

Positions Ascribed to Global Witness and The Wilderness Society in

FCCC/AWGLCA/2008/16/Rev.1' ('The Assembly Doc')

Corrections to para 61 relating to REDD

**Submitted by Global Witness and The Wilderness Society
19 December 2008**

Voluntary vs Binding Agreement

The position ascribed to Global Witness (GW) in FCCC/AWGLCA/2008/16/Rev.1, para 61(e), is incorrect. GW does not support a voluntary REDD mechanism.

The wording should be corrected in a further revision of The Assembly Doc. to read:

“(d) That they should be implemented through an agreement which legally binds Annex 1 countries as well as developing countries, and which is not be linked to the KP (GW);

(e) That they should be voluntary (ED, ~~GW~~)...”

Note that in its submission, Global Witness stated:

- A REDD mechanism should be a stand-alone agreement not linked to the Kyoto Protocol and should contain obligations which bind Annex I countries as well as developing countries. A voluntary REDD mechanism would be more susceptible to leakage.

Sustainable Forest Management

The position ascribed to Global Witness (GW) and The Wilderness Society (TWS) in FCCC/AWGLCA/2008/16/Rev.1, para 61(k), is incorrect. GW and TWS support and promote sustainability, but cannot promote use of the term “Sustainable Forest Management” since there is no common understanding of this term and it is misused to promote management that is not sustainable.

The wording should be corrected in a further revision of The Assembly Doc. to read:

“(k) Promoting sustainable forest management (~~GW~~, ITUC, ~~TWS~~)