Annex II

[English only]

Summary report on and recommendations of the third forum of the Standing Committee on Finance

I. Summary report on the third Standing Committee on Finance forum on enhancing coherence and coordination for forest finance

A. Introduction

1. The third forum of the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) took place on 8 and 9 September 2015 at the International Conference Centre, Durban, South Africa. It was organized in conjunction with the 14th World Forestry Congress in collaboration with the South African Government and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

2. The focus of the 2015 SCF forum was on issues related to finance for forests, including the implementation of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70 (hereinafter referred to as REDD-plus[1]), inter alia: (1) ways and means to transfer payments for results-based actions as referred to in decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 29; and (2) the provision of financial resources for alternative approaches. The main objective of the 2015 SCF forum was enhancing coherence and coordination of forest financing, in the context of actions addressing mitigation and adaptation to climate change. The forum brought together representatives from Parties, forest and financial institutions, the private sector, civil society. They included representatives of governments, multilateral and bilateral financial institutions including operating entities of the Financial Mechanism, think tanks and United Nations organizations.

3. The forum focused on the issue of coherence and coordination from a perspective of financing for forests, taking into account different policy approaches, and considering, inter alia, the importance of forests in the context of sustainable development, the multifunctional and cross-cutting nature of forests, the diversity of actors involved in forest financing within and beyond the Convention and the different circumstances of the developing countries involved.

4. The first day of the forum focused on an overview of the issues related to forest finance, including the landscape of forest finance, and coherence and coordination of the delivery of forest financing, from the perspectives of both public and private sectors. On the second day, the forum focused on sharing case studies and experiences among the participants, on the two mandated topics, namely on: (1) ways and means to transfer payments for results-based actions; and (2) the provision of financial resources for alternative approaches. The second day also included discussions on the incentives required to achieve sustainable investments, which reduce deforestation and forest degradation, promote sustainable management of forests and enhance forest carbon stocks.

[1] In decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, the Conference of the Parties encouraged developing country Parties to contribute to mitigation actions in the forest sector by undertaking the following activities: reducing emissions from deforestation; reducing emissions from forest degradation; conservation of forest carbon stocks; sustainable management of forests; and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

5. Following the practice from the 2014 forum of the SCF, the 2015 forum took the modality of both plenary sessions and breakout group discussions, and there was positive feedback from many participants. During the plenary sessions, scene-setting presentations were given by panellists, followed by open discussions among the participants. In order to enable interactive exchange of ideas, breakout group discussions were held on both days. The discussion leaders and rapporteurs reported back to the plenary session at the end of each breakout group discussion, and concluding remarks were provided by co-facilitators.

B. Landscape of forest finance

1. Scale, sources and instruments

6. Information on the scale and sources of existing forest finance was presented by panellists from think tanks and international organizations, including the Climate Policy Initiative (CPI), FAO, the Overseas Development Institute (ODI), the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF). According to a recent study by CPI, Climate Focus and the European Forest Institute, annual commitments from international public actors[2] for land-use mitigation and adaptation in 2012–2013 amounted to USD 5.8 billion, including more than USD 1.2 billion flowing to the forest sector to address climate change. CPI noted that while comprehensive data are lacking on domestic public expenditure and private investments in land-use mitigation and adaptation, climate finance appears to be a very small portion of the broader financial flows to agriculture and forestry in low- and middle-income countries, estimated to be hundreds of billions of USD, dominated by domestic private and domestic public spending. Existing financial instruments that support sustainable land-use include grants, concessional loans, market rate loans, equity, tax incentives, insurance and guarantees. One panellist mentioned that, taking note of the limited public sources of finance, new and innovative financing instruments are needed to meet the investment needs.

7. Some participants were of the view that the needs of developing countries cannot be met with a single type of forest finance, and that private finance will play a key role. Other participants were of the view that, while and even though substantial amounts of finance are already flowing for climate change and forests, relatively small amounts are flowing through the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism and overall flows are low compared with needs. In fact, the representative of UNFF stated that the required funding for sustainable forest management is between USD 70 and USD 160 billion per year globally.

8. According to the FAO representative, in a national context, forest financing encompasses a mixture of different and complementary types of finance, including finance for sustainable land-use and results-based climate finance. Several participants highlighted that finance for REDD-plus activities alone will not be sufficient for the transformational change in the sector, and finance beyond that is needed to achieve the envisioned long-term cumulative emission reductions. It was indicated by several participants that there is a need to mobilize investments in sustainable forestry and sustainable agriculture in order to reduce the pressures on forests. Such private sector investments should support the national plans or strategies that are tailored to country-specific circumstances.

9. Regarding the scale and sources of REDD-plus finance, the representative of FAO quoted a study published by ODI indicating that more than USD 8 billion has been pledged so far for REDD-plus, which mostly comes from public sector sources. However, despite this significant figure, it was pointed out that low and slow disbursement rates can be observed.

[2] Including bilateral donors, development financial institutions, and domestic and international climate funds.

10. Financial support for the first two phases of REDD-plus is being provided through various funds and programmes, via bilateral and multilateral channels. For example, representatives of the United Nations Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (UN-REDD) and the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility shared their experiences in providing REDD-plus support that allows countries to access results-based payments and emphasized the importance of coordination among providers of REDD-plus support. Furthermore, pledges to support are being made but are not yet disbursed. Other sources of funding that countries are experimenting with for REDD-plus activities include domestic budgets, multiple sources pooled into national forest funds, and readiness support including by non-governmental organizations and voluntary markets. It was highlighted that in many cases, the different sources of REDD-plus finance are duplicative and can represent a challenge for a country to coordinate at the national level. Discussions on the role of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) are elaborated in chapter D below.

11. The GEF shared its experience and lessons learned in providing support for sustainable forest management and REDD-plus. The GEF invested more than USD 700 million into sustainable forest management and the REDD-plus incentive mechanism in over 80 countries. These investments have leveraged USD 4.6 billion in co-financing, from a range of other sources. Within its sixth replenishment, the GEF reinforced its strategy for sustainable forest management, aiming to harness multiple benefits from forests and tackling the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, while supporting the role of forests in national sustainable development plans.

12. Participants noted that the UNFF facilitative process is aiming to assist countries to understand the existing funding sources for forests.

2. Mobilization of scaled-up forest finance

13. With regard to scaling up forest finance, the need for harnessing the existing resources was highlighted. Many noted the importance of leveraging and redirecting the existing capital and investments to contribute to sustainable land-use practices. Some participants also underscored the role of co-financing in further scaling up resources. In addition to these discussions, technical suggestions were made on how to support the mobilization of financial resources for forests, including: provision of enhanced information on the flow of forest finance so as to better inform the decision makers in designing land-use mitigation and adaptation strategies; conduct of financial viability analysis; identification of financial instruments to redirect the existing resources to more sustainable practices; and encouragement of the coordination between public policy and financing instruments.

14. Participants also discussed ways to further scale up private finance for forests and referred to the need to redirect large capitals seeking risk-adjusted returns to sustainable forest projects. In this regard, conditions needed for scaling up private finance were presented, including: management of risk; access to finance; and enabling environments and policy frameworks. One panellist presented the usefulness of strengthening public–private partnerships, to exchange knowledge, enhance public awareness and develop better business models for the private sector. Support from the public sector to enable private sector involvement, such as through provisions of concessional loans and insurances from bilateral and multilateral sources, can encourage more private sector participation in REDD-plus support. Many participants agreed that private sector investments can best contribute to protecting forests if the investment is aligned with government actions for sustainable management of forests.

15. The role of public policies and finance was discussed with regard to how it can contribute to make the private investments sustainable in the long term. Some participants highlighted that governments should play a leading role in implementing the New York Declaration on Forests, which grew out of dialogue among governments, companies and

civil society at the United Nations Secretary-General's Climate Summit 2014 in New York. A number of participants noted the importance of coordination among governments, international organizations and the private sector in advancing the objectives outlined in the Declaration.

16. The role of local domestic private sector actors was emphasized. Some participants said that governments, when designing sustainable forest management policies, need to take into account the fact that private sector actors are motivated by favourable risk-return profiles. Successful case studies were presented in this regard. One example presented highlighted the importance of using public–private partnerships to encourage the local private sector to start investing in sustainable forest management. Another example focused on improving access to credits for smallholders, who are facing poor financial infrastructure and high transaction costs. Providing them with favourable long-term capital, for example, with longer maturity or readjusted repayment schedules to productivity cycles, could encourage them to engage in sustainable forest management, and, where agriculture drives deforestation, in sustainable agriculture.

17. In relation to financial resources for REDD-plus, several participants raised the importance of predictable and adequate international financial support in preparing and implementing their national REDD-plus strategies. Lack of clarity on the amount and duration of forthcoming financing is a challenge. It was also noted that current financial support for REDD-plus is concentrated more on phase one and phase three, and the need for sufficient and balanced financial support for all three phases was emphasized.

3. Information gaps

18. In the discussions related to the estimates of forest finance flows, participants noted that there are gaps in data and information on forest finance flows. Currently, there is no commonly agreed definition of forest finance and what qualifies as forest finance. Information on private finance for forests is largely unavailable due to the difficulty in tracking. Participants mentioned that this poses challenges to governments and investors alike, in acquiring necessary information for designing policies or making investment decisions.

19. Some participants noted that measurement, reporting and verification of support is one of the main functions of the SCF and that there are lessons that could be learned in tracking REDD-plus finance. It was also noted that the Lima Information Hub for REDD-plus could enhance the transparency of results-based actions and of corresponding payments.[3]

C. Addressing the drivers of deforestation: opportunities and challenges in forest finance

Coherence of policy and financing instruments across sectors

20. Many participants agreed that policies and investments (e.g. in the agriculture sector) should be coherent with policy guidance on sustainable forests and its financing. Agriculture was highlighted as one of the main drivers of deforestation by a number of participants. Some studies have shown that up to 80 per cent of global deforestation occurs as result of agricultural practices. In this regard, increasing the scale of national and international resources for forest finance will do little to stop deforestation, unless the key drivers are addressed.

[3] More details on the Lima Information Hub are available at <http://redd.unfccc.int/>.

21. In this context, many participants stressed that policy coherence between forestry and sectors that drive deforestation, in particular agriculture, is crucial to achieve reductions of deforestation and forest degradation. Agricultural policies and financing instruments, such as concessional loans, can encourage agricultural production techniques that reduce the pressures on forests. Another example was to reduce the policy incentives for drivers of deforestation, or to add fiscal conditions and requirements for subsidies that drive deforestation. One representative of the United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative shared a recent relevant study by the UN-REDD programme titled "Fiscal incentives for agricultural commodity production: options to forge compatibility with REDD+".[4]

22. During this discussion, some participants suggested that governments should invest in tools to better monitor land-use changes and improve regulatory frameworks. It was also pointed out that, for a transformational consumption pattern of forest products, both supply and demand sides of the drivers of deforestation and degradation should be addressed.

23. Addressing drivers of deforestation requires cross-sectoral cooperation among different institutions, especially between different government ministries. Emphasis was given to the importance of coordinating enabling environments across different sectors to clarify any conflicting regulations, enhancing capacity of relevant institutions, application of common language and generation of comprehensive and accurate data. In this discussion, it was noted that matchmaking is the key to connecting the public and private actors dispersed in regional and sectoral silos. Participants suggested that all countries should be called upon to enhance their enabling environments so as to encourage their domestic private sectors to invest in sustainable forest management.

24. In this context, the importance of scaling up sustainable land-use investments and of redirecting finance towards sustainable land-use practices was highlighted, as these are capable of creating multiple benefits, including for climate change and forestry. Participants noted that there are opportunities to be harnessed in this regard, for example, pools of assets and investors seeking risk diversification, potential in the growth of green bonds and scaling up REDD-plus finance with market commitments. It was also noted that there should be a clear business case for investors. During this discussion, some participants underscored the usefulness of designing risk-mitigating or risk-sharing instruments and making them accessible to institutional investors. Many participants stressed that local smallholders need to be empowered and supported with favourable financial benefits, so that there are strong business cases for them. It was also pointed out by some participants that land-based investments, including for forests and through REDD-plus activities, should be delivered with a full consideration of the social, economic and environmental impacts on the ground and in line with safeguard requirements and national policies. To continue the discussion on this topic, a suggestion was made for the SCF to look into how private finance can be scaled up for forests, based on lessons learned from other sectors.

D. Finance for REDD-plus and alternative approaches: enhancing coherence and coordination

25. Participants exchanged views on how to enhance coherence and coordination of finance for REDD-plus and alternative approaches, considering that the forest financing mix of a country consists of different and complementary types of finance (e.g. finance for sustainable land use and REDD-plus finance).

[4] Available at <http://www.unredd.net/index.php?view=document&alias=14584-un-redd-policy-brief-qfiscal-incentives-for-agricultural-commodity-production-options-to-forge-compatibility-with-reddq&category_slug=forest-ecosystem-valuation-and-economics&layout=default&option=com_docman&Itemid=134>.

1. Financial support for different phases of REDD-plus

26. Participants acknowledged the existing support for the REDD-plus provided by developed countries but pointed out that an important share of international REDD-plus finance is concentrated in a few countries. In order to address these issues, some participants suggested that coordination between providers of REDD-plus finance would be useful. In addition, participants mentioned that coordination of REDD-plus finance could aim for, inter alia, provision of balanced support for all phases of REDD-plus and alignment of different requirements and methodologies required by the providers of finance, especially for phase three.

27. Many participants noted that countries are currently at different phases of REDD-plus and levels of capacity differ among countries. It was mentioned that programme implementation can be costly and time consuming, if capacity is not built properly with readiness support. Significant ex ante funding is required to overcome these barriers, including fiduciary capacity.

28. This led to discussions on building the fiduciary capacity of recipient countries and the international support needed. Many participants highlighted that fiduciary requirements for accessing finance could be challenging for some developing countries, and emphasized that building national fiduciary capacity is important to ensure country ownership of REDD-plus finance. Some participants from developing countries noted that they need readiness support to build fiduciary capacity as soon as possible, so that their national institutions can be prepared to be accredited to the GCF. In this context, there was general agreement that international support for phases one and two of the REDD-plus is the key to unlocking the potential for REDD-plus. Other participants suggested that maintaining the linkages between the different phases of the REDD-plus in a country is helpful for attracting financial support from multiple sources.

29. Regarding the role of the GCF, several participants, particularly from developing countries, remarked on the expectation of the GCF to provide funding for the three phases of REDD-plus and in accordance with the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus. Funding for readiness (phase one) was especially highlighted, and queries were made to the GCF representative about guidelines for consideration of results-based payments under phase three.

30. The timelines for the GCF to develop and put in place its operational guidelines for results-based payments, as well as more concrete guidance on how it will support REDD-plus activities across the three phases, remained unclear. Some participants noted that the SCF may be in a position to recommend guidance to the Conference of the Parties (COP) in this regard.

2. REDD-plus strategies and country ownership

31. When discussing international support for sustainability of REDD-plus, participants noted that it is important for a country to have a REDD-plus strategy to first determine what it wishes to achieve. Participants also noted that countries with a national forest strategy need to take holistic approaches and should take their REDD-plus strategies into consideration, in order to ensure the alignment of different sources of forest finance. It was also mentioned that the REDD-plus strategies and the finance associated with them can be most effective if they are aligned with national development policies and promote engagement of relevant private sector actors. In this context, participants noted the importance of interministerial and sectoral coordination, which requires clear responsibilities and coordination among key actors. It was also mentioned that benefits for each stakeholder have to be communicated in a simple and clear narrative. It was also noted that the design of REDD-plus strategies needs to be tailored and that there is no one size which fits all.

32. Under this discussion, it was pointed out that country ownership is crucial in designing the REDD-plus strategies and the associated financing structures. The financing structures for national REDD-plus strategies need to be designed according to each country's existing financial architecture. Some participants were of the view that this should be considered at an early stage, as retrofitting the institutions and frameworks at a later stage could be challenging. Many agreed that sharing the lessons learned in developing such strategies and financial architectures would be useful. Some participants mentioned that the co-benefits of REDD-plus activities, such as non-carbon benefits, contribute to development and enhance country ownership.

3. National REDD-plus and climate change funds

33. Participants also shared their views and experiences regarding national REDD-plus funds or other national climate change funds. For establishing national REDD-plus funds, some suggested using existing legal frameworks, financial structures, funds and institutions, as this could be less resource intensive than creating the funds from the beginning. Design of REDD-plus funds should take into account the needs of recipient countries and the requirements of contributing countries. Other ideas shared in this discussion include: the need for the national REDD-plus funds to be flexible in choosing the most suitable actors in order to make better use of resources; the definition and selection of the best types of actors to implement the policies and measures; and using the REDD-plus funds as hubs to scale up and coordinate activities at subnational levels.

4. Engagement of the private sector in REDD-plus activities

34. Participants discussed the opportunities for and challenges in engaging the private sector in REDD-plus activities. The role of the private sector was underscored more for phase two of the REDD-plus activities,[5] because of the larger scale of potential resources that can be unlocked. However, the relatively smaller amounts of international support provided for phase two, more through bilateral channels than multilateral ones, are posing some challenges to countries when implementing their REDD-plus programmes. Some solutions were suggested to scale up private investments in REDD-plus activities, such as public–private partnerships and co-financing schemes, which could also create better coordination among the public and private sectors and enhanced information sharing. In this context, it was also mentioned that, currently, private sector actors are not well informed about REDD-plus or about sustainable investment in forestry and agriculture, and participants agreed that governments need to engage more with the private sector, in their efforts to coordinate different stakeholders.

5. Enhancing coherence and coordination for results-based payments

35. Participants discussed the opportunities and challenges regarding results-based payments. Many agreed that results-based payments backed by international financial support can be an effective means to finance innovative measures, which could not have been financed otherwise domestically. Successful cases could inform domestic policies and be replicated through local actors. In this discussion, the importance of scaled-up financial support for phase three and harmonization among the providers of results-based payments was highlighted.

36. With regard to the potential role of the SCF in work on coherence and coordination, there was a suggestion that the SCF could facilitate the sharing of country experiences on accessing the results-based payments with financing entities, including the GCF.

[5] Phase two of REDD-plus includes the implementation of national policies and measures and national strategies or action plans that could involve further capacity-building, technology development and transfer and results-based demonstration activities (decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 73).

37. A number of participants acknowledged that the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus provides the guidelines for the delivery of results-based payments and that this should be considered as the basis for results-based payment mechanisms. They emphasized that financing entities, including the GCF, should apply the guidance as per decision 9/CP.19, and results-based payment mechanisms that have been set up before the adoption of the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus should revisit their methodological framework in order to ensure coherence with other institutions. Some participants indicated that there are areas where guidelines for results-based payments do not exist (e.g. ensuring coherence between private proposals and national REDD-plus strategies within the Private Sector Facility of the GCF), and these guidelines have to be discussed, ensuring country ownership and involvement of national stakeholders. Some suggested that the SCF could play a facilitating role in ensuring communication and linkages between the providers of results-based payments for harmonization of guidelines and methodologies.

6. Financial resources for alternative approaches

38. Discussions were also held on the provision of financial resources for alternative approaches. There were different views on how alternative approaches could be defined. Participants generally agreed that alternative approaches could be considered as holistic approaches that build on synergies and complementarities of benefits created by forests including for mitigation and adaptation, which take into account the multifunctional aspect of forests. In comparison with the REDD-plus programme, which is more focused on the aspect of mitigating carbon emissions, taking into account non-carbon benefits, some participants considered alternative approaches as achieving both mitigation and adaptation goals with ex ante financial support, which is conducive to achieving the objectives of the Convention. There was recognition of joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests, which are referred to in numerous COP decisions adopted since 2010.

39. With regard to financial resources for alternative approaches, participants recognized that a number of COP decisions encourage provision of financial resources for different policy approaches, allowing countries to harness multiple benefits of forests according to their national circumstances (e.g. mitigation, adaptation and non-carbon benefits). They also recognized that financing for alternative approaches can come from public and private sources. Some participants were of the view that innovative financing mechanisms, such as green bonds, could be one way to scale up business investments in forest projects. It was mentioned that synergetic financial solutions could scale up the support for alternative approaches and that there are lessons to be learned from other policy approaches, such as payments for ecosystem approaches. In addition to this, the importance of setting up conducive enabling environments for private investments was emphasized.

E. Conclusions

40. The third forum of the SCF generated new insights into the issue of forest finance and brought together a number of important stakeholders. Options to enhance coherence and coordination, from both contributor and recipient perspectives, were discussed.

41. The forum focused on the issue of coherence and coordination from the perspective of financing for forests, taking into account different policy approaches.

42. Currently, forest finance is flowing from and through both public and private sources and channels, for various policy approaches encompassing a mixture of different and complementary types of finance. This includes sustainable land-use finance and results-based climate finance. However, financing flows for REDD-plus require further clarity, particularly for disbursement.

43. There are gaps in data and information on forest finance flows and there is not a commonly agreed definition of forest finance and what qualifies as forest finance. Information on private finance for forests is scarce and difficult to track.

44. Opportunities for scaling up the mobilization of forest finance can be harnessed by utilizing existing financial instruments and investing in enabling policy frameworks.

45. The GEF has invested more than USD 700 million into sustainable forest management and the REDD-plus incentive mechanism in over 80 countries, leveraging USD 4.6 billion in co-financing from a range of sources. The GEF aims at harnessing multiple benefits from forests and tackling the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, while supporting the role of forests in national sustainable development plans.

46. Existing public and private resources should be redirected to sustainable land-use practices and forest management. There is a need to create enabling environments that will promote sustainable investments by domestic and international private and public sectors to support the efforts to achieve sustainable land-use practices to mitigate and adapt to climate change effects, including sustainable forest management**.**

47. Policy coherence and coordination among forestry and activities that drive deforestation and forest degradation is a key issue. Policies and fiscal instruments in agriculture, for example, should incentivize sustainable agricultural production techniques with low/no negative impacts on forests. Enhanced cross-sectoral coordination in governments and between stakeholders is essential to improve policy coherence and effectively address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.

48. REDD-plus finance can be most impactful if it can be aligned with national development policies and priorities**,** supported by cross-sectoral coordination, involving relevant stakeholders, such as local communities, indigenous peoples and private sector actors.

49. International support is a crucial enabler for preparation and implementation of REDD-plus activities by developing countries. REDD-plus support should be adequate and balanced across the implementation of the three phases of REDD-plus activities, in particular for phase two. Countries have different capacities and are at different phases of REDD-plus. REDD-plus support should encourage broad participation of all stakeholders and be accessible to recipient countries with a balanced distribution.

50. Coherence and coordination should be enhanced among the entities providing finance for REDD-plus activities, including requirements for accessing results-based finance. In this context, the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus should guide funding schemes for REDD-plus results-based payments.

51. With regard to the GCF, developing countries are looking forward to receiving more information on the procedure and timeline for consideration of funding proposals for REDD-plus activities by the GCF, including the results-based payments (phase three).

52. Coherence needs to be ensured between private proposals and national REDD-plus strategies.

53. There were different views on how alternative approaches could be defined. Among them, one example could be a holistic approach that builds on synergies and complementarities of benefits created by forests, including for mitigation, adaptation and sustainable development, which takes into account the multifunctional aspect of forests. Financing for alternative approaches can come from public and private sources.

II. Recommendations of the Standing Committee on Finance

54. Based on the conclusions of the third SCF forum, the SCF highlights the following for consideration by the COP:

(a) Invite Parties to ensure policy coherence, coherence of financing instruments and financial incentives and multisectoral coordination to address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and promote sustainable management of forests;

(b) Welcome the investments by the GEF in sustainable forest management and REDD-plus, harnessing multiple benefits from forests and tackling the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation;

(c) Encourage entities financing REDD-plus activities, including the GCF, to enhance coordination and exchange of information on the provision of support, including results-based payments guided by the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus;

(d) Encourage the GCF to expedite work on results-based finance in 2016, applying the methodological guidance consistent with the Warsaw Framework for REDD-plus, in order to improve the effectiveness and coordination of results-based finance, as referred to in decision 9/CP.19, paragraph 7, and to report its progress to COP 22;

(e) Welcome the GCF provisions to provide forest finance in the context of ecosystems-based adaptation;

(f) Request the GCF to consider, in its work under the Private Sector Facility, the mobilization of finance for sustainable land-use practices and sustainable management of forests.

III. Follow-up activities of the Standing Committee on Finance in 2016

55. To build upon the rich discussions that took place at the 2015 SCF forum and the momentum generated, the SCF decided to undertake the following activities to improve coherence and coordination of forest finance:

(a) An overview of forest finance flows in the 2016 biennial assessment and overview of climate finance flows;

(b) Consideration of reaching out to entities financing the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, and other relevant stakeholders working on forest finance to strengthen the coherence and coordination between the forestry sector and sectors that drive deforestation and forest degradation, and in the access to and delivery of support;

(c) Organization of an SCF side event in conjunction with a UNFCCC conference session in 2016, to facilitate the interactions among the financing entities providing forest finance;

(d) Consideration of the outcomes of the above-mentioned activities at SCF meetings, with a view to preparing SCF recommendations for COP 22 on, inter alia, draft guidance to the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism.