

Schweikart, Melanie; Mertz, Ole; Müller, Daniel

Article — Published Version

Adaptive approaches to REDD+ are needed for countries with high forest cover and low deforestation rates

Environmental Research Letters

Provided in Cooperation with:

Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies (IAMO), Halle (Saale)

Suggested Citation: Schweikart, Melanie; Mertz, Ole; Müller, Daniel (2022) : Adaptive approaches to REDD+ are needed for countries with high forest cover and low deforestation rates, Environmental Research Letters, ISSN 1748-9326, IOP Publishing, Bristol, Vol. 17, Iss. 11, pp. 1-10, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac9827> , <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/ac9827>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/265310>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Adaptive approaches to REDD+ are needed for countries with high forest cover and low deforestation rates

Melanie Schweikart^{1*}, Ole Mertz², and Daniel Müller^{1,3,4}

¹ Geography Department, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin,
Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany

² Department of Geoscience and Natural Resource Management, University of Copenhagen,
Øster Voldgade 10, 1350 København K, Denmark

³ Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies (IAMO),
Theodor-Lieser-Str. 2, 06120 Halle (Saale), Germany

⁴ Integrative Research Institute on Transformations of Human-Environment Systems (IRI THESys),
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany

* Corresponding author: melanieschweikart@posteo.de

Supplementary Material

Supplementary Table 1: Comparison of the FRL submissions

	Suriname	Guyana	Papua New Guinea	Congo	DRC
Year of initial submission	2018	2015	2017	2016	2018
Reference period	Historical: 2005 to 2015; FRL: 2016 to 2020	Historical: 2001 to 2012; FRL: 2013 to 2015	Historical: 2001 to 2013; FRL: 2014 to 2018	Historical: 2000 to 2012; FRL: 2015 to 2020	Historical: 2000 to 2014; FRL: 2015 to 2019
REDD+ activities considered	Deforestation, forest degradation	Deforestation, forest degradation	Deforestation, forest degradation, enhancement of forest carbon stocks (set to zero)	Deforestation, forest degradation	Deforestation
Drivers of deforestation	Included but quantity not reported; choice of drivers not justified	Detailed list of drivers; effects of political decisions mentioned in percent; contribution of drivers for historical emissions listed	Only drivers for deforestation given in percent and tCO ₂	Driver for the period 2015 to 2020 listed in tCO ₂	Included but not justified
Share of emissions from deforestation in FRL	Mining (55%), Infrastructure (11%), urbanization (3%), agriculture (2%)	Mining (49%), infrastructure (9%)	Agricultural conversion (quantity not reported)	Agriculture, urbanization, mining (quantity not reported)	Slash-and-burn agriculture, infrastructure, urbanization (quantity not reported)
Share of emissions from degradation in FRL	Logging (25%)	Logging (20%)	Logging (major share of emissions but quantity not reported)	Logging (quantity not reported)	Logging (quantity not reported)
Projection method	Linear projection based on regression refined with results from a national "development scenario model"	Combined reference level approach using global forest carbon emissions (Baccini <i>et al.</i> 2012); conditional crediting baseline specified in bilateral agreement with Norway	Linear projection based on regression	Adjusted historical approach; 85% emissions increase compared to average historical emissions	Linear projection based on regression

References

Baccini A *et al* 2012 Estimated carbon dioxide emissions from tropical deforestation improved by carbon-density maps *Nat. Clim. Change* 2 182–5, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1354>