

More (bad) news from Papua New Guinea

By Chris Lang, 29th September 2009

 Flattr this!



Here are two more REDD-related news items from Papua New Guinea. The first is an article from Ilya Gridneff, a journalist with Australian Associated Press in Port Moresby. Carbon Planet has invested A\$1.2 million in projects in PNG.

Gridneff has uncovered more about where some of the money went – apparently to James Kond, the vice-president of PNG's ruling party, who offered to help “secure endorsement of these projects for carbon trading from the PNG government”. The second is a statement from the Eco-Forestry Forum, a PNG NGO, calling for a stop to carbon scams in the country.

By Ilya Gridneff

PORT MORESBY, Sept 24 AAP – A Papua New Guinea governing party power broker was paid 200,000 kina (\$A85,000), ultimately funded by Australian environment firm Carbon Planet, for “consultation” on carbon trading deals central to a pending investigation.

James Kond, PNG's ruling National Alliance (NA) party vice-president, received the money on May 14, 2008, as part of Carbon Planet's \$1.1 million spend with companies in PNG for carbon projects they predict are worth a billion dollars a year.

Documents obtained by AAP show Carbon Planet's money went through Hong Kong-based company Forest Top, that then paid a number of entities including Australian businessman Kirk Roberts and his PNG company Nupan and its local facilitator Kond.

On April 16, 2008, Kond signed a memorandum of agreement with Forest Top, Roberts and Nupan assuring his work would earn him “10 per cent of the net cash flow generated from carbon credit sales”.

Kond's Western Highlands Province-based business Koo management was: “to liaise with and advise the PNG government” on Nupan's deals that Carbon Planet would then broker for the global voluntary carbon market.

Kond stands by the deal and says there was no conflict of interest.

“It is a confidential business arrangement and none of your business about the way we do business,” he said.

“I've been deputy NA leader for 10 years and doing my part to improve PNG and to help policy (and) there is no need for these investigations.

“I have not dealt with Carbon Planet, I invited Kirk (Roberts) to PNG and receive money from Nupan as their country representative.”

Adelaide-based Carbon Planet declined to respond to questions.

Kond's other Nupan responsibilities included: “to bring together all of the parties and other persons required to achieve the commercialisation of the carbon credits from the specific present and future projects in PNG”.

In a series of letters obtained by AAP, Kond writes to Roberts on December 28, 2007, suggesting PNG's Kamula Doso forest in Western Province and April Salome forest in East Sepik as potentially lucrative future carbon trading sites.

“I will personally be there to assist you to secure endorsement of these projects for carbon trading from the PNG government as I am part of the PM Somare government through being an executive member of the NA ruling party that has direct influence on shaping government policy,” he writes.

In February, 2008, Kond urges PNG Prime Minister Michael Somare to meet him and experts from Australia.

“I am delighted to inform you we have already secured two projects for this carbon trading program,” he said.

“I am now seeking a formal appointment ... to brief you on this matter.”

Somare's media spokesperson Betha Somare, who has seen the letters, said: “The PM has never met Kirk Roberts or his associates”.

AAP understands PM Somare's then chief of staff Theo Yasause met Roberts and also met several members of Carbon Planet.

Yasause later became PNG's Office of Climate Change (OCC) director but was suspended pending an investigation that includes why the office went bankrupt in less than a year of operating.

The investigation will also delve into a series of “sample” carbon trade documents Yasause signed as OCC director as well as a mandate to assure international carbon deals.

Acting OCC director Wari Iamo in a newspaper advertisement on August 31 said PNG was waiting for United Nations endorsed carbon trading rules, expected after the Copenhagen climate summit in December.

“Carbon trading agreements cannot be legally signed over these (PNG) lands until the government has put in place an appropriate policy and legal framework,” he said.

Carbon Planet in July announced a merger with Australian publicly listed company m2m Group, saying they had 25 potential carbon trading projects in PNG that could generate \$1 billion a year.

But Carbon Planet has not said where their PNG projects are, what the landowners benefits are, nor do they recognise that the 800,000-hectare Kamula Doso forest is subject to a court injunction on projects.

Carbon Planet's merger with m2m is “continuing with some delay arising from the complicated and novel circumstances of this emerging industry,” m2m said in a statement.

AAP ig/mo/cdh

Here's the statement from Eco-Forestry Forum. It is also [available here](#) (PDF file 50 KB).

THE PAPUA NEW GUINEA
ECO-FORESTRY FORUM
P.O. Box 3217, Boroko, National Capital District

EFF Calls on Government of PNG, Development Partners and AusAid to Protect PNG from Carbon Scams

In April 2009 the activities of the PNG Office of Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability (OCCES) brought international condemnation and embarrassment for the Somare Government.

Central to the scandal was the printing of fake 'state-backed' carbon credits, and their sale to an Australian company 'Carbon Planet'. It was reported by the Economist that Carbon Planet acquired 39 'certificates' giving them saleable rights to much of PNG's forests (1). Since then Carbon Planet has gone on to raise funds and list on the Australian Stock exchange (2). According to Carbon Planet CEO Jim Johnson "the company has exclusive rights over 25 REDD projects in PNG alone which could generate up to \$1 billion a year in carbon credits for the project owners (2)".

The certificates issued by OCCES have no legal basis. One of them, that provided a guarantee to the million hectares of forest in the Kamula Doso region, has been enjoined by the National Court in proceedings instituted by The PNG Eco-forestry Forum (PNGEFF) (3). Further the carbon rights over Kamula Doso were issued despite the fact that PNG Forest Authority (PNGFA) had already allocated timber rights over the exact same area to Rimbunan Hijau, a Malaysian Logging Company that owns over half of the forest concessions in PNG. The acquisition and allocation of those timber rights is currently the subject of an existing national court injunction obtained by PNGEFF, and litigation over those timber rights is on-going.

The scandal caused by these certificates led to the suspension of then Director of OCCES, Dr. Theo Yasause, referral of the OCCES to the Public Accounts Committee and the appointment of the Secretary for Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) as acting Executive Director.

The PNGEFF hoped that this was the beginning of a new direction for the management of PNG's Climate Change Strategies. It now appears that this was naive.

In May 2009, The Economist reported that an Australian National University Academic Dr Colin Filer, was working for Carbon Planet. His contract involved advising Carbon Planet on methods of paying landowners for carbon projects in PNG (4).

We now understand that the same Dr Filer has been engaged by DEC undertake stakeholder analysis under its UN-REDD National Joint Programme which has already been signed by the acting Expectative Director of the Office of Climate Change. We further understand that Dr. Filer may also, under the same arrangement, be engaged to undertake "a review and synthesis of mechanisms for securing land for REDD and for benefit sharing" as indicated by a Climate Change Update prepared by the OCCES (5). It is believed that payments for his services to DEC and the government of PNG could potentially be, among others, supported through funds secured by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) under the Australian Governments (AusAID) International Forest Carbon Initiative (IFCI) to undertake a synthesis portfolio of case studies on both customary land agreements and benefit sharing mechanisms. It is believed that this work will form part of the interim Low Carbon Strategy for PNG with the emphasis on REDD.

Dr. Filer's engagement with both Carbon Planet and the Department of Environment and Conservation is of major concern to the Eco-forestry Forum and its members.

Kenn Mondiai, Chairman of the EFF asks:

1. Would DEC/Government of PNG not consider that hiring Dr. Filer to advise the PNG Government on how to secure land for carbon projects when he is also advising Carbon Planet on how to access the same forests for carbon projects, is a major conflict of interest?
2. Would the DEC/Government tell the people of PNG if there was a proper tendering process that resulted in the engagement of Dr. Filer.
3. "Has it already been decided by the Government if Carbon Planet will take the lead in commercialising carbon projects in PNG? IF so why?"
4. Could the Government of PNG tell the people of PNG how Carbon Planet was able to obtain carbon credits in the absence of a national climate change and carbon trade policy?
5. Do all parties in this process see this as an action best undertaken through a wider stakeholder consultation, which was started during the OCCES regional workshops in May 2009?
6. Could the Australian Government tell the people of PNG if it has any links at all to Carbon Planet? If so to what level and or extend?

"We need to promote good governance by bringing transparency into the creation of carbon-related policy" said Mr Mondiai. "The people of this country have suffered enough from bad governance in other resource sectors and we do not want to see the same happen in any climate change related incentives including through REDD" he added.

The Forum and its members demand that:

1. Dr. Filer should not be engaged on anything to do with Climate Change, Carbon Trade and REDD in PNG.
2. Dr. Filer's contract must be terminated.

Finally we call upon all development partners and donors to work together in a true spirit of partnership and transparency to make REDD work for PNG and its people. There must be true consultation.

For further comment contact Chairman Kenn Mondiai

1. natashaloder.blogspot.com
2. www.theaustralian.news.com.au
3. natashaloder.blogspot.com
4. natashaloder.blogspot.com
5. Memo from Dr Wari Iamo dated 17 August, 2009.

The Papua New Guinea Eco-Forestry Forum supports integrated rural community development and sustainable resource use through a viable and sustainable eco-forestry industry

Tel: 323 9050

Fax: 323 0397

Email: teff@global.net.pg

Website: www.ecoforestry.org.pg

share this:

0

[Share](#)

[StumbleUpon](#)

[Share](#)

Tags: [Carbon Credits](#), [Risk](#) | Category: [Papua New Guinea](#) |

11 comments to More (bad) news from Papua New Guinea

1 [David Gilbert](#) says:
9 October 2009 at 9:51 pm

Conflict of interest? Business as usual? A matter of concern? I guess it all comes down to who you ask. We at RAN recently sponsored a environmental advocate and impacted landowner from Milne Bay, PNG to come to the US to speak about her experiences with oil palm expansion and carbon trading in Papua New Guinea.

Matilda Pilacapio brought with her testimonials and photographs of the struggles small shareholders are having with ecological destruction and debt at Cargill's massive oil palm operations in Milne Bay.

She also brought a little heard first person perspective on the tumultuous process PNG is experiencing with carbon trading. Matilda stressed the likelihood that carbon trading schemes will be subject to the dangers of transfer pricing, where corporations and government actors receive kickbacks and under-the-table payments for selling PNG's natural resources, in this case carbon, at lower than market prices, filling their pockets while further exploiting local people and PNG taxpayers. Matilda pointed to a long history of transfer pricing in the forestry sector in PNG as a precedent.

Although James Kond and Carbon Planet want us to believe they are just following normal business procedures, the recent reporting by Gridneff for the AAP shows that carbon speculators are establishing government connections to find a way to line their pockets, not to implement carbon projects that will reduce deforestation in PNG's tropical forests.

You can see a full interview with Matilda on oil palm and carbon trading over at Mongabay:
<http://news.mongabay.com/2009/0925-png-palm-oil.html>

David Gilbert
Research Fellow, RAN

2 [Richard King](#) says:
10 October 2009 at 6:58 am

Dear David,
I would like to respond regarding first hand experience to the facts in PNG.

The company Nupan has a strong originating process in place.
Observed by Independent International verifiers in PNG at project sites. (see Post Courier)
A submitted "Methodology"
Complete consent.
A generous Distribution Model.
I must say we are impressed.

Richard King creative brain

3 [jackson](#) says:
17 October 2009 at 12:11 pm

The Real Threat to PNG Forests

Much has been written in the world press about REDD, Carbon Trading in PNG, and the machinations of Global Warming and Climate Change. But so far, not a single article, blog, journalist or newscaster has addressed the single most important issue facing PNG – let alone the world.

Do we want the forests in PNG to remain standing for future generations?

Intellectually, many of us would say "yes". But then just as many of us degenerate into conversations about the mishmash of standards, verification organizations, REDD, CDM, VER, VCU, and a plethora of acronyms that make the space race seem mild by comparison.

Many articles have laboured the point that any Carbon Trading scheme in PNG must have the support of the local indigenous people. Every article and blog so far has assumed that the people and companies behind Carbon Trading in PNG don't have such support.

They are completely wrong.

This writer, at the invitation of Nupan (PNG) Trading Corporation Limited, and the PNG Government, has been privileged to openly tour with two other internationally accredited journalists through many of the proposed Project Areas, to freely meet and speak with the local people in villages, towns, forests, and camps. We have also been given open access to Government officials and Departmental staff, to hear first hand what is really happening inside PNG.

All told, we have now been involved with over 10,000 people, and filmed around 60 hours of speeches, sing-sings, commentary, and interviews, literally all over PNG.

The people of PNG – the landowners of PNG – intellectually, emotionally, and vocally want to preserve their forests for future generations. And Carbon Trading offers them a non-destructive way to both preserve their traditional domain, and earn a living that can enhance their lives and the development of the entire country.

The unambiguous and literal truth is that of all the Pacific Nations, PNG has done more to facilitate the organized and honest business of Carbon Trading than any other country – and that includes Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, Samoa, the Philippines, Japan, Korea, and all the other Island nations combined.

The PNG Government realized some years ago that the outside world would try to take advantage of it, and either use economic power or political power to try to take over the forests, and their carbon potential. The UNFCCC started a round of discussions to address the potential of forest credits, and it quickly developed that there were four or five main agendas being developed by different countries, none of which were in the best interests of PNG.

Australia wanted to avoid doing anything at all until it had to about Emissions Reductions – but at the same time started a dialogue with the PNG Government that had at its heart a simple swap – continued Australian Aid for control of the forests. When that didn't get a warm response, they tried to create a scenario where all the forests would be classed as conservation areas, effectively bypassing both the PNG Government and the traditional PNG land owners in one seemingly environmentally friendly swoop.

And when that strategy failed, they cleverly inserted staff into the key offices within the PNG Government in the guise of "Aid" to try and control the development agenda. This is the situation that remains today – we journalists saw and experienced this for ourselves, as over the past few months fake stories and "facts" were consistently leaked to pliable Australian media contacts by Australians working in different Government departments under the guise of "advisors". This stream of disinformation turned into malicious stories that at times have effectively challenged the PNG Government's ability to govern the country.

One such story about the Office of Climate Change and Carbon Trading (as it was originally called) cost the Director his job, tarnished his reputation, and created havoc within the PM's Department, which created the Office. The PNG Government instigated a full and open enquiry, and within weeks found the claims to be totally and utterly baseless, only to have the matter refuelled by more malicious blogging and newspaper articles that ran and reran the same story for weeks on end. It is possible that a major financial institution is also involved in this under-the-counter power play, as their executives have been seen several times leaving the country with their tails between their legs, upset that their offer of taking over full control of the forests for a mere 15% return to the country hasn't been readily accepted!

The same institution also has a major shareholding in one of the newspaper groups that is continually republishing the "old" stories.

It seems that today it doesn't matter what the facts are, or when an issue is formally and honestly resolved, it's okay to keep publishing the "old" story in the hope that people are hoodwinked into believing what the media want them to believe.

In this case one has to ask what the Australian Government wanted out of all this malicious and fictitious dialogue, which if they didn't overtly support, they certainly covertly provided the disinformation that formed the centre of the arguments.

The answer is simple. Control of the PNG forests, at the lowest possible cost to the Australian Government.

The USA also took the stance that they would do nothing until they were forced to by either world opinion or a Pacific Island sinking into the ocean. Only since the election earlier this year has the US started the political process of establishing some form of cap and trade scheme – albeit one flawed from the start with "forgiveness slips" to high emitters reminiscent of the dark ages when the Church was still trying to conquer the world.

Other countries took varying stances depending on their social consciences, with many choosing to create debate within their own societies to better understand both the effect and the potential of Emission Reduction Schemes. PNG kept to their strategy, and slowly and quietly went about the business of working out how to protect the

interests of their people, support the rights of the indigenous landowners, and bring their forest to market in a manner that was acceptable to the international community. One man, guided by his father, started work some years ago, to understand the fundamentals that would help PNG keep control of their forests, while maximizing the potential commercial return to the land owners and indigenous people. "Roberts", as he is widely known as throughout PNG, crossed the country nonstop for three years meeting villagers, tribal elders, Government workers, land owners, resource developers, and literally anyone who wanted to talk about the forests and the potential for carbon trading. He sought to find the literal truth that would enable the PNG Government and the people to keep control of their forests while retaining their basic right to earn a living. The answer lay in PNG Corporations Law. Under this, indigenous landowners are able to form groups – incorporated companies – that have the full authority of a normal company, with all the legal and social responsibilities of any business inside PNG.

There were several critical issues that this business model addressed elegantly – not the least of which is the strong tribal, cultural, and social focus of the country, as well as the fact that there are over 820 different languages to cope with. There is evidence that some of the land tenure elements have been a work-in-progress for thousands of years. In fact, we saw a customary map that had been crafted before the time of Christ, attached to a current ILG certificate with gave full title and rights to a specified area of land that this particular family had lived on for as far as their tribal memory could recall.

So, to simplify, a number of Indigenous Landowners group themselves together by either tribal, cultural, geographical, or social tenants, and form a company – an Incorporated Land Group (ILG) – they form a constitution and a set of bylaws, elect a Board of Directors, and establish themselves under PNG Corporations Law as an entity able to enter the nascent Carbon Trading market.

Roberts discovered that there are over thirty separate commercial and legal processes the ILG's have to manage before they are even able to have a designated Project Area. These processes establish the legitimacy of the land tenure, the role of various Government Departments such as Forestry, Environment, Fisheries, OCC&ES, and establish the fact before Law that the people want to preserve their forests and not log them.

This is the critical issue at the heart of the PNG dilemma – for many years, PNG has relied on logging to provide a meagre income for its people. Cutting down the forests has been going on for generations, and in one way or another, it is embedded in the culture of the country. To establish Carbon Trading, the whole concept of logging has to be revisited.

There are some unpalatable facts about PNG, facts that many countries try to ignore in their own self interest. Mining, Oil, and Gas projects take all the resources out of the country, and return minimal revenue to the Government and the people. The Government "owns" the rights to anything below two meters, the people own everything above. So the commercial world has been able to effectively establish huge projects inside PNG and not necessarily return a fair reward for the resources that they have milked from the land.

In fact, the people own the forests. For over nine thousand years, land tenure has evolved through tribal battles and indigenous wars to the point where you now challenge the ownership of the land at your peril.

And to its eternal credit, the PNG Government has recognized this legitimate traditional claim, and has enshrined it in both politics and Law.

When you read about Land owners locking out the workers at the Hides Gas Plant, they do so with the implicit support of the police, army, and Government. They settled their dispute peacefully, but made the point very clear – land tenure and land ownership is now a growing power within PNG, and if you want to succeed, your first discussion must be with the traditional landowners or your project will fail.

Numerous issues about landowners have been reported in the last six months, and many more will be in the next six months, all to do with developers forgetting just this one little fact – the people own the land, the people control the land, and the people are now empowered to manage and control their land.

And the people want to move from logging and into Carbon Trading.

The path is clear, but littered with pot holes, obstacles, and uncertainties, the biggest of which is the disparate and somewhat Romanesque standards against which a voluntary forest Carbon Credit must be verified, certified, and finally listed.

The VCS – voluntary carbon standard – has been built around the CDM – clean development mechanism standard, and consequently while offering considerable rigor in the mathematics of carbon accounting, is found wanting in terms of the realistic elements of baseline calculation, leakage, risk, and non permanence. For example, the base comparison is taken from a dead tree, with no consideration for the biomechanics or biodiversity of a real forest.

The CCBA – Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance – has a forest standard that is particularly socially orientated, but by itself does not really provide the rigor of parts of the VCS standard. The CCBA see themselves as potential influencers in the development of REDD.

And recently, there is a new social standard that has evolved within Brazil, and offers a truly remarkable opportunity to link a strong social content into any carbon standard.

"Roberts", after consultation with all the Standards organizations, many Governments, and even more forestry vested interests, finally decided to complete a verification process under the VCS for the first "demonstration" project to evolve within PNG. And this he is doing step by laborious step, funded almost entirely out of his own pocket. In fact, while a lot has been written about Roberts, most of it derogatory, no one found time to mention that he had sold his family home and a few blocks of land that he had accumulated to provide the majority of the funds he has expended in getting this far.

As a part of this process, it was suggested that representatives from a Verifier Organization visit the country, to see first hand what the mood and the attitude of people was, and to see what level of public consultation had been embarked on. This writer cannot comment on behalf of the verifier, but having been present during the week long visit, we can give a first hand report of what we saw and heard.

Day one, around one hundred Chairman, Directors, and landowners met in the public gardens at the back of the University, and one by one, group by group, were interviewed, by both the verifier and a local reporter. The mood was upbeat, positive, and tremendously supportive of Roberts and Nupan. Five separate project Areas were represented, with the participants having travelled from all over PNG on their own initiative to be present. Some had walked in over a period of ten days or more.

Day two saw yet another group of representatives from ILG's taking part of their own accord, and again, nothing but positive statements were heard and constant praise for Roberts and Nupan. The level of awareness of the issues and the opportunities was high, and we were all surprised by the sharp questions we were all asked. Why are you here. What do you think of PNG. Why does the outside media write such bad articles about us. Why don't they come and see us for themselves.

Day three required us and the verifier to fly to Hagen, in the central highlands of PNG. We had to fly in, as there is no road that links Port Moresby to Hagen. It takes a bit of mental adjustment to realize there is no national road system in PNG, and many of the cities, towns, and villages are literally disconnected without power or services we take for granted.

Over the next two days we visited three small tribal villages in the Kamula Doso Project area – Awaba, Lake Cambell, and Somogopa, only accessible by light aircraft, and then only on a good day weather wise. The mountains tower above five thousand meters in every direction and the clouds are often sitting just a few hundred metres above the ground, making for some interesting flying conditions! A constant reminder of the urgency of what we were there for came in the form of the logging tracks and logging camp fires we constantly flew over.

The reception was amazing.

At the tiny village of Awaba, we were greeted by warriors in full war paint, and hundreds and hundreds of children and parents who formed a continuous line down the mountain to their village, where with great ceremony Roberts was reaffirmed as the Project Developer. This was no village meeting – the local member of Parliament was there, the Tribal Council was fully represented, and the ILG's were represented with Directors and Chairmen. It was made patiently clear that the people wanted no logging, but to save their forests for future generations, protect their cultural heritage, and benefit from Carbon Trading.

The obvious question we all had was how much did the local people know about Carbon Trading, and we were constantly surprised by both the quality and depth of the answers, and the penetrating questions we were asked in turn.

What did we think about the village; what did the media attack PNG so much; and why is the Carbon Trading Project taking so much time.

We asked Roberts about this, and with a crooked smile, he simply said that one the one hand while everyone said they wanted forest based carbon trading, they then did everything in their power to prevent it from becoming a reality.

Lake Campbell was a beautiful location, this time a thousand people had walked in for the ceremony, and the welcome and positive reinforcement for Carbon Trading was evident. Towards the end of the ceremony, a gentleman in a grey set of working overalls asked a critical question. It hushed the crowd, and the speakers all looked to Roberts to respond.

After a somewhat pregnant pause, and after checking with the other speakers, he answered, "yes". The question was from a representative of a logging company, sent in to embarrass the village. His question was "is carbon trading the best way to use the forest?" Interestingly, he was shown great respect by the people, and he asked a few more hard questions, all of which were then answered by the indigenous representatives. You got the feeling that he was saddened by the turn of events, but in the face of such a cohesive response, he retired to the back of the crowd.

We interviewed him on camera before we departed, and he expressed his disappointment with the village, as they had not "come out" as strongly against logging before. I asked him what might have changed their minds. He looked me straight in the eye, smiled, and said the promise of keeping the forests intact and still making a living from them was irresistible. We asked him what he was going to do now, and he smiled again. The logging company was paying him to go village to village asking the same questions. We would see him again.

Somogopa village was the smallest of the three, and the ceremony was held in a long hut, with the visitors escorted by warriors and singers and hundreds of children whose faces never ceased to light up at the sight of the strange white people and their cameras.

At each village, there had been a similar story – A Forest Management Area had been declared many years before, but then nothing had happened. Yet illegal logging was

apparently rife in all the surrounding areas. The villages reported that with logging they get, literally, a few cents per cubic metre, their land destroyed, and the biostructure irrevocably changed for a hundred years. If you have even seen a rapaciously logged area, you will know what we mean.

Back to Port Moresby, where the verifier met with representatives of the Government Departments involved in both logging and Carbon Trading, and again the frank, open and honest response was hard to ignore. The Government clearly supports the commercialization of Carbon Trading. The Government clearly supports the landowners making their own decisions with respect to logging and Carbon Trading. The Government is clearly both supportive and facilitative in their approach to helping the fledging ILG's make their mark on behalf of the people of PNG.

And the Government is clearly supportive of Roberts and Nupan in their efforts to bring orderly and conformal Carbon Trading to PNG.

The following day we had the opportunity of talking quietly with the film crew that had been accompanying us on the trip. Their response was sobering, and insightful. They believed that they were in a privileged position, to witness first hand the very start of a transformational process that would benefit the next generations of indigenous people in PNG in a manner that they cannot yet comprehend.

We think they are right.

The real threat to PNG Forests? Media ignorance and bias, outside Government interference, and worldwide politics concerning the final shape of REDD. If you want to save fifteen percent of the world's remaining rain forests, right now, today, all you have to do is let PNG get on with it, and get out of their way.

It truly will be a breath of fresh air.

4 *R Webster says:*
[17 October 2009 at 12:29 pm](#)

Jackson,

I have a very simple question for you: what do you think PNG's forest carbon should be traded "against"?

RW

5 *jackson says:*
[19 October 2009 at 11:13 am](#)

I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.

6 *R Webster says:*
[19 October 2009 at 11:29 am](#)

Jackson

Well correct me if I am wrong, but the point of your interesting travelogue was to inform us of the enthusiasm for forest carbon trading amongst the various communities which you are trying to bring into forest carbon trading deals.

As I understand it, 'trading' is a mutually agreed exchange of goods or services (perhaps you have a different understanding of it). So my question was, what would PNG's forest carbon be exchanged for, exactly?

RW

7 *Richard King says:*
[19 October 2009 at 8:32 pm](#)

Dear RW,

The PNG developer explained this question some time ago in PNG.

Each forest are owned as an incorporation by individual incorporated land groups.

Each forest area is calculated through a due process and approved by independent verifiers for standards.

The results are then valued, quantity to the nominated currency.

No consideration has been applied for World Bank taxing "bartering" outside or any government trade off's.

Individual incorporations will direct their own infrastructure requirements through committees designed to manage the future of the incorporations and its people.

I believe it to be a sound future for the Forest people of PNG.

Richard King creative brain

8 *Richard King says:*
[1 December 2009 at 12:30 pm](#)

Hello all,

What about the good news in PNG this week days before Copenhagen.

Richard King creative brain

9 *allah sykess says:*
[28 April 2011 at 11:40 am](#)

you know what,

it's this kinda mentality that PNG is still living in the past.

you got to explore your boundaries and think outside the box to do

something that would benefit your country, you and the rest of Papua New Guineans. Nothing is free, you gotta work to earn it, everyone knows that, so thumbs up to those who are actually doing something to benefit mankind. If you're not one of them, then it's time to get busy.....c'mon now!!

10 *Lawrence Anton says:*
[10 October 2011 at 7:54 am](#)

Richard, David, Jackson, and others,

I would rather prefer that PNG problems are left to Papua New Guineans.

Allah Sykess' right. While many others see Papua New Guinea as still living in the past, we know our rights and are thinking big about things that can be of benefit to us. I don't like NGOs coming in or being fed remotely to the US, Europe or Australia and not actually getting first hand info. A lot of stuff being posted is hearsay and doesn't help us people who are trying our very best to help ourselves. I say, lay off, go find other things to gossip about.

My land is my birthright, and I'm not sitting back and letting anyone else take control of it.

11 *Nesia Khotum says:*
[11 October 2011 at 9:42 am](#)

@ David, know your rights and try and manage that 'big thinking' and complete one tenth of those thoughts to help yourself and PNG.

The people of PNG really have no idea what other countries and the UN plan for PNG commodities and the land and sea of those commodities.