COP30 Presidency Roadmap on Halting and Reversing Deforestation and Forest Degradation by 2030

The Brazilian Coalition on Climate, Forests and Agriculture is a multi-stakeholder network that brings together more than 450 representatives from the private sector, financial sector, academia and civil society committed to advancing a low-carbon economy and more sustainable land use in Brazil. Over the past years, the Coalition has built a consistent body of technical proposals and policy contributions on deforestation control, forest restoration, bioeconomy, supply-chain traceability, climate finance and sustainable agriculture.

This contribution is grounded in a structured analytical process based on the review of 22 key Coalition documents, followed by validation in an extended consultation involving nearly 90 participants from across sectors, and further refined through the Strategic Group of the Coalition, which brings together leading institutions and senior leaders shaping Brazil's climate and land-use agenda.

The relevance of the Coalition's contribution to this process lies precisely in its ability to articulate different perspectives and identify areas of convergence across sectors that are often treated separately. The analysis, evidence, and recommendations presented in this submission are rooted primarily in the Brazilian experience, drawing on the Coalition's accumulated technical and policy work on land-use issues. Its accumulated work reflects both the complexity of land-use dynamics in Brazil and the practical conditions required to scale conservation, restoration, reforestation, low carbon-agriculture and forest-based production models. It also highlights that maintaining forests is not only an environmental imperative, but an economic one: forests underpin climate stability, water regulation, agricultural productivity, energy security, and the long-term resilience and competitiveness of key sectors of the Brazilian economy. In this sense, the Coalition's contribution seeks to offer evidence-based and implementation-oriented inputs that may be useful to the Presidency Roadmap on Halting and Reversing Deforestation and Forest Degradation by 2030.

In the Coalition's view, the roadmap will be most useful if it remains focused, action-oriented, and grounded in solutions that can be implemented and scaled by 2030. Rather than functioning as a broad compilation of issues, it should help identify priority barriers, practical levers, and areas where international cooperation can accelerate delivery. The Coalition's analysis suggests that particular attention should be given to governance, economic incentives, supply-chain transformation, and the scaling of forest-based economic alternatives, including restoration, bioeconomy, and sustainable forest management. At the same time, the usefulness of this roadmap will also depend on greater clarity regarding its role within the broader COP30 action agenda, including how it connects with parallel processes such as the roadmap on transitioning away from fossil fuels, what kind of follow-up and political traction it is expected to generate, and how its recommendations may inform implementation, cooperation, and finance beyond its launch.

(a) What are the most critical barriers — whether physical, economic, financial, institutional, technological or social — preventing the halting and reversing of deforestation and forest degradation?

The analysis of the Coalition's body of work indicates that the main barriers to halting and reversing deforestation and forest degradation are structural rather than technological, at least in Brazil. Persistent land tenure insecurity, institutional fragmentation across different levels of government, organized crime and limited enforcement capacity continue to undermine the implementation of existing policies and regulatory frameworks. In this context, land tenure and territorial ordering are not only sectoral challenges but enabling conditions for the effectiveness of virtually all other forest, climate, and land-use policies. Land appropriation remains a strategy for asset-building: clearing forest establishes informal property claims, increases land value, and signals productive use under legal frameworks that reward conversion[1]. While Brazil has made significant progress in reducing deforestation in recent years—supported by strong monitoring systems and renewed governance arrangements, including national and subnational anti-deforestation programs—the effectiveness and long-term stability of these efforts still depend on overcoming persistent gaps in coordination, investment gaps, institutional continuity, and implementation across jurisdictions. To accelerate progress toward 2030, the roadmap should therefore focus on areas where evidence is strongest, institutional capacity already exists, and near-term implementation gains are feasible. In the Brazilian case, this includes strengthening territorial governance, realigning economic incentives, improving transparency and accountability across supply chains, combat organized crime, and expanding forest-based economic alternatives at scale.

Globally, Indigenous Peoples and local communities (IPLCs), alongside smallholder farmers, manage or hold tenure rights over approximately half of the world's land, including around 54% of intact forests and 40% of Key Biodiversity Areas, and evidence consistently shows that these territories are among the most effective barriers against deforestation and forest degradation. Halting and reversing deforestation will therefore require not only securing land tenure, but also strengthening sociobioeconomy value chains rooted in these territories, generating income while maintaining forest cover. Despite their central role, IPLCs and smallholders receive less than 1% of global climate finance, revealing a critical misalignment between conservation outcomes and financial support. Protecting and strengthening IPLC-managed territories is thus one of the most cost-effective climate mitigation strategies available, but long-term conservation outcomes will depend on combining tenure security with the strengthening of sustainable territorial economies.

In parallel, the current economic incentive structure still favours the conversion of native vegetation. Perverse incentives embedded in credit systems, subsidies, and market dynamics continue to make land-use conversion more economically attractive than maintaining standing forests. This challenge is closely linked to the still unresolved land cost opportunity, as deforested or converted land often generates more immediate and predictable economic returns than standing forests. At the same time, there is an absence of sufficiently robust and scalable mechanisms to economically value forests, including payments for ecosystem

[1] Carrero, G. C., Fearnside, P. M., Valle, D. R. D., & De Souza Alves, C. (2020). Deforestation trajectories on a development frontier in the Brazilian Amazon: 35 years of settlement colonization, policy and economic shifts, and land accumulation. Environmental Management, 66(6), 966–984. doi.org/10.1007/s00267-020-01354-w

services and carbon-related instruments. This also includes insufficient methodologies, policy frameworks, and market conditions to value biodiversity and standing forests as economic assets in ways that are credible, scalable, and capable of influencing land-use decisions. This mispricing is particularly problematic because standing forests already generate substantial economic value through ecosystem services that sustain rainfall patterns, water availability, soil stability, agricultural production, and broader macroeconomic resilience, even if these contributions are still poorly reflected in markets and public policy.

The development of a global carbon market capable of supporting the reduction of deforestation depends on the effective implementation of Article 6. Under Article 6.2, ITMOs are central to enabling climate finance; however, the lack of clear and predictable rules has limited the development of projects, particularly in the land use and forestry sectors.

Under Article 6.4 and other international initiatives (such as SBTi and CORSIA), important challenges remain regarding the compatibility of existing criteria with the realities of land use and forestry in different regions of the world. In many cases, rules designed based on northern hemisphere contexts do not fully reflect the agro-environmental conditions, mitigation pathways, and implementation challenges found in the southern hemisphere. It is therefore crucial to promote greater alignment among different regulatory instruments and initiatives, ensuring that the criteria adopted are robust while also being compatible with the diversity of solutions available across regions**.** In particular, it is essential to ensure that nature-based solutions are fully recognized as an integral, rather than marginal, part of mitigation strategies, including their eligibility within international mechanisms and their capacity to generate environmental assets with integrity. Without such alignment, there is a risk that the global carbon market will evolve in a way that is disconnected from the real mitigation potential available, undermining both the effectiveness of climate action and the economic viability of initiatives that are fundamental to reducing and reversing deforestation.

Structural pressures linked to land-use dynamics further exacerbate these challenges. Agricultural expansion into frontier areas and the influence of global commodity markets continue to drive deforestation, while the implementation of deforestation-free supply chains remains incomplete due to limitations in traceability, transparency, and alignment between public policies and private sector commitments. More broadly, greater data integration, transparency, and clearer mechanisms for traceability remain necessary to strengthen accountability across supply chains and improve the effectiveness of both public and market-based interventions. In some regions, these pressures are further compounded by the growing nexus between illegal deforestation and organised crime, which suggests that the issue must be addressed not only as an environmental and land governance challenge, but also as a territorial security issue.

Additionally, there is a lack of an integrated national strategy in Brazil to scale a forest-based economy. Existing policies related to climate, agriculture, industry, and regional development remain fragmented, and there are limited industrial and innovation policies targeting bioeconomy and forest-based value chains. This scenario is compounded by a persistent deficit in multilevel climate governance, characterised by fragmented coordination and limited institutionalised collaboration among subnational entities, which further constrains policy coherence and effective implementation.

Organized crime is also a significant barrier to combating deforestation. It operates within a broader context of weak land governance, where unclear land tenure, unreliable registries, and limited enforcement create opportunities for illegal activities such as land grabbing and illegal logging. While criminal networks can amplify these dynamics through corruption and coercion, they are part of a wider set of structural challenges. Strengthening land governance, including clearer property rights and more effective institutions, is therefore essential to addressing both criminal activity and other drivers of deforestation.

At the international level, constraints include insufficient climate finance, the persistent undervaluation of tropical forests, and difficulties in converting ecosystem services into stable and predictable financial flows. Accelerating the regulation of Article 6.4 of the Paris Agreement, while considering the efficiency and effectiveness of nature-based solutions, can be key to financing restoration and deforestation control activities. However, it is necessary to understand and precify those activities in a financially viable way.

(b) What potential levers, whether economic, financial, institutional, social or technological, exist for accelerating the implementation of the commitment to halt and reverse deforestation and forest degradation?

The Coalition's analysis identifies a set of institutional, economic, and productive levers capable of accelerating the implementation of forest-related commitments. Strengthening territorial governance is central, particularly through the consolidation and effective implementation of existing instruments such as land-use planning, land tenure regularisation, environmental monitoring systems, and enforcement mechanisms, combined with improved coordination across levels of government.

The Brazilian experience demonstrates that coordinated governance approaches can deliver results, including through subnational initiatives strategy, which integrates production, conservation, and social inclusion at the territorial level. In tropical forest contexts, such governance arrangements are particularly important because they must address complex interactions between land tenure, forest protection, agricultural expansion, local livelihoods, and territorial control. Monitoring systems are also a transversal lever, as they support enforcement, territorial planning, transparency, MRV, and the implementation of traceability systems.

The Brazilian Coalition on Climate, Forests and Agriculture is a multi-stakeholder network, and our experience proves that cooperation and partnership between various actor groups are beneficial. In Brazil, jurisdictional - and landscape-level approaches are demonstrating proof of concept, with several jurisdictions showing promising results. Efforts to address deforestation will benefit tremendously from cooperation and partnership between various actor groups (e.g., the public sector, private sector, civil society, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, smallholder farmers, etc.). Multistakeholder initiatives include public-private partnerships that address themes such as forest and commodity certification, assurance, supply chain traceability and disclosure data challenges, landscape and jurisdictional approaches, and platforms for alignment, collaboration, and governance across sectors, levels, and geographies.

Reforming economic incentives is equally critical. This includes integrating socio-environmental criteria into credit, subsidies, and other financial incentives that shape land-use decisions, revising subsidies that indirectly promote deforestation, and developing financial instruments that enhance the economic value of standing forests, such as payments for ecosystem services and carbon markets. This also requires the reorientation of public and private credit, the development of sustainable taxonomies and other financial classification tools, and the creation of instruments capable of pricing the risks and externalities associated with land-use change. In addition, incentive structures need to be better adapted—or "tropicalized"—to reflect the ecological, productive, and territorial realities of tropical forest countries, rather than relying exclusively on frameworks designed for other contexts.

Transforming supply chains represents another key lever. Expanding traceability and transparency systems, consolidating deforestation-free production models, and aligning regulatory frameworks with private sector commitments are essential to address the role of commodity markets in driving deforestation. Roadmap should drive harmonisation of traceability standards across jurisdictions to reduce compliance burdens on producers, and ensure integrity, transparency and cost-sharing. Supporting the development of Digital Public Infrastructure (shared, open, interoperable systems) has the potential to support more inclusive and enforceable forest and ecosystem governance. Independent certification schemes and other verification mechanisms can also help strengthen credibility, comparability, and accountability across forest and agricultural value chains. Cultural factors are also relevant: greater awareness and engagement among producers, consumers, and market actors are important to support behavioural change and the broader uptake of sustainable production models.

It is essential to recognize the heterogeneity of productive structures and national realities. In some contexts, particularly in Brazil, there are production systems integrated with the conservation of native ecosystems, in which industrial activities operate in a complementary way to conservation. These models contribute to reducing pressure for illegal deforestation by combining production, expansion of conserved areas, carbon stocks, and the generation of economic value from reforestation, constituting an approach that should be recognized, strengthened, and, where possible, replicated

A central structural lever lies in the expansion of a forest-based economy through an integrated "forest continuum" approach. Such an approach is important not only for environmental reasons, but also because it helps reposition forests as strategic economic assets capable of generating jobs, income, innovation, climate resilience, and long-term territorial development. This involves scaling interconnected models that combine conservation, sustainable forest management, ecological restoration, reforestation, silviculture of native species, and bioeconomy activities, among other regenerative production models within a unified land-use strategy. In this context, low-carbon and high-productivity agricultural systems play a complementary role by increasing efficiency in already converted areas and reducing pressure on native vegetation.

A key lever for accelerating the implementation of the commitment to halt and reverse deforestation and forest degradation is the scaling of a sociobioeconomy rooted in forest territories, particularly through stronger support for Indigenous Peoples, local communities, smallholders, cooperatives, and community-based enterprises. This requires reforming

economic incentives so that standing forests become more valuable than land conversion, while expanding tailored finance, blended finance, payments for ecosystem services, and market instruments that are accessible to territorial actors. It also requires better infrastructure, technical assistance, fit-for-purpose regulation, local value addition, and inclusive market access for sociobiodiversity products and services. In parallel, stronger traceability, interoperable data systems, and multilevel governance are needed to connect territorial livelihoods with transparent, deforestation-free supply chains. Together, these measures can help transform forest conservation into a viable long-term development pathway that combines climate mitigation, biodiversity protection, income generation, and social inclusion, while recognizing that keeping forests standing is itself a foundation for economic stability and productivity in forest and agricultural regions.

Finally, international cooperation and financial mechanisms can significantly enhance implementation. This includes climate finance instruments, results-based payments, coordination among producer countries, and the role of international markets in promoting deforestation-free supply chains and socio-environmental standards. Greater alignment across the Rio Conventions—climate, biodiversity, and desertification—would also strengthen coherence in implementation, particularly when combined with trade-related agendas and socio-environmental standards in international markets.

Public finance should also be used to absorb early-stage risks and crowd in private investment for producers transitioning to deforestation-free and nature-positive farming practices. Blended finance facilities, combining public concessional capital with private co-investment, can provide sufficient financing to make it economically viable for farmers to shift practices.

(c) What country, regional or sector experiences, best practices, and lessons learned can be shared regarding forest conservation and restoration?

Brazil provides a set of concrete experiences that offer relevant lessons for the international agenda. Public policies such as the Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Deforestation in the Amazon (PPCDAm) demonstrate that significant reductions in deforestation can be achieved through coordinated approaches that integrate monitoring, enforcement, and inter-institutional action. The adaptation of similar strategies to other biomes, such as the Cerrado, highlights the importance of tailoring policies to different ecological and productive contexts, particularly in regions characterised by a higher proportion of privately owned land and stronger links to agricultural expansion. In this context, sectoral and territorial arrangements such as the Cerrado Protocol also offer relevant lessons on how biome-specific governance and market engagement can be combined to address deforestation risks in regions where agricultural expansion is a central driver. An important lesson from these experiences is that effective policy design must be biome-specific and accompanied by governance arrangements capable of translating national goals into territorial implementation.

Advanced monitoring systems, including satellite-based tools such as PRODES and DETER, have played a key role in increasing transparency and enabling rapid responses to deforestation dynamics. Complementary initiatives such as MapBiomas have expanded data availability and improved territorial monitoring capacity. At the same time, the discussions highlighted the importance of expanding monitoring capacity beyond the Amazon. While PRODES already provides national coverage, DETER remains concentrated in the Amazon,

which limits the ability to respond to fires and forest degradation in other biomes. This points to a broader lesson on the need to strengthen monitoring systems in ways that are territorially comprehensive and interoperable across data platforms. “União com os Municípios” program, financed by the Amazon Fund, is also a relevant experience in strengthening territorial governance and prioritisation at the local level, while exposing implementation bottlenecks related to rural extension services, land tenure regularisation, payments for ecosystem services, and other enabling conditions.

Sustainable forest use models, such as forest concessions in public lands, demonstrate how economic activities can be aligned with conservation objectives. Jurisdictional approaches, exemplified by subnational strategies such as Mato Grosso’s Produce, Conserve, Include (PCI) strategy, illustrate the importance of integrating production, conservation, and social inclusion at the territorial level. The network also highlighted jurisdictional REDD+ initiatives, with Tocantins mentioned as a relevant example, reinforcing the value of subnational approaches that connect climate finance, territorial governance, and implementation. In addition, greater attention was drawn to public-private efforts related to deforestation-free supply chains, including the Soy Moratorium, the Beef TAC, Beef on Track, the Pará Green Grain Protocol, and other traceability-oriented arrangements reinforce the importance of practical tools, shared criteria, and coordination across actors to support implementation in complex commodity chains. Those are experiences that can inform the design of more effective accountability and market alignment mechanisms.

In Brazil, the Pará Sustainable Cattle Program is building full traceability systems for cattle supply chains, while the Soy on Track program provides a platform for soy producers, traders, and other supply chain actors to access tools, data, and technical information to comply with the Amazon Soy Moratorium and Pará’s Green Grain Protocol. Similarly, Beef on Track provides an example of how digital tools and structured information can support the cattle sector in advancing traceability, monitoring, and compliance with deforestation-related commitments. Independent certification schemes and other verification mechanisms can also help strengthen credibility, comparability, and accountability across forest and agricultural value chains.

Financial and institutional mechanisms also provide important lessons. The Amazon Fund represents a tested mechanism for financing prevention, monitoring, and sustainable production, while Indigenous Territories and Protected Areas have consistently demonstrated strong effectiveness in containing deforestation when land rights are secured. The Living Amazon Mechanism and Brazil’s Sovereign Sustainable Bonds demonstrate innovative approaches to mobilising blended public-private forest finance at the national scale. The USD 1.7 billion IPLC Forest Tenure Pledge (1.0) – which exceeded its target at COP26 – provides a model for direct funding commitments for tenure and guardianship. The Rural Environmental Registry (CAR) was also mentioned as an important experience, although still marked by major implementation gaps that limit its full effectiveness. A broader lesson emerging from these examples is that successful experiences should not only demonstrate sound institutional design, but also show the capacity to channel resources into implementation at scale. In this context, Brazil’s Ecological Transformation Plan offers a relevant example of how national development strategies can help align climate, land-use, and economic policy. Instruments associated with this agenda, such as Eco Invest, are particularly relevant for demonstrating how public frameworks can help mobilize finance, de-risk investment, and connect forest and

agricultural transitions to a wider development strategy. In the same direction, sector-led financial frameworks such as SARB 26 provide useful lessons on how the financial system can incorporate socio-environmental and climate-related criteria into decision-making, helping to align capital allocation with forest and land-use objectives.

Agricultural subsidies and other public incentives that indirectly encourage forest conversion remain an important challenge and deserve greater attention in the transition toward more sustainable land-use systems. Repurposing part of these incentives toward climate-smart and forest-positive approaches could generate significant social, economic, and environmental benefits, particularly if accompanied by complementary measures to protect vulnerable groups, including smallholder producers who may be adversely affected by subsidy reform. In practice, this may include technical assistance for sustainable production, improved access to concessional finance for land-use transition, and payments for ecosystem services. In Brazil, recent regulatory changes such as CMN Resolution No. 5,193 of December 19, 2024, which introduced social, environmental, and climate-related criteria into rural credit rules, illustrate how financial regulation can begin to align public support mechanisms with broader climate and forest objectives. In the same direction, sector-led financial frameworks such as SARB 26 provide useful lessons on how the financial system can incorporate socio-environmental and climate-related criteria into decision-making, helping to align capital allocation with forest and land-use objectives.

Policies promoting agricultural intensification and restoration demonstrate how increasing productivity in already converted areas can reduce pressure on forests. In Brazil, this approach is supported by a set of national policy frameworks that integrate agricultural production, restoration, and climate objectives. Key examples include the Low-Carbon Agriculture Plan (ABC+), which promotes sustainable and low-emission production systems; the National Program for the Conversion of Degraded Pastures (PNCPD), which focuses on restoring productivity in already cleared lands; and the Plan for Native Vegetation Recovery (Planaveg), which provides strategic direction for scaling ecological restoration and the Productive Forests Programme (Floresta Produtiva), led by the Ministry of Agrarian Development, which helps illustrate how forest-based production, restoration, and the inclusion of family farmers can be articulated within territorial development strategies. Together, these policies illustrate how aligning agricultural efficiency with restoration efforts can contribute to reducing deforestation while supporting rural development.

In addition, civil society-led restoration platforms have played an important pre-competitive alignment role in advancing restoration at scale. Notable examples include the Atlantic Forest Restoration Pact and the Amazon Restoration Alliance, which help align methodologies, shared agendas, technical standards, and territorial strategies among multiple actors before direct project implementation. Similar collaborative arrangements exist across other biomes, reinforcing the importance of collective action to strengthen coordination, expand technical capacity, and develop supply chains for seeds, seedlings, and restoration services. Native seeds and seedlings should be treated as strategic components of restoration policy and implementation, rather than as secondary operational issues.

In parallel, data governance and monitoring initiatives have become increasingly relevant. The Restoration Observatory, an initiative incubated by the Brazilian Coalition on Climate, Forests and Agriculture, aims to consolidate and systematise data on restoration efforts, improving

transparency, tracking progress, and strengthening the evidence base for decision-making and policy design.

Innovation initiatives are also critical, particularly where they help create the enabling conditions for new forest-based economic activities to scale. A relevant example is the Research and Development Program on Native Species Silviculture (PP&D-SEN), launched from a pre-competitive alignment among private sector actors, academia, and civil society. The program was designed to address longstanding scientific, technological, regulatory, and market gaps that have limited the expansion of native species forestry, despite its potential to generate timber, carbon removal, biodiversity benefits, and rural income. By building the foundations for native-species silviculture to become a viable land-use option on already cleared and degraded lands, PP&D-SEN contributes to making forest-based production more competitive and to reducing pressure for further land conversion.

(d) How can forest conservation, sustainable management, and restoration best reflect the diverse realities of countries at different stages of development, the rights and knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, and different degrees of forest cover?

The analysis highlights that effective implementation of forest-related strategies must reflect the diversity of national and territorial contexts. Countries differ significantly in terms of forest cover, development pathways, and the drivers of deforestation, which requires context-specific policy approaches adapted to local ecological and socio-economic conditions. The Brazilian experience across different biomes, such as the Amazon and the Cerrado, illustrates the need for differentiated strategies.

The central role of Indigenous Peoples and local communities is consistently emphasised. These groups are key actors in forest conservation, and their effectiveness is closely linked to the recognition of land rights, territorial protection, and the incorporation of traditional knowledge systems into policy frameworks. Strengthening collective tenure security can help reduce land grabbing and conflict, improve policy implementation, and reinforce the resilience of forest territories under pressure. In this sense, advancing the recognition, protection, and effective implementation of collective rights remains a relevant condition for long-term forest conservation.

It is also essential to recognize the specific realities of smallholder farmers, who often operate under very different economic, technical, and institutional conditions than large-scale producers. In many contexts, smallholders face limited access to credit, technical assistance, markets, land tenure security, and risk-sharing instruments, even though they play an important role in rural livelihoods, food production, and land-use dynamics. Policies aimed at halting and reversing deforestation should therefore avoid one-size-fits-all approaches and instead provide differentiated conditions for inclusion, enabling smallholders to transition towards more sustainable and forest-positive practices without undermining their livelihoods. This may include tailored access to finance, rural extension services, support for compliance, and incentive structures that reflect their scale and constraints.

More broadly, the integration of conservation and production emerges as a critical dimension. Strategies must move beyond treating these as competing objectives and instead promote

territorial development models that combine low-carbon agriculture, restoration, bioeconomy, and sustainable forest use within an integrated framework, consistent with a forest continuum approach.

Finally, mobilising private capital is essential to scaling forest-based solutions. The Brazilian case suggests that the country's leadership in this agenda will depend on the ability to attract and direct private investment toward bioeconomy value chains, carbon markets, restoration at scale, silviculture of native species, and technological innovation. In this context, private sector engagement is not peripheral, but a central condition for expanding implementation, reducing pressure for land conversion, and consolidating forest-based economic alternatives over the long term.