

**gtz**



Coalition for Rainforest Nations



Federal Ministry for the  
Environment, Nature Conservation  
and Nuclear Safety

## **CD REDD**

# **Capacity Development for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation**

**Understanding National Inventories for the LULUCF Sector:  
The Experience of Annex-I Countries**

**5-7 November 2008  
Berlin, Germany**

## **Table of Contents/List of Presentations**

Climate Change and Development: Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation  
Ms. Federica Bietta

Reporting Under the UNFCCC: Overview of Annex I Parties  
Dr. Maria Sanz-Sanchez

Supporting Decision Makers with the Best Climate Change Science/Estimating Stock Changes  
Dr. Zoltan Somogyi

Estimation of GHG Emissions and Removals Using IPCC Methodology: Forestry Case Studies, Hungary  
Dr. Zoltan Somogyi

USA National Inventory: Reporting for the LULUCF Sector  
Ms. Kimberly Todd

National System and National Inventory Report of Germany for LULUCF  
Dr. Karsten Dunger

Italian GHG Inventory—National System/Quality Assurance & Quality Control  
Dr. Riccardo de Lauretis

Reporting Emissions and Removals from Forests: Experience of LULUCF in Europe  
Dr. Sandro Federici

World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility: An Experience from Nepal  
Mr. Pem Kandel

German International Climate Initiative/GTZ  
Mr. Martin Homola and Ms. Lisa Maushof

United States EPA Approach to Building GHG Inventory Capacity  
Dr. Stephen Ogle

UN-REDD Programme  
Ms. Claudia Hiepe

CD-REDD Program  
Mr. Kevin Conrad

## Acronyms

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CfRN	Coalition for Rainforest Nations
COP-15	15 <sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
DEFRA	Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GEOSS	Global Earth Observation System of Systems
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GOFC-GOLD	Global Observation of Forest and Land Cover Dynamics
GPG	Good Practice Guidance
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
REL	Reference Emission Level
UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration for Rights of Indigenous People
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
WB	World Bank

## Day 1 – Introduction

Under UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol, Annex-I Parties have been requested to establish a national GHGs inventory system and to submit an annual National Inventory Report (NIR) to the UNFCCC Secretariat. The IPCC Inventory Task Force published the 2003 LULUCF Good Practice Guidance (adopted by COP/MOP for reporting under KP) and the 2006 AFOLU Guidelines which provide comprehensive and exhaustive methodological approaches to assess GHGs emissions and removals from land at a national scale under any particular national circumstance.

The objective of the workshop was to introduce developing countries to techniques and practices of Annex-I countries in establishing national GHG inventory systems and to provide guidance on the procedural aspects of completing a national GHGs inventory under the UNFCCC. Danilo Mollicone of the CfRN reminded delegates that the **National System** and the **National Inventory** of greenhouse gases ensure the equivalence of net emissions estimates among Parties and sectors. He further stated that Country performance is based on reported Inventory estimates. Mollicone provided effective working definitions of the National System and the National Inventory.

Dr. Mollicone then reviewed the purposes and objectives of IPCC Good Practice Guidance for producing accurate and transparent estimates with few uncertainties.

## Welcome Messages

Dr. Norbert Gorissen, Head of the Department for International Cooperation of the Federal Republic of Germany Ministry of Environment, welcomed and informed delegates that 120€ million have been earmarked for international mitigation, adaptation and biodiversity projects. This initiative is active in 40 developing countries and includes selected REDD activities. Dr. Gorissen pledged that the financing will continue well into the next year at the minimum.

Ms. Federica Bietta, Deputy Director of the CfRN, then extended a welcome message. Her presentation provided a history of REDD negotiations prior to COP-11 in Montreal. She also introduced a tiered system of REDD and a corresponding basket of instruments. The system calls for clear outcomes outlined by demonstration projects (Bali), followed by a scaling up of initiatives (Poznan) and leading to a REDD market mechanism (Copenhagen). Ms. Bietta also spoke at length of consideration of a new body, the Global Forest Carbon Framework, which will combine objectives and initiatives of the FCPF of the World Bank, GEF and UN REDD. She noted that the European Union and ‘The Eliasch Review’ by the PM Brown’s special envoy in Climate Change and Energy have also called for a similar body.

Dr. Mollicone proceeded to place the three IPCC GPG workshops in context. The goal of all three is to enable non-Annex I Parties to quickly fulfill the procedural and methodological requirements for a transparent, accurate, consistent, complete and comparable monitoring and reporting system of the forest sector. The Berlin workshop will discuss Annex-I countries and the complexities encountered and how these nations are resolving them. The workshop in Brazil will discuss land representation issues of monitoring systems. Mollicone noted that since 1998 Brazil has instituted a system that is state of the art and independent of the Kyoto Protocol. The third workshop in India will be focused on carbon stocks and carbon stocks changes estimates in forests by means of the experience of non-Annex I

countries such as India and Mexico. This workshop will be organized with the Forest Department of the FAO because of their experience in forest assessment programs.

The Democratic Republic of Congo noted that the European Union is presently in favor of a fund, not a market mechanism. DRC reported that the Congo Basin countries received funding from the World Bank for development of Reference Scenarios but also need guidance on how to deal with mining, agriculture and other drivers of deforestation.

Nicaragua said that the country enjoyed the support of the FAO but need further assistance on implementation of information and funding on the ground. The question of how the global economic crisis would affect the cost of addressed was deemed of utmost importance.

Mexico asked whether different models (REDD, SFM, etc.) may be employed simultaneously within a country? Dr. Mollicone replied affirmatively and stated that many instruments need to be used to ensure success. However, politically, the issue is not so clear and a basket of instruments needs to be determined based on national circumstances.

Ms. Bietta noted that in spite of the economic crisis, money remains available and cited Norway and the United Kingdom as examples.

### **Reporting Under the UNFCCC: Overview of Annex I Parties**

Dr. Maria Sanz-Sanchez presented on the importance of robust GHG inventories and the regulations that Annex-I countries follow to determine such inventories. She stressed that reporting is not accounting.

Honduras asked how a country should deal with prescribed forest fires. How does a country deal with emissions from these forest fires?

Sanz-Sanchez replied that all human activities (ie, emissions) must be reported. Prescribed should be reported. Honduras noted that carbon stocks are protected by managed fires and asked if there is a contradiction? Sanz-Sanchez observed that it is fundamentally unfair not to report all emissions and noted that the saved carbon stocks are also reported under the relevant pool of the forest land category.

Kenya asked about additionality issues and how Annex I inventories are deemed to be compliant under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. Dr. Sanz-Sanchez replied that additionality is an accounting issue. As for compliance, the UNFCCC does not review reports. Instead, teams of experts, chosen by those inscribed in the UNFCCC roster of experts and equitably selected among industrialized and developing countries, are involved in the fulfillment of the review process. The resulting report is published by the UNFCCC. Disputes between the expert team and the host country are referred to the UNFCCC Compliance Committee.

Nicaragua noted that limited budgets restrict activity and asked of the availability of assistance. Sanz-Sanchez noted that realization of an Inventory is up to country but added that inventories have other uses beyond determination of carbon credits. Donors and institutions may assist. She further noted that in the past different data sets have been provide to UNFCCC and FAO and they are currently attempting to harmonize reporting.

Papua New Guinea reported that lack of funding results in “guesswork” and asked if data within the UNFCCC archive might help developing countries. Dr. Sanz-Sanchez stated that the National Communications records may provide guidance and that they are a matter of public record.

Central African Republic said that because of political priorities, forest inventories are overlooked. Sanz-Sanchez suggested that because of cultural similarities and national circumstances similarities, South-South cooperation could be helpful.

Dr. Sanz-Sanchez summarized the role of the UNFCCC as a conveyer of the message that GPGs should be used for inventories and that these inventories are fundamentally important and have many uses and should be employed as a tool. Synthesis and assessment reports are superb sources of information and are available on the UNFCCC website. Efforts are currently underway to produce material on how to implement IPCC GPGs.

### **Supporting Decision Makers with the Best Climate Change Science**

Dr. Zoltan Somogyi, IPCC Guidelines author and Fellow at the Hungarian Forest Research Institute, presented a history of reactions to climate change over 30 years which gave rise to the IPCC. He reviewed the IPCC Methodological Reports: 1) 1996 Revised Guidelines (excluding LULUCF); 2) 2003 GPG for LULUCF; and 2006 Guidelines. He noted that the FAO selected the 2006 Guidelines for its 2010 Assessment Report.

Kenya stated that there is a disconnection between developing countries and the latest IPCC findings. Dr. Somogyi urged delegates to research and attend various events and conferences.

Guyana asked about the process of getting an IPCC review. For methodologies that have been formed, what can be done to guarantee that they are compliant? Somogyi suggested that countries urge their scientists to publish reports including said methodologies in peer reviewed journals to gain recognition and acceptance. He added that IPCC only issue reports.

Central African Republic expressed concern over politically driven research. Somogyi said compromise is sometimes necessary as policymakers sometimes interpret data differently that scientists.

### **Estimating Carbon Stock and Carbon Stock Changes**

Dr. Somogyi started this presentation by stating that estimation matters because carbon has become vital. The designation AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Uses) was adopted for the IPCC

2006 Guidelines to replace LULUCF. It is accepted as more complete and there is less chance of double-counting.

Liberia asked if double-counting is the primary reason to use AFOLU. Somogyi noted that the main reason is that it is more user-friendly and more concise.

Democratic Republic of Congo asked if using default data could lead to uncertainties and, if so, how best to avoid this? Somogyi replied that because of National Circumstances, deviation from the mean will occur, therefore local measurements are required.

Democratic Republic of Congo then expressed concern with the FAO definition of forest—by their standard everything but the desert is forest. Dr. Somogyi stated that countries should set their own forest definition ensuring consistency among estimates and processes (e.g. FAO).

Cameroon asked how much can a country rely on remote sensing with respect to carbon measurements. Somogyi clarified that while remote sensing has advanced, it is not highly accurate and groundwork is needed.

Dr. Mollicone explained the two types of remote sensing: active (radar) and passive (optical). Active remote sensing measures forest cover and limited carbon loss within forests. However, accurate reporting of loss requires fieldwork and measurement of all carbon pools.

Malaysia inquired about treatment of managed land. Somogyi explained that managed land is forest where one can expect carbon emissions due to human activities.

Liberia asked what other factors other than “age” need to be considered when stratifying forests. Dr. Somogyi listed tree species type, climate and terrain characteristics as factors that should be considered.

Mexico which has remote sensing and other data asked what degree of precision is needed for IPCC approval? Somogyi noted that the IPCC does not consider or determine error margins and suggests more measurements be taken in areas with many emissions and removals.

Ghana asked if data is unavailable within one of the carbon pools, what should a country do? Dr. Somogyi stated that carbon stock change is the most important and that to be conservative shall be the lighthouse when accurate data is lacking. He then observed that IPCC 2006 software which will help determine inventory, will soon be available.

Nicaragua stated that developing countries do not have “timelines” of data to determine carbon stock and loss. Vegetation is heterogeneous. With respect to these variables, what precision is needed? Somogyi said that countries must rely on National Circumstances and conditions and perhaps countries should apply different methodologies to different areas.

Nicaragua offered that it does not cut more than annual growth there is no net carbon emissions and noted that it may be crucial to REDD. When a disturbance occurs, Nicaragua activates regeneration activities to compensate. Somogyi added that much data is needed to establish SFM and advised Nicaragua to consult other sources.

Costa Rica stressed the preservation of forest canopies. Dr. Sanz-Sanchez stressed that while canopy preservation does reduce carbon emissions, soil disturbance does result in emissions.

### **Estimation of GHG Emissions and Removals Using IPCC Methodology: Forestry Case Studies, Hungary**

Dr. Somogyi briefed the delegation on current practices of GHG estimation in Hungary.

### **Day 2—USA National Inventory: Reporting for the LULUCF Sector**

Kimberly Todd of the Environmental Protection Agency opened the second day of presentations with an explication of the United States reporting practices for the LULUCF sector. She noted that the initiative was led by the EPA with cooperating agencies and used the IPCC Guidance as a broad guide.

Cambodia asked about private plots. Ms. Todd replied that the location of plots and resulting data is confidential.

Dr. Sandro Federici interjected and reminded participants that the USA is a continent and must contend with more factors than many developing countries.

Honduras asked if new plots have been developed for carbon. Ms. Todd replied that established plots were used for new carbon measurements and that previously taken data was re-evaluated with respect to carbon.

Guyana posed that if plots are permanent and of fixed methodology, how does a country account for disturbances that are unique to time, like Hurricane Katrina. Ms. Todd answered that plot systems should pick up larger events such as Katrina over time—smaller events may go undetected. Sampling of the plot system is extensive enough to detect large events.

Dr. Stephen Ogle of Colorado State University co-led the presentation and urged delegates to consider long-term inventory strategies and not to rush to a Tier 3 model.

Nicaragua noted that the soil is heterogeneous and because of poverty, there is rapid land-use change. Which model is best for this scenario? Dr. Ogle suggested the Century model could be used and has been used in developing countries although not in Central America. Ogle added that Century could work in forests but must be tested on a country by country basis. Century methods are consistent with IPCC guidelines.

Papua New Guinea asked if Century is applicable to REDD. Is there a value add or should modeling be abandoned given limited resources? Dr. Ogle said if there is capacity and resources, modeling can enhance inventory study.

### **National System and National Inventory Report of Germany for LULUCF**

Dr. Karsten Dunger of the Johann Heinrich von Thünen-Institut for Forest Ecology and Forest Inventory reported on Germany's inventory initiative. He informed the participants that there is a separate reporting system for LULUC and Forestry but a process of integration is in development.

Cameroon asked if a 5 meter minimum tree level is eligible for CDM funding. Dunger replied that each country has different parameters and thresholds. He added that with respect to emissions from forests, only data for living biomass is available. Soils, litter and deadwood data are expected soon.

Liberia noted that data collection is "on demand" and asked what drives this demand. Dr. Dunger noted that there is always demand and that political expediency is the primary driver. It is a big concern in Germany.

Dr. Mollicone explained that circular plots are usually the best because they minimize the border-error and relascope methods could be applied.

Malaysia asked how many plots will yield enough data of carbon stock. Dr. Dunger offered that it depends on the variability of forest conditions due to management practices, tree-composition and environmental constraints and variability. Germany uses about 6,000 plots.

Honduras asked if permits are needed for private plots? Dunger said no—in Germany if a forest is private, it must be managed and the owner must have a plan. Owners work with the forestry service and report changes.

### **Italian GHG Inventory—National System/Quality Assurance & Quality Control**

Dr. Riccardo de Lauretis of the Italian Agency for the Protection of the Environment and Technical Services (APAT) briefed the participants on Italian LULUCF monitoring and reporting system and on National system requirements also focusing on quality control procedures and accurate record keeping.

Dr. de Lauretis emphasized the importance of effective communication at all levels. He added that Italy solicited the help of Ecofys, an international research institution to conduct a review of procedures. This review was additional to those conducted by the UNFCCC.

Dr. Mollicone added that the Italian system is legal-based—a result of national legislation.

Honduras asked what is Italy's primary goal in establishing this inventory. Dr. de Lauretis replied that Italy has reduction commitments and it needs these measures for compliance.. Dr. Mollicone added that a National System and National Inventory are necessary to participate in any financial mechanism.

### **Reporting Emissions and Removals from Forests: Experience of LULUCF in Europe and Challenges for REDD**

Dr. Sandro Federici's presentation focused on the importance of goal reporting, Annex I reporting and the challenges for REDD. He noted that forestry data in Europe is collected mainly through forest inventory and that heterogeneity presents a challenge to developing an EU inventory.

Nicaragua requested a definition of removals and emissions. Federici replied that a removal is an increase in carbon stock and emission is a decrease in carbon stock. Dr. Federici further explained that Annex I countries started the development of their national system for GHGs inventory from a situation comparable with that currently experienced by developing countries and that a learning by doing process has been implemented, and assisted by means of the IPCC GPG, in order to reach high quality inventories. Dr Federici also stressed that such a process is still ongoing and that, therefore, developing countries should analyze Annex I countries experiences and use assistance from UN agencies, donors and CfRN.

Cameroon commented that the many definitions require further guidance from Dr. Federici and other experts. Panama agreed and stated that the UNFCCC should help developing countries establish common definitions which would help develop inventories and unify the effort.

Dr. Federici said the issue should be raised at the next SBI meeting.

Thailand asked for a working definition of forest degradation. Drs. Federici and Mollicone stated that any loss of carbon stock, at national scale, can be defined as forest degradation.

### **World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility: An Experience from Nepal**

Mr. Pem Kandel of the Ministry of Forests of Nepal reported on his country's experience with the FCPF. Included in the presentation were a review of the R-PIN process and an overview of lessons learned.

Mr. Kandel highlighted a number of developments based on Nepal's experience with the FCPF. The first recommendation was to continue and intensify REDD capacity building to internalize and ultimate adoption at the national level. Mr. Kandel advised colleagues to formulate a national REDD strategy and to implement policies to institutionalize such strategies. Mr. Kandel suggested that analysis of deforestation, forest degradation and carbon stock change are essential to making REDD projects operational.

Mr. Kandel suggested that the Coalition should lead and coordinate activities at the operational level and funds should be made available to the Coalition to implement international programs. To address immediate logistical concerns, Nepal tabled the idea that focal persons should be designated by the

Coalition to more effectively deal with a national REDD program. The focal persons would bear responsibility for managing success of his/her national REDD program. Nepal concluded by urging colleagues that after the third technical workshop in India, Coalition countries should push to institute a REDD strategy for each country depending on readiness and level of capacity building.

### **Day 3—German International Climate Initiative/GTZ**

Mr. Martin Homola and Ms. Elisabeth Maushof first clarified that the Initiative is not a GTZ program but is officially employed by GTZ. Its criteria for funding are innovative character and new technological, economic, social and/or institutional approaches.

Democratic Republic of Congo asked about the local efforts of the initiative and stated that host countries should have an ownership stake in the projects. Mr. Homola said that any country can apply for funding and that ownership is shared with partner countries. However, he added that only 120€ million is divided between 40-100 countries so resources are scarce. Ms. Maushof conceded that the initiative needs more exposure and many programs are very new.

Costa Rica inquired about the effect of the global economic crisis. Mr. Homola replied that the initiative and money is “safe” until 2011.

Ghana asked why mitigation has been left out of the initiative? He further suggested focusing more on REDD activities. Ms. Maushof stated the process is slow and they have just begun to support REDD. They believe this support will increase. Homola added that mitigation within the REDD process is important and presently receives attention.

### **United States Environmental Protection Agency Approach to Building GHG Inventory Capacity**

Dr. Stephen Ogle of Colorado State University expanded the EPA’s policies and practices regarding national GHG inventory. Dr. Mollicone cited the efforts of the US as an example of capacity building under the UNFCCC.

### **UN-REDD Programme**

Ms. Claudia Hiepe of FAO reported on the new UN-REDD program. A website UNNREDD.org is under construction. The objective is to initiate REDD programs led by the host country.

Panama noted that while FAO has made great strides in capacity building, other players need to be involved. Ms. Hiepe agreed and cited that there are many official and unofficial relationships, for example the World Bank FCPF.

Kenya asked to what extent can non-pilot countries draw on FAO expertise. Hiepe replied that FAO intends to help other countries in the future with increased funding.

Cameroon added that countries should not have to wait for the FAO and that information should be made available to governments so countries know what to expect. Ms. Hiepe agreed and stated that the process could be more transparent.

### **CD-REDD Program**

Mr. Kevin Conrad, Executive Director of CfrN, presented on the structure of the CD-REDD program. The structure is based on UNFCCC outcomes: COP-13—Readiness and Demonstration; COP-14—Scaling up (non-compliance); and COP-15—Carbon Markets (measurable, reportable, verifiable data).

Ghana asked if other methodologies outside IPCC GPG such as Gofc-Gold be investigated. Dr. Mollicone replied the Gofc-Gold is essentially an extension of IPCC GPG.

Panama asked, “What is the role of this workshop with respect to Poznan?” Mr. Conrad replied that as technicians we should advise our UN Focal Points in advance of COP-14.

Panama added that the absence of the World Bank was regrettable. This workshop has shown how important inventories are and how to start them. Panama was grateful for the elucidation of funding sources. Panama concluded that a draft for Poland is crucial.

Nicaragua observed that REDD has co-benefits that agencies are ignoring. UN-REDD seems to be implementing measures in areas with few challenges. He stated that projects should be started in areas of greater poverty, with greater challenges, for a more substantial impact.

Equatorial Guinea suggested hearing from more experts who have made inventories in tropical forests as these are much more diverse and applicable to participants experience. Mr. Conrad added that that may be one way of focusing UN agencies money and energy.

Papua New Guinea cited severe coordination challenges and called for the need to form a REDD secretariat. He suggested that CfrN might fill this role.

Costa Rica offered that the country has been re-foresting since 1988 and expressed concern over who will impose baselines. If other parties set baselines based on the 1990s, Costa Rica is punished. Costa Rica suggested a regional resource distribution.

Guyana backed a Global Forest Carbon Framework (GFCF) to work in tandem with agencies “in country” so that all relevant parties are involved. Guyana further suggested “training in country” as an element of mobilizing resources. Support for CfrN serving as a secretariat was expressed as there is no need “to re-invent the wheel.” Guyana concluded by noting that countries with high forest cover and low deforestation must be included in REDD, perhaps by adjusting the baseline.

Nicaragua proposed that a parallel effort be made to communicate the message across indigenous and rural communities and called for more tools to consult with these communities. Central African Republic supported the idea.

Malaysia called for more details on the function and composition of the GFCF.

Ms. Bietta thanked all participants for a productive meeting and concluded the workshop.

## Annex 1: Provisional Agenda

### Understanding National Inventories for LULUCF Sector: The Experience of Annex I Countries Capacity Development Workshop 5-7 November 2008, Berlin Germany

#### **5 November**

9:30 Workshop Introduction (Danillo Mollicone, CfRN)

10:00 Welcome Message (Dr. Norbert Gorissen, Department for International Cooperation)

10:20 Welcome Message (Federica Bietta, CfRN)

10:40 Coffee Break

#### **First Session, "Monitoring and Reporting under UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol"**

11:00 National systems for national GHG inventories: reporting requirements and provisions under UNFCCC (Dr. Maria Sanz-Sanchez)

12:30 Lunch Break

14:00 Methodological approaches developed by IPCC for monitoring and reporting (Dr. Zoltan Somogyi, IPCC)

#### **Second Session: "GHGs National Inventory"**

16:30 National System and National Inventory Report of Hungary (Dr. Zoltan Somogyi)

#### **6 November**

#### **Second Session: "GHGs National Inventory" (continued)**

9:30 National Inventory Report of the USA (Dr. Stephen Ogle/Ms. Kimberly Todd)

10:30 Coffee Break

11:00 National System and National Inventory Report of Germany (Dr. Karsten Dunger)

12:30 Lunch Break

14:00 National System and National Inventory Report of Italy (Dr. Riccardo de Lauretis)

16:00 Overview on European Annex I Countries (Dr. Sandro Federici)

17:30 World Bank FCPF: An Experience from Nepal (Mr. Pem Kandel)

#### **7 November**

#### **Third Session: "Future Capacity Development Initiatives"**

9:00 German Climate Change Initiative (Mr. Martin Homola and Ms. Lisa Maushof)

10:00 United States Environmental Protection Agency (Dr. Stephen Ogle)

11:00 UN-REDD Programme (Ms. Claudia Hiepe, FAO)

12:00 CD-REDD Programme (Mr. Kevin Conrad, CfRN)

1:00 General Discussion and Conclusions

Annex 2: List of Participants

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Organization/Country</b>	<b>Email</b>
Earl GREEN	Belize	<a href="mailto:greenideas@btl.net">greenideas@btl.net</a>
Marcelo WINDSOR	Belize	<a href="mailto:windsorbelize@yahoo.com">windsorbelize@yahoo.com</a>
Omaliss KEO	Cambodia	<a href="mailto:omaliss@gmail.com">omaliss@gmail.com</a>
Kimsun CHHENG	Cambodia	<a href="mailto:chheng.kimsun@yahoo.com">chheng.kimsun@yahoo.com</a>
Joseph Armathe AMOUGOU	Cameroon	<a href="mailto:ioearmathe@yahoo.fr">ioearmathe@yahoo.fr</a>
Haman UNUSA	Cameroon	<a href="mailto:hamaunusa@yahoo.fr">hamaunusa@yahoo.fr</a>
Gaetan MOLOTO KENGUEMBA	Central African Republic	<a href="mailto:molotokg@yahoo.fr">molotokg@yahoo.fr</a>
Arnaud BIT SINDOU	Central African Republic	<a href="mailto:darina_bitsindou@yahoo.fr">darina_bitsindou@yahoo.fr</a>
Kristel HEINRICH	Costa Rica	<a href="mailto:kheinrich@imn.ac.cr">kheinrich@imn.ac.cr</a>
Roberto VILLALOBOS FLORES	Costa Rica	<a href="mailto:rvilla@imn.ac.cr">rvilla@imn.ac.cr</a>
Vincent Ka Sulu Seya MAKONGA	Democratic Republic of Congo	<a href="mailto:kaseyamak@yahoo.fr">kaseyamak@yahoo.fr</a>
Oneshope Mut Shail KAVUL	Democratic Republic of Congo	<a href="mailto:kmutshail@yahoo.fr">kmutshail@yahoo.fr</a>
Karina RAMIREZ MARCELINO	Dominican Republic	<a href="mailto:Kariramirez03@gmail.com">Kariramirez03@gmail.com</a>
Edward Elvis MATOS PENA	Dominican Republic	<a href="mailto:eematos@yahoo.com">eematos@yahoo.com</a>
Ricardo VALDIVIESO	Ecuador	<a href="mailto:rvaldivieso@ambiente.gov.ec">rvaldivieso@ambiente.gov.ec</a>
Guillermo NAVARRETE	El Salvador	<a href="mailto:gnavarrete@marn.gob.sv">gnavarrete@marn.gob.sv</a>
Alma CORDOVA VILLEDA	El Salvador	<a href="mailto:acordova@marn.gob.sv">acordova@marn.gob.sv</a>
Deogracias Ikaka NZAMIO	Equatorial Guinea	<a href="mailto:ikakanzamio@yahoo.fr">ikakanzamio@yahoo.fr</a>
Pedro Nsene MALAVO	Equatorial Guinea	<a href="mailto:pmalavo@hotmail.com">pmalavo@hotmail.com</a>
Robert BAMFO	Ghana	<a href="mailto:bamforobert@yahoo.com">bamforobert@yahoo.com</a>
Kofi AFFUM-BAFFOE	Ghana	<a href="mailto:Kofi1964-ba@hotmail.com">Kofi1964-ba@hotmail.com</a>
Yaw Bediako OSAFO	Ghana/Francois & Associates	<a href="mailto:yaw.osafo@gmail.com">yaw.osafo@gmail.com</a>
Mohamed Lamine DOUMBOUYA	Guinea	<a href="mailto:doumbouya_ml54@yahoo.fr">doumbouya_ml54@yahoo.fr</a>
Tidiane Konate AHMED	Guinea	<a href="mailto:tkamadou@yahoo.fr">tkamadou@yahoo.fr</a>
Pradeepa Bhavna GOBERDHAN	Guyana	<a href="mailto:economist_pradeepa@yahoo.com">economist_pradeepa@yahoo.com</a>
Mirna Yesenia RAMOS	Honduras	<a href="mailto:mirna_ramos_73@yahoo.com">mirna_ramos_73@yahoo.com</a>
Rafael Oscar OQUELI SOLORZANO	Honduras	<a href="mailto:rafael_oqueli@yahoo.com">rafael_oqueli@yahoo.com</a>
Alfred GICHU	Kenya	<a href="mailto:alfredgichu@yahoo.com">alfredgichu@yahoo.com</a>
William OMONDI	Kenya	<a href="mailto:Williamomondi2004@yahoo.co.uk">Williamomondi2004@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Jerome G.N. NYENKA	Liberia	<a href="mailto:jeronyenka@yahoo.com">jeronyenka@yahoo.com</a>

Johansen T. VOKER	Liberia	<a href="mailto:vokerj@yahoo.com">vokerj@yahoo.com</a>
Simon Anak DAVID	Malaysia	<a href="mailto:simondavid@nre.gov.my">simondavid@nre.gov.my</a>
Mohammed Hizamri BIN MOHD YASIN	Malaysia	<a href="mailto:hizamri@forestry.gov.my">hizamri@forestry.gov.my</a>
Carmen MENESES-TOVAR	Mexico	<a href="mailto:cmeneses@conafor.gob.mx">cmeneses@conafor.gob.mx</a>
Rigoberto PLALFOX-RIVAS	Mexico	<a href="mailto:rpalafox@conafor.gob.mx">rpalafox@conafor.gob.mx</a>
Iris RUIZ-MONTES	Mexico	<a href="mailto:iruiz@conafor.gob.mx">iruiz@conafor.gob.mx</a>
Pem Narayan KANDEL	Nepal	<a href="mailto:pkkandelnepal@gmail.com">pkkandelnepal@gmail.com</a>
Bernardo Rumaldo TORREZ	Nicaragua	<a href="mailto:btorres@marena.org.ni">btorres@marena.org.ni</a>
Javier GUTIERREZ	Nicaragua	<a href="mailto:jgutierrez@posaf.org.ni">jgutierrez@posaf.org.ni</a>
Syed Amjad HUSSAIN	Pakistan	<a href="mailto:hydroman_amji@yahoo.com">hydroman_amji@yahoo.com</a>
Emil Alexander CHERRINGTON	Panama	<a href="mailto:emil.cherrington@cathalac.org">emil.cherrington@cathalac.org</a>
Darysbeth MARTINEZ	Panama	<a href="mailto:d.martinez@anam.gob.pa">d.martinez@anam.gob.pa</a>
Chalapan KALUWIN	Papua New Guinea	<a href="mailto:ckaluwin@upng.ac.pg">ckaluwin@upng.ac.pg</a>
Omega NELSON	Papua New Guinea	<a href="mailto:omeganelson@gmail.com">omeganelson@gmail.com</a>
Rupa MULINA	Papua New Guinea/CfRN	<a href="mailto:rupamulina@yahoo.com">rupamulina@yahoo.com</a>
Lucia MANN	Paraguay	<a href="mailto:damidel@cu.com.py">damidel@cu.com.py</a>
Blas KNOOP	Paraguay	<a href="mailto:knoop@tigo.com.py">knoop@tigo.com.py</a>
Douglas YEE	Solomon Islands	<a href="mailto:d.yee@met.gov.sb">d.yee@met.gov.sb</a>
Marlon Mohamed HOESEIN	Suriname	<a href="mailto:mhoesein@yahoo.com">mhoesein@yahoo.com</a>
Felician KILAHAMA	Tanzania	<a href="mailto:feliciankilihama@yahoo.co.uk">feliciankilihama@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Jesada LUANGJAME	Thailand	<a href="mailto:jesada@mozart.inet.co.th">jesada@mozart.inet.co.th</a>
Phoonowvarat VINIT	Thailand	<a href="mailto:vinit@dnp.go.th">vinit@dnp.go.th</a>
Xavier Nyindo MUGUMYA	Uganda	<a href="mailto:xavierm_1962@yahoo.com">xavierm_1962@yahoo.com</a>
Elungat Odeke DAVID	Uganda	<a href="mailto:davide@nfa.org.ug">davide@nfa.org.ug</a>
Watson John LUI	Vanuatu	<a href="mailto:watson_lui@yahoo.com">watson_lui@yahoo.com</a>
Phan Minh SANG	Vietnam	<a href="mailto:phanminhsang@gmail.com">phanminhsang@gmail.com</a>
Xuan Viet NGUYEN	Vietnam	<a href="mailto:Xuan.nv@rcfee.org.vn">Xuan.nv@rcfee.org.vn</a>
Reinhard WOLF	GTZ	<a href="mailto:reinhard.wolf@gtz.de">reinhard.wolf@gtz.de</a>
Zoltan SOMOGYI	Hungarian Forest Research Institute (ERTI)	<a href="mailto:Som9013@helka.iif.hu">Som9013@helka.iif.hu</a>
Kimberly TODD KLUNICH	US Environmental Protection Agency	<a href="mailto:klunich.kimberly@epa.gov">klunich.kimberly@epa.gov</a>
Maria SANZ-SANCHEZ	UNFCCC	<a href="mailto:msanz-sanchez@unfccc.int">msanz-sanchez@unfccc.int</a>
Karsten DUNGER	Germany	<a href="mailto:karsten.dunger@vti.bund.de">karsten.dunger@vti.bund.de</a>
Riccardo de LAURETIS	ISPRA/APAT	<a href="mailto:delaretis@apat.it">delaretis@apat.it</a>
Stephen OGLE	Colorado State University/US EPA	<a href="mailto:ogle@nrel.colostate.edu">ogle@nrel.colostate.edu</a>
Kevin CONRAD	CfRN	<a href="mailto:conrad@rainforestcoalition.org">conrad@rainforestcoalition.org</a>

Federica BIETTA	CfRN	<a href="mailto:fbietta@rainforestcoalition.org">fbietta@rainforestcoalition.org</a>
Danilo MOLLICONE	CfRN	<a href="mailto:dmollicone@rainforestcoalition.org">dmollicone@rainforestcoalition.org</a>
Sandro FEDERICI	CfRN	<a href="mailto:sfederici@rainforestcoalition.org">sfederici@rainforestcoalition.org</a>
Paul CHUNG	CfRN	<a href="mailto:pchung@rainforestcoalition.org">pchung@rainforestcoalition.org</a>
Catherine KAMARA	CfRN	<a href="mailto:ckamara@rainforestcoalition.org">ckamara@rainforestcoalition.org</a>