



Governance

International
National
Communication

International Processes

Different conventions & processes negotiated separately:

- Differences in language,
- No mechanisms of co-ordination
- Each sees S. Development from a different perspective.
- Definitions problematic.

A 'Messy' business

We shouldn't think that there is a neat, easily applied, quick solution,

- We are at the start of a new narrative:
- Pilot schemes,
- Trial and error,
- Communication.

International

- Simple 'outcomes' should be possible to negotiate,
- Financial instrument with rules and compliance systems,
- Baseline approach,
- How likely that principles of SFM will feature?

Problems?

- Carbon farming rather than SFM,
- Perverse outcomes,
- Reputational risk.

Sovereignty

- Not up to international community to say how countries manage their land or deal with internal conflict,
- Sensitivity to language,
- Up to countries to decide how they will operate within the baseline constraints,
- Deforestation is a socio-political issue, but these issues are owned by countries, not international processes

Accountability

- Ownership of audit & compliance systems, (GF?)
- Dealing with leakage?
- Simple things work, difficult things (e.g. technology transfer) don't,

Risks

- SFM becomes sidelined (Carbon farming & deforestation become the only valid concerns),
- Perverse outcomes,
- Commercial & trade – market instruments,
- Reputational,
- No outcomes.