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• Governance
• Three key elements of REDD+ governance
• Explaining comparative differences in REDD+ outcomes
• The impact of political and income inequalities
• Implications for policy and scholarship
Governance or ‘Management’

- Governance: From Leviathan to Laissez faire
- Governance is not same as ‘management’
- Determination of the goals/objectives of governance is a ‘political’ question
- Governance: Political; Management (‘technical’)

- Eight Elements of Good Governance (Governance Pro): Participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and follows the rule of law.
Empty half the Earth of its humans. It's the only way to save the planet | Kim Stanley Robinson

There are now twice as many people as 50 years ago. But, as EO Wilson has argued, they can all survive – in cities
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Protecting nature in an unequal world

By Prakash Kashwan* Democracies can do better than to give into the mirage of "Wilsonian Enclosures", which envision half of the planet or more in nature reserves. The excessive focus o...
Political Mediation of Competing Goals & Strategies

• How do societies negotiate difficult trade offs?

• What explains the differences across regions and countries?
Background: Fund → Market → Fund

• Brazilian proposal: Maximum tolerable emission levels for Annex B + a ‘compulsory contribution’ to a ‘clean development fund’; Vetoed by the US delegation

• ‘Flexible financing instrument’ and a ‘trading system’ → REDD

• REDD → REDD+


• Welcome: Carbon Cowboys & Land Grabs
REDD+ Governance I: Tenure Security

- What role does tenure play?
- Imagine an experiment:
  - Three countries, each with two sets of tenures (secure, less-secure)
  - Market-based REDD+ related funding on offer
  - Which type of tenure would you link REDD+ to?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Indian Forest Act 1927; Forest Conservation Act 1980; Joint Forest Management circular 1990; Forest Rights Act 2006</td>
<td>State forestry departments/ Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF)</td>
<td>Limited to harvesting of firewood and collection of fodder in limited quantities. Rights to manage community forests, and to harvest and market non-timber forest produce; timber rights unclear.</td>
<td>Very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Land Act 1999; The Forest Act 2002; Wildlife Policy 2007</td>
<td>The state—“Unoccupied and unused village land” considered “general land,” which is under the authority of the central government represented by FBD; the 2002 act provides for creation of village land forest reserves.</td>
<td>Very few rights unless village boundaries are registered and delineated, which is uncommon; no rights within the boundaries of national parks and reserves.</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village Land Act 1999</td>
<td>Village councils—“Unoccupied and unused” village lands vested in village councils.</td>
<td>Significant strong rights under community-based forest management (CBFM); Practically difficult because of the red tape.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Agrarian Law of 1992</td>
<td>Members of agrarian communities</td>
<td>Rights of timber harvesting with appropriate management plans &amp; safeguards.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Law on Sustainable Forest Development of 2012</td>
<td>Members of agrarian communities</td>
<td>All of the above plus forest rights of the tenants.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Village Land Use Plans in Tanzania

- Village land use plans: legacy of the villagization era
- WMAs, CBFM: Significant authority & powers to village councils

- “Privatization” of VLUPs: “REDD+ LUP; biofuel LUP; Conservation LUP → Creating fictitious “village forests.”
- “Communities in Tanzania have clear legal rights, what they lack, in the Tanzanian political context, is sufficient forms of power and leverage to enforce and capitalize upon those rights”
REDD+ Governance II: Policies for Sharing REDD+ Benefits
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country National Climate Change Program</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>REDD+ Benefit-Sharing Provisions</th>
<th>Additional Provisions Listed Under “Safeguards”</th>
<th>Land Tenure Regime that Informs Benefit-Sharing/ Safeguards</th>
<th>Strength of Tenure Regime (Strong/ Weak)</th>
<th>Level of Ambiguity (High/ Low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC)</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>“To encourage and incentivize local communities for their role in conservation by transferring the financial benefits accrued on account of REDD+ … based on their performance” (MoEF 2014)</td>
<td>“Safeguarding existing traditional rights of local communities… Fair and transparent accounting and disbursement of benefits and REDD+ incentives” (MoEF 2014, 6)</td>
<td>Refers most frequently to JFM. Safeguards: The progressive Forest Rights of 2006.</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Climate Change Law 2012</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>“...the property rights relating to...carbon lie with the legal owners of land (e.g. ejidos, communities, indigenous groups, individuals, firms)...activities that generate more social benefits and support rural sustainable development” (Balderas Torres and Skutsch 2014, p.7 citing the National REDD+ Strategy 2012)</td>
<td>Safeguards to respect “gender considerations and guaranteeing the certainty over property rights and economic competitiveness” (Balderas Torres and Skutsch 2014, p.7 citing the National REDD+ Strategy 2012)</td>
<td>Combines the progressive aspects of Agrarian Law of 1992 and the General Law on Sustainable Forest Development 2002 (amended in 2012).</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REDD+ Governance III: Safeguards

**Definition of SAFEGUARD**

1. **a**: PASS, SAFE-CONDUCT
   - **b**: CONVOY, ESCORT

2. **a**: a precautionary measure, stipulation, or device
   - **b**: a technical contrivance to prevent accident
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>National Climate Change Program</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>REDD+ Benefit-Sharing Provisions</th>
<th>Additional Provisions Listed Under “Safeguards”</th>
<th>Land Tenure Regime that Informs Benefit-Sharing/Safeguards</th>
<th>Strength of Tenure Regime (Strong/Weak)¹</th>
<th>Level of Ambiguity (High/Low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC)</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>“To encourage and incentivize local communities for their role in conservation by transferring the financial benefits accrued on account of REDD+ … based on their performance” (MoEF 2014)</td>
<td>“Safeguarding existing traditional rights of local communities… Fair and transparent accounting and disbursement of benefits and REDD+ incentives” (MoEF 2014, 6)</td>
<td>Refers most frequently to JFM. Safeguards: The progressive Forest Rights of 2006.</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3
National Benefit-Sharing Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>National Climate Change Program</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>REDD+ Benefit-Sharing Provisions</th>
<th>Additional Provisions Listed Under “Safeguards”</th>
<th>Land Tenure Regime that Informs Benefit-Sharing/Safeguards</th>
<th>Strength of Tenure Regime (Strong/Weak)¹</th>
<th>Level of Ambiguity (High/Low)²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Climate Change Law 2012</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>&quot;...the property rights relating to...carbon lie with the legal owners of land (e.g. ejidos, communities, indigenous groups, individuals, firms)...activities that generate more social benefits and support rural sustainable development” (Balderas Torres and Skutsch 2014, p.7 citing the National REDD+ Strategy 2012)</td>
<td>Safeguards to respect “gender considerations and guaranteeing the certainty over property rights and economic competitiveness” (Balderas Torres and Skutsch 2014, p.7 citing the National REDD+ Strategy 2012)</td>
<td>Combines the progressive aspects of Agrarian Law of 1992 and the General Law on Sustainable Forest Development 2002 (amended in 2012).</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Low²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rights abuse allegations in the context of REDD+ readiness and implementation
A preliminary review and proposal for moving forward

Juan Pablo Sarmiento Barletti and Anne M. Larson

Key messages

- This review reveals multiple allegations of abuses of the rights of Indigenous Peoples in the context of Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD+) readiness and implementation.
- Findings from the review should be transformed into opportunities for REDD+ to promote and strengthen the rights of Indigenous Peoples.
- A rights-based approach to REDD+ requires engagement with indigenous men and women as rights-holders, rather than as project beneficiaries.
- Parties should be pressed to investigate abuse allegations, enable access to justice, and develop grievance mechanisms within REDD+ processes.
- REDD+ risks exacerbating issues of unsecured rights and pre-existing conflicts over land in the contexts in which it is being readied and implemented, unless it is re-oriented to enhance the rights of Indigenous Peoples. Evidence suggests Indigenous Peoples' underlined 'tenure rights will negatively impact REDD+ targets.
Carbon Colonialism: How the Fight Against Climate Change Is Displacing Africans
Biofuels

Secret report: biofuel caused food crisis

Internal World Bank study delivers blow to plant energy drive

Biofuels have forced global food prices up by 75% - far more than previously estimated according to a confidential World Bank report obtained by the Guardian.

World Bank and UN carbon offset scheme 'complicit' in genocidal land grabs - NGOs

The biofuel debate is electrifying the US food price crisis summit in Rome as President Obama and growing public attention to alternative fuels. But activists claim the heavily subsidized biofuel industry is fundamentally immoral, diverting land which should be producing food to fill human stomachs to produce fuel for car engines.

US corn ethanol fuels food crisis in developing countries

The US ethanol programme pushed up corn prices by up to 21 per cent as it expanded to consume 40 per cent of the harvest.

Record drought in the US farm belt this summer withered corn fields and parched hopes for a record US corn harvest, but US farmers may not be the ones most severely affected by the disaster. Most have insurance against crop failure. Not so the world’s import-dependent developing countries, nor their poorest consumers. They are hurting.

This is the third food price spike in the last five years, and this time the finger is being pointed squarely at biofuels. More specifically, the loss of a quarter or more of the projected US corn harvest has prompted urgent calls for reform in that country’s corn ethanol programme.
Bigotry against indigenous people means we're missing a trick on climate change

Prakash Kashwan
What Explains these REDD+ Governance Outcomes?
Political Mediation of Environment—Development Relationship

Magufuli orders seizure and reallocation of undeveloped farms

Wednesday, June 14, 2017

[News article from Daily Nation]
Implications for Scholarship & Policy
Beyond Binaries and the Romance of Community

• Neither markets nor the state, but an intermeshing of state, markets, and societal initiatives
• Focus on political and economic power, processes, checks and balances
Conceptual Shifts: Forestland “Regimes”

FORESTLAND REGIMES: The configuration of actors, authorities, and institutions that regulate forest and land use, as well as “the formal and informal structure and nature of political power” in forested regions. (Kashwan 2017, 4. Citing Jayal 2001; Siaroff 2011)
Climate governance Amidst Inequalities

• Climate governance is entangled with subnational political & economic inequalities.
• Subnational distributional concerns ↔ domestic institutional reforms ↔ climate governance
• Addressing domestic inequalities should be more central to scholarship & practice of climate governance
• Inequality drives unsustainability (via resource extraction, production, consumption)
• Inequalities undermine our ability to respond
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