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol) was achieved with the adoption of the Bali Action Plan. This also included enhanced action and international cooperation on *adaptation* to enable climate-resilient development and reduce vulnerability, especially in developing countries.

The UNFCCC-process is only one of several international policy processes touching the fields of biodiversity and forests which hardly work in a synergistic manner, such as the UNFF (United Nations Forum on Forests) and the CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity). The CBD for example has a work program on forest biodiversity and will discuss on the upcoming negotiation in October 2010 ways and means to achieve co-benefits for biodiversity, combating desertification, land degradation and climate change. .

However, at instrument level the climate change arena could learn from the existing approaches (see below).

REDD – Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation

The rationale behind REDD is the fact that forest destruction accounts for 1/5 of global GHG emissions. At the same time growing forests are important carbon sinks. The scope of REDD has been enlarged step by step during international negotiations: Starting with Reduced Emissions from Deforestation (RED), degradation has been added (REDD) and finally also sustainable management of forests has been considered as an important means for carbon stock enhancement (REDD+). There are a number of multilateral initiatives to support REDD+ such as the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) and the Forest Investment Program (FIP) of the World Bank, the United Nations Collaborative initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (UN-REDD) in developing countries, led by FAO, UNDP and UNEP and the Copenhagen-Paris-Oslo-Process.

Although it looks like a good start, a number of challenges need to be met during the ongoing negotiations related to (i) the level of accounting (national or sub national level), (ii) the financial support system, (iii) methodological aspects and (iv) safeguards, to finalize a decision regarding the integration of REDD into the UNFCCC Post Kyoto agreements:

(i) the level of accounting: In reality, actors at different levels (project and sub-national as well as national) are expecting payments. In theory, there are three options for the accounting of emission saving and incentives: (1) only at national level, (2) only at sub-national level (here included projects) or (3) a combination (national and sub-national) with performance-based incentives given directly to the Government and to actors at sub-national and project level. Whereas the 2nd option is most unlikely to come true, there is indication that the combined approach, denominated as *nested approach*, might reach consensus. However, this requires inter alia that national and sub-national baselines and monitoring are consistent and that double or multiple counting of emission reductions is avoided. For an interim period sub-national leakage will have to be accounted.

(ii) the financial background: The idea of REDD coming into effect, and especially the large sums of money involved have fueled many discussions and have raised expectations in developing countries. However, there are huge gaps between the budget needed as claimed by developing countries' representatives, and the sums pledged by developed countries, and the finally deposited money. It is not yet clear if the REDD-money will in the end really be additional or if it may include former ODA-pledges. Furthermore there is a voluntary market that plays a small but important role.

(iii) the definition of baselines: Baselines are an incremental part of establishing a REDD-project as they provide the reference level necessary for accounting. There are two methodological concepts: back-looking, historic baselines and prospected, forward looking ones. A case study from Peru revealed the

limitations of a historical baseline: In an area of prospected fossil oil exploitation, for example, it is most unlikely that the historical low deforestation rate may sustain. A case study from peatlands in Belarus made clear that only forward looking baselines would help to select the appropriate management activities (in this case rewetting) that would bring the desired effects and give realistic estimates of avoided emissions. However, prospected baselines are even more difficult in methodological terms, and their establishment will cause even more costs. The opportunity costs of establishing a baseline may well put the REDD-instrument at stake.

(iv) safeguards: Safeguards are standards that should ensure that REDD activities do not negatively impact social development and biodiversity conservation (see below win-win-win). This is especially important in the case of the openly negotiated voluntary agreements.

Currently much emphasis is put on capacity building, MRV (monitoring, reporting, verification) and pilot activities but it seems that the commonly known drivers for deforestation and degradation are still largely neglected and the demand side not adequately considered.

Other forest related initiatives

Besides REDD there are a number of international forest related processes aiming at sustainable forest management and reduction of forest loss and degradation, thus biodiversity conservation. They all agree that loss of forest cover, forest degradation and loss of trees outside of forests have manifold causes: large scale land-use change, illegal/unsustainable logging, unsustainable fuelwood extraction as well as subsistence agriculture and infrastructure. There is also consensus on respective ecological, social and economic consequences especially loss of biodiversity, income and environmental services. All initiatives share a common goal: the enhancement of sustainable forest management and conservation.

The main process of international forest policy dialogue continued after the World Summit (UNCED, 1992) in the informal Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) and the subsequent Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF) for five years. In its final session in 1997, the IPF called on its member countries to adopt National Forest Programmes (nfps) as the first commonly agreed concept to further actual implementation of sustainable forest management (SFM), applicable to all countries and to all types of forests. Adhering to qualitative aspects (principles especially national sovereignty, country leadership, partnership and participatory mechanisms, establishment of inter-sectoral linkages), nfps were to provide effective linkages between the international forest policy dialogue and national realities, as well as between strategic and operational planning.

In 2000, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC), established the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), a subsidiary body composed of all Member States of the United Nations and specialized agencies. In 2007 ECOSOC adopted the Non-Legally Binding Instrument on All Types of Forests (NLBI) which was negotiated at the UNFF and which is considered a milestone, as the instrument is expected to have a major impact on international cooperation and national action to reduce deforestation, prevent forest degradation, promote sustainable livelihoods and reduce poverty for all forest-dependent peoples.

There are also some forest specific initiatives addressing illegal logging such as FLEG, FLEGT, EU-FLEGT Action Plan, EU FLEGT Voluntary Partnership Agreements and EU Due Diligence Regulation aiming at fostering good governance in the sector by using market instruments and addressing the demand side.

Also, most multilateral environmental agreements (MEA), esp. UNFCCC, CBD, UNCCD comprise parts addressing forest issues such as the CBD's program of work on forest biodiversity.

All these processes, entirely or partially targeted to forests, can synergetically contribute to the role of forests for mitigation and adaptation. On the basis of common definitions of forests and SFM, they can enhance suitable framework conditions (good governance, law enforcement, anti-corruption), address drivers of deforestation, mainstream SFM, agree on proposals for action and help to further develop REDD-strategies including additional funding and allocation of funds.

4 Win-win-win

Win-win-win means to achieve several benefits (environmental, social and climate) through a single action. It equally means that benefits are mutually supportive.

Considering REDD, the relationship between the three issues climate, biodiversity and livelihoods is a continuum ranging from safeguards and co-benefits to win-win-win.

From the perspective of carbon saving, consideration of biodiversity aspects serves to enhance resilience of forests and consequently sustainability of REDD activities. The carbon stock can be enhanced through planting/maintaining landscape- eco-corridors. Sustainability of REDD activities and thus carbon storage is also secured, if livelihood aspects are considered as they increase acceptance and ownership. Participation of local communities in compensation payments sets incentives to maintain forests.

From the angle of biodiversity REDD can help to conserve biodiversity hot-spots and fragile ecosystems and to restore biodiversity in degraded areas. As mentioned above, livelihood aspects are important for maintaining forests which again serves biodiversity.

From the livelihoods perspective people can benefit from additional money that is channeled to their region for development activities. From a meta-perspective people also benefit from conserving forest services. However, people's immediate impression might not be purely positive if REDD comes along with a fenced-off approach.

An example of such a win-win-win situation is forest conservation and SFM: There is a biodiversity gain by in-situ conservation of habitat for plant and animal species, an economic gain by increased income generation, a socio-cultural gain through culture protection of indigenous people and local communities, a mitigation gain by carbon storage and finally the adaptive function through prevention of erosion (landslides), and maintenance of nutrient and water flow.

These multiple benefits are communicated through standards. The Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA), a global partnership of companies and NGO, has developed a standard for projects which deliver credible and significant climate, community and biodiversity benefits in an integrated and sustainable manner. The *approved status* certifies positive climate, biodiversity and community impacts. For the *gold status* at least one additional standard must be met: climate change adaptation benefits, exceptional community benefits and/or exceptional biodiversity benefits.

5 Conclusions

During the seminar, the discussions on ecosystem-based approaches to climate change mitigation and adaptation from the different angles increased the impression that the international policy sphere and practitioners needs are still largely disconnected. At international level much effort is invested in developing methodologies and searching for finance, raising lots of expectations, whereas on field level not much has changed yet. The example of REDD proves that highly sophisticated MRV-systems are being

discussed at international level, while the "old forest governance and SFM instruments" could already limit deforestation if only they were implemented.

Dealing with adaptation and mitigation may also provoke the question "Is there anything new?" as current measures often resemble the well-known development approaches. However, the systematic assessment of future climate influences as part of development planning processes is new. The strategic discussion on climate change offers an opportunity to enhance ecosystem-based solutions as they can provide sustainable and cost-effective development options. They offer potentially powerful arguments for biodiversity conservation. The search for synergies between climate, biodiversity and livelihood issues has the potential for win-win-win solutions. Planned in a participatory manner, ecosystem-based mitigation and adaptation measures can enhance local development and ownership and at the same time conserve or even re-install biodiversity. New instruments for assessing possible impacts of climate change such as the climate proofing, ensure that these aspects are taken into account. When dealing with partner countries, clear and transparent communication is an important task to assist partners to make effective and informed decisions.

The climate change adaptation and mitigation discussion highlights the role of ecosystems' efficient contributions to climate change mitigation and adaptation. They could be used as a strong argument backing conservation efforts by protected area managers and the biodiversity community. In implementation, biodiversity conservation in times of climate change needs to further work towards a more inclusive and target-oriented approach. However, there is need for further discussion on the definition of "which biodiversity" can and should be protected in times of climate change given scarce resources. This highly ethical and at the same time very practical question asks for a clear focus of the interventions: What role does biodiversity play in a country's development? Do we protect biodiversity or ecosystem services (e.g. carbon) or both? How can ecosystems be kept intact? How does biodiversity contribute to ecological and social resilience to climate change and other pressures? How does biodiversity contribute to maximizing carbon capture and storage in forests?

Finances are a key issue: Climate related funding mechanisms can contribute to the improvement of conservation efforts, e.g. the protected area systems. REDD is one possible source of additional funding, but at the moment it is still very uncertain when and how this will come into effect, apart from seed money. The high transaction costs reduce the chances of fast and wide application of REDD. In the meantime, other payments for environmental services could come in place more quickly, such as the Forest Share in Rügen, where tourists can purchase shares which are used to finance afforestation activities. At local level stakeholders need to see tangible benefits from conservation. There is need to attach not only an economic value but also a market price to the services of intact ecosystems to make their protection competitive.

The concept of payments for climate change mitigation and adaptation is of utmost importance to development cooperation as it touches the basic principle of social justice. Especially in this field there is need for realistic approaches and hands-on instruments that relate experiences in the past with future challenges.

The above mentioned tasks and questions require new/other skills of the involved staff as well as ongoing support from development cooperation. There is a strong call for capacity building and guidance for practitioners, such as tangible decision support by learning how to deal with abstract research data and efficient implementation by learning from concrete examples of best practices.

Annex

Coordination team:

Thora Amend, GTZ; Judith Jabs and Gisela Stolpe, BfN; Claudia Mayer and Alexandra Müller, GTZ SV Biodiv; Stefanie von Scheliha, GTZ SV IWP.

Presenters (plenary):

Martin Bostroem, KfW; Barbara Fröde-Thierfelder, ECO Consult; Britta Heine, consultant; Susanne Lehmann, BfN; Alexandra Müller, GTZ SV Biodiv; Lucio Pedroni, Carbon Decisions; Petra Ruth, IKI Programm Office; Trevor Sandwith, The Nature Conservancy; Stefanie von Scheliha, GTZ SV IWP; Michael Scholze, GTZ Climate Task Team; Dicky Simorangkir, The Nature Conservancy; Jutta Stadler, BfN; Ariane Steinsmeier, The Nature Conservancy.

Presenters at the marketplace:

"Experiences in biodiversity conservation and climate change":

Thora Amend, GTZ; Britta Heine, consultant; Mirjam de Koning, DED RSA; Cornelia Sepp, ECO Consult; Heinz Terhorst, GTZ FORCLIME Indonesia.

Excursion leaders:

Gisela Stolpe, BfN; Franziska Tanneberger, University of Greifswald; Gerd Klötzer, Forest district Rügen.

Facilitators:

Barbara Fröde-Thierfelder and Cornelia Sepp, ECO Consult.

This **report** has been prepared by Barbara Fröde-Thierfelder and Cornelia Sepp, ECO Consult. It is based on the presentations and discussions during the seminar. The daily feedback-teams contributed in summarizing the conclusions: Ariane Steinsmeier and Ismet Khaeruddin; Martina Duerto and Dominic Stanculescu; Ulrich Flender and Tomas Keilbach; Britta Heine and Christoph Nolte.

For additional information on the seminar please contact martina.finger@bfm-vilm.de.

Program

| Sunday 11 July | Monday 12 July | Tuesday 13 July | Wednesday 14 July | Thursday 15 July | Friday 16 July |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| | <p>1 Setting the scene</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aims & objectives of the seminar - Climate change: causes, trends, consequences - Addressing climate change (mitigation, adaptation, ecosystem-based adaptation and mitigation) - International policy responses - German responses | <p>2 What is the role of forest biodiversity for mitigation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - REDD - Case studies on REDD - International & national forest policy processes | <p>3 What is the role of forest biodiversity for adaptation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management for adaptation - Case studies (Bangladesh, Vietnam) <p>4 Financing adaptation and mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financing ecosystem-based adaptation and mitigation - Conclusions and challenges | <p>Reflection of the field trip</p> <p>6 How to link climate change and protected areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How to address climate change through protected area management: practical implications and policy recommendations - Case studies - Conclusions and challenges | <p>8 How to remain updated and active?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overview on training, tools and support services - Overall conclusions of the seminar, lessons learnt and outlook - Evaluation of the seminar |
| | <p>Guided tour around the Isle of Vilm</p> <p>GTZ climate proofing for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - training unit - case study | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Carbon and Biodiversity Atlas - Group work on critical issues of REDD with regard to biodiversity conservation in DC - Are you REDDY? Training unit on REDDiness | <p>5 Field trip: Local contributions of forests and peatlands to climate regulation and biodiversity conservation</p> | <p>7 How to design win-win situations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biodiversity and livelihood benefits of REDD - Group work on win-win design | <p>Departure 13.30/13.35 (boat), 14.00 (train)</p> |
| <p>Arrival</p> <p>Welcome & introduction</p> <p>Soccer World Cup: final match</p> | <p>Introduction to the field trip</p> | <p>Dinner in Stralsund</p> | <p>Farewell party</p> | | |