COP 30 Presidency Roadmap for Halting and Reversing Deforestation and Forest Degradation by 2030

Email Address	First name and name	Nationality	Gender	Institutional affiliation	Country of work	ob positi	What are the most critical barriers — whether physical, economic, financial, institutional, technological or social — preventing the halting and reversing of deforestation and forest degradation?	What potential levers, whether economic, financial, institutional, social or technological,existfor accelerating the implementation of the commitment to halt and reverse deforestation and forest degradation?	What country, regional or sector roadmap experiences, best practices, and lessons learned can be shared regarding forest conservation and restoration?	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?	Any other information which you would like to share
		India	Male	Graphic Era (Deemed to	India	Assistan	A primary barrier is institutional and governance failure. This manifests as a critical lack of alignment and coordination across government levels and sectors, creating conflicting policies where one arm of the government promotes conservation while another subsidizes the very industries driving destruction . This is compounded by an "enforcement vacuum" where strong forest protection laws exist on paper but lack the political will and resources for implementation on the ground . Furthermore, the absence of a universal, agreed-upon definition for "forest degradation" creates "definitional chaos," making it impossible to set clear global targets, measure progress consistently, or hold actors accountable . Without a shared scorecard, underperformance can hide behind differing national methodologies. The second critical barrier is perverse financial flows and economic disincentives. The financial system is fundamentally misaligned with forest protection goals. A stark UNDP report reveals that for every one US dollar spent on forest protection, six dollars flow into sectors actively driving deforestation, such as industrial agriculture and logging . This includes $500 billion annually in government subsidies that encourage environmental destruction and $6.1 trillion from private financial institutions invested in deforestation-linked sectors . Simultaneously, there is a massive shortfall in positive finance, with a global biodiversity funding gap of nearly $1 trillion per year . This is exacerbated by debt burdens in developing nations, which often force them to exploit forest resources for short-term economic survival rather than long-term conservation . Finally, economic and technological implementation barriers prevent effective action on the ground. Market-based solutions like the EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR), while well-intentioned, risk being undermined by the high costs of compliance and physical segregation of commodities. These costs can exceed the narrow 1-3% profit margins in sectors like the soy trade, potentially pushing deforestation-linked products away from regulated markets like the EU and toward less stringent ones, without solving the underlying problem . Furthermore, while technology exists to monitor forests, a "technological access divide" persists. The countries most affected by forest loss often lack the capacity for advanced monitoring, forcing them to rely on outdated data and inconsistent indicators, which cripples effective management and rapid response to illegal activities .	The most transformative lever is the redirection of financial flows at a systemic level. We must move from a system that inadvertently funds destruction to one that rewards protection. This involves, firstly, shifting the $500 billion in harmful government subsidies toward positive incentives for conservation and sustainable agriculture. Secondly, we need to massively scale innovative mechanisms like the proposed Tropical Forests Forever Facility (TFFF), which would pay tropical countries a fixed amount per hectare for standing forests, regardless of the carbon price volatility. This provides predictable, large-scale funding for conservation. Simultaneously, we must leverage the power of the private sector through regulations like the EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR), which mandates that products placed on the market are deforestation-free, forcing companies to clean up their supply chains and creating a powerful market pull for sustainable commodities. On the institutional and policy front, the most critical lever is securing the land rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Data overwhelmingly shows that tenure-secure Indigenous territories are the most effective barrier against deforestation. Formalizing and protecting these rights is a low-cost, high-impact intervention that empowers the best forest guardians. Another key institutional lever is fostering cross-governmental coherence, ensuring that ministries of agriculture, finance, and planning are aligned with environmental goals, rather than working at cross-purposes through conflicting subsidies and development plans. Technological and social levers are equally vital. The rapid advancement of near-real-time monitoring systems using satellite data and AI puts unprecedented power in the hands of regulators and civil society to detect and respond to illegal clearing as it happens. This technology, when made accessible, closes the enforcement gap. Finally, the emerging forest bioeconomy offers a powerful economic lever. By creating viable markets and value chains for products like açaí, nuts, and bio-pharmaceuticals that come from a standing forest, we can make conservation economically competitive with cattle ranching or soy farming. This shifts the paradigm from forests as an obstacle to development to forests as the very foundation of a prosperous and sustainable economy.	The Amazon Fund in Brazil offers one of the most powerful examples of a financial and institutional mechanism for conservation. Created in 2008, it operates on a simple but transformative premise: rewarding results. It raises international donations (primarily from Norway and Germany) for verified reductions in deforestation. These funds are then channeled to Brazilian government agencies, states, and municipalities, as well as NGOs and research institutions, to support monitoring, enforcement, and sustainable production. The critical lesson here is that results-based payments can work, but they require robust institutions to receive and manage funds transparently and a credible system for measuring and verifying emissions reductions. The fund's effectiveness has also shown that consistent, long-term international partnership is essential, but it must be resilient to political changes within the recipient country. Costa Rica's decades-long experience provides a world-renowned model for national restoration through payments for ecosystem services (PES) . Starting in the 1990s, the country reversed one of the highest deforestation rates in the hemisphere by fundamentally changing the economic equation for forest landowners. Through its FONAFIFO program, the government pays landowners to conserve standing forests, manage sustainable timber, or reforest degraded areas. The funding comes from a dedicated fuel tax and water tariffs, creating a sustainable domestic financing stream. The key lesson from Costa Rica is that making conservation economically viable for landowners is essential. By putting a direct price on the services forests provide (carbon, water, biodiversity), it transformed them from a liability into an asset, proving that national-scale restoration is possible with consistent policy and dedicated financing. At the sector level, the Brazilian Soy Moratorium stands as a landmark example of a private-sector-led solution. Launched in 2006 by major traders and civil society, it was a voluntary agreement not to purchase soy grown on newly deforested land in the Amazon. Crucially, it was paired with a robust monitoring system using satellite imagery to track both deforestation and soy planting. The result was a dramatic reduction in soy-driven deforestation in the biome. The lesson learned is powerful: supply chain interventions can be highly effective when they combine clear, simple rules with credible monitoring and the commitment of major market players. However, its success also highlighted the challenge of "leakage," as deforestation pressure shifted to other biomes like the Cerrado, underscoring the need for these mechanisms to expand geographically. Finally, the experience of community forest management in Mexico and Nepal offers critical social and institutional lessons. In Mexico, over half of the country's forests are owned by communities (ejidos), and legal reforms have empowered them to manage these lands for commercial timber. Research shows that community-managed forests often have lower deforestation rates than protected areas. In Nepal, community forestry user groups have restored vast areas of degraded hill forests. The shared lesson is that securing tenure rights and building local technical and business capacity is a powerful conservation strategy. When communities have a long-term stake in the forest's health and a viable economic pathway from its sustainable management, they become its most effective and motivated guardians. This demonstrates that conservation is as much about empowering people as it is about protecting trees.	First, strategies must be differentiated according to national circumstances and stages of development. For developing countries with high forest cover and low deforestation rates, the priority is often proactive protection. This requires predictable, long-term international finance and technology transfer to support monitoring and sustainable development, effectively valuing their standing forests as a global asset. For nations with historically high deforestation, the focus shifts to aggressive law enforcement, landscape restoration, and redirecting agricultural subsidies toward sustainable intensification. For developed, largely temperate countries with stable or expanding forest cover, the responsibility lies in leading by example—protecting primary forests, restoring degraded ecosystems within their borders, and ensuring their consumption patterns do not drive deforestation abroad through imported commodities. This principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities" is not about assigning blame, but about matching action to circumstance. Second, efforts must fundamentally center the rights, knowledge, and leadership of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. This is not merely a matter of social justice; it is a proven conservation strategy. Reflecting their diverse realities means moving beyond token consultation to full recognition of land tenure rights. Data consistently shows that deforestation rates are significantly lower on lands where Indigenous and community rights are legally secured. It also means respecting and integrating traditional knowledge into management plans, from controlled burning practices that prevent megafires to sustainable harvesting techniques honed over generations. Effective reflection requires that financial mechanisms, such as the new Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage or forest carbon markets, are designed to provide direct, accessible funding to these communities, empowering them as partners and rights-holders, not just beneficiaries. Finally, approaches must be tailored to different degrees and types of forest cover. Countries with vast, intact primary forests, like those in the Amazon or Congo Basin, must prioritize the integrity of these ecosystems, as they are irreplaceable for biodiversity and climate stability. Here, the focus is on defending against frontier expansion and degradation. In contrast, countries with fragmented forests or high historical loss, like many in Central America or West Africa, require a focus on landscape restoration and connectivity. This involves using agroforestry to create biological corridors and restoring degraded lands to improve ecosystem services for local communities. The mosaic of forest cover demands a mosaic of solutions: strict protection for wilderness, sustainable management for production forests, and active restoration for degraded lands, all tailored to the ecological and social context.	
		South-Korea	Male	Hawassa University	Ethiopia	Prof.	The most critical barrier would be economic issues.	I thought economic levers.	German, Sweden, South-Korea	Set up appropriate not advanced goals and strategies for forest conservation and restoration depending on local conditions	NA
		Norwegian	Female	UK Centre for Ecology an	UK	Scientist	The most critical barriers to halting and reversing deforestation and forest degradation are systemic and interconnected, spanning economic, institutional, social, and technological dimensions, with particularly acute challenges in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Economic drivers and incentives remain the dominant barrier. Global demand for agricultural commodities (e.g. beef, soy, palm oil) and timber continues to make deforestation economically attractive, often outweighing the perceived value of standing forests. Perverse incentives, including harmful subsidies and weakly regulated markets, reinforce forest loss. Financial constraints and misaligned flows further limit progress. There is a substantial gap in accessible, predictable, and long-term finance for forest conservation, restoration, and sustainable land use—especially for LMICs. At the same time, significantly larger financial flows continue to support deforestation-linked activities, while mechanisms such as carbon markets and results-based finance face challenges related to scale, integrity, and equitable benefit-sharing. Institutional and governance weaknesses are a major barrier. Limited enforcement capacity, corruption, insecure land tenure, and fragmented policy frameworks reduce the effectiveness of forest protection measures. In many contexts, unclear or contested land rights—particularly for Indigenous Peoples and local communities—undermine sustainable management. Social and equity challenges are also central. Local communities often depend on forests for livelihoods, and without viable economic alternatives, conservation efforts may conflict with immediate survival needs. Exclusion from decision-making processes and inequitable distribution of benefits can reduce trust and undermine long-term success. Technological and capacity gaps constrain monitoring, enforcement, and sustainable land management. While tools such as satellite monitoring have advanced, many countries lack the technical capacity, infrastructure, or data systems to fully utilise them. Physical and environmental pressures, including climate change, increase the frequency of fires, droughts, and pests, weakening forest resilience and accelerating degradation. Addressing these barriers requires aligning economic incentives with conservation, scaling up equitable finance, strengthening governance and land rights, investing in capacity and technology, and ensuring that forest protection supports sustainable livelihoods and development goals.	Accelerating progress to halt and reverse deforestation requires aligning economic incentives, finance, governance, and community action. Key levers include promoting deforestation-free supply chains, removing harmful subsidies, and scaling up accessible, long-term finance such as results-based payments and blended finance. Strengthening land tenure—especially for Indigenous Peoples and local communities—alongside improved governance, enforcement, and land-use planning is critical. Empowering local communities and supporting sustainable livelihoods enhances effectiveness and equity, while technological tools like satellite monitoring and traceability systems improve transparency and accountability. Strong international cooperation is essential to address global drivers and support implementation, particularly in low- and middle-income countries.	A range of country and regional experiences offer valuable lessons for advancing forest conservation and restoration. Brazil provides a well-documented example of rapid reductions in deforestation in the Amazon during the mid-2000s through strong law enforcement, satellite monitoring, expansion of protected areas, and supply chain interventions such as the soy and beef moratoria. A key lesson is that coordinated policy action across sectors, backed by enforcement and transparency, can deliver large-scale results, though maintaining progress requires sustained political commitment. Costa Rica demonstrates long-term success in forest restoration and conservation by combining payments for ecosystem services, forest protection laws, and ecotourism. Its experience highlights the importance of aligning economic incentives with conservation and ensuring stable, long-term financing mechanisms. Indonesia has made progress through peatland restoration initiatives, forest moratoria, and improved fire management. Lessons include the value of targeted ecosystem restoration (e.g. peatlands), strong monitoring systems, and addressing commodity-driven deforestation, particularly in palm oil sectors. At the regional level, the Bonn Challenge has catalysed large-scale restoration commitments, emphasizing landscape approaches that integrate forests, agriculture, and livelihoods. This underscores the importance of restoration at scale with clear targets and international cooperation. Across these experiences, several common best practices emerge: Strong governance and enforcement, supported by transparent monitoring systems. Economic incentives for conservation, including payments for ecosystem services and sustainable value chains. Recognition of Indigenous and community land rights, which consistently improves outcomes. Integrated landscape approaches that balance conservation, restoration, and production. Long-term policy consistency and financing, which are essential for sustaining gains. Overall, these examples show that successful forest conservation and restoration depend on combining policy, finance, community engagement, and technology, adapted to national contexts and supported by international cooperation.	Forest conservation, sustainable management, and restoration must be context-specific, inclusive, and flexible, reflecting the wide diversity of national circumstances, forest types, and social realities. First, approaches should be differentiated by development stage and forest context. Countries with high forest cover and low historical deforestation may prioritise conservation and prevention (e.g. avoiding future loss), while those with significant degradation may focus more on restoration and sustainable land use. In low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), strategies must also align with pressing development needs such as poverty reduction, food security, and energy access, ensuring that forest protection does not come at the expense of livelihoods. Second, recognising and securing the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities (IPLCs) is fundamental. Evidence consistently shows that forests managed by IPLCs often have lower deforestation rates. Effective approaches therefore include secure land tenure, respect for customary governance systems, and full participation in decision-making. Integrating traditional knowledge with scientific approaches can strengthen resilience, biodiversity outcomes, and long-term sustainability. Third, flexible policy frameworks and financing mechanisms are needed to accommodate different capacities and priorities. Countries with limited institutional or financial resources require accessible, predictable international support, including concessional finance, capacity building, and technology transfer. Benefit-sharing mechanisms must be equitable and transparent to ensure local engagement and trust. Fourth, landscape-level and integrated approaches are critical. Balancing conservation, restoration, and production within the same landscape—through tools such as agroforestry and sustainable forest management—can deliver climate, biodiversity, and livelihood benefits simultaneously. Finally, adaptive and inclusive governance is essential. Policies should be iterative, based on monitoring and local feedback, and coordinated across sectors such as agriculture, forestry, and infrastructure. This ensures that strategies remain effective under changing environmental and socio-economic conditions. In sum, reflecting diverse realities requires moving beyond one-size-fits-all solutions toward locally grounded, rights-based, and development-aligned approaches, supported by strong international cooperation and long-term commitment.	