REDD+ Benefit Sharing Dialogue

• Break out session Day 1.
Barriers and Challenges

G1: What are the barriers and challenges to determining what the benefits are?

G2: What are the barriers and challenges to determine who should benefit?

G3: What are the barriers and challenges to ensure linkage between local, sub-national, national distribution mechanisms?

G4: What are the barriers and challenges to make benefit sharing mechanisms effective, efficient and equitable?
Group 1

• What are the barriers and challenges to determine what benefits are?
Change of scope over time

• Scope of REDD+ is changing
  – RED to REDD+
  – Initially REDD+ was a PES but now moving towards rural development

• Not clear understanding:
  – Carbon vs non-carbon/co-benefits
  – Monetary vs non-monetary

• Confusion, poor communication

• Danger of overloading REDD+
Differing context?

- Conceptual framework in different countries
- Cross sectorial buy-in
- Multi-stakeholder buy-in
- Wider landscape
- Rural development plans, sustainable development plans, integrated land use planning
Benefits across different time points

• Benefits in
  – readiness phase
  – Implementation
  – End game
  – Immediate to long term

  – Rights and tenure may be derived benefits at different times
Layers of benefit?

• Carbon has to be the main output but for who?
• What is a benefit to communities might not be perceived as a benefit to Gov.
• what is the value of a benefit
• Need more gender differentiate benefits
• Co-benefits difficult to monetize
• Value of tenure, value of SFM – difficult to monetize
Group 2

• What are the barriers and challenges to determine who should benefit?
Group 2 – Barriers & Challenges to determine who benefits?

- Who depends on what benefits are included
- Definition of carbon rights vs other tenure types
- Deciding on the discourse being used
- Horizontal vs. vertical benefit sharing
- Gender outside the construct of REDD+ constituencies
- Use of pooled vs non-pooled resources can have implications on inclusiveness
IN-COUNTRY (national & sub-national)

- Clarity
  - in legal frameworks, tenure arrangements, roles & responsibilities and differentiation within a constituency (subactors)
- Legitimacy
  - of title, design of participatory processes, grievance mechanisms for conflict, political regime and of stakeholders
- customary rights are often a barrier to other stakeholders
- mapping of stakeholders and the different dimensions of stakeholder involvement thereof
Unique to national or sub-national

• Technical barriers: e.g. mapping projected deforestation to an individual stakeholder group
• Introducing cash into non-cash societies
• Implementation of global rules into national laws and local action & actors
• Attribution of results to REDD+ vs other development processes in-country
Group 3.

• What are the barriers and challenges to ensure linkage between local, sub-national, national distribution mechanisms?
Barriers

• 1. Differences in understanding rights at the 3 levels: local, sub-national & national
• 2. What do we know about REDD+ at the local, sub-national & national levels (Knowledge, information exchange & communication)
• 3. Institutional arrangements:
  ▪ Differences between formal & customary
  ▪ Differences in authority
  ▪ Current ones have bottlenecks
  ▪ Young institutional structures
Barriers

4. Government capacity

5. Lack of coordination: at the ministerial level, & inter-ministerial level

6. Difficulty to move away from:
   I. Business as usual
   II. Failed experiences

7. Ineffective representation of local, sub-national & national stakeholders in decision making, in defining policies etc.

8. The lack of resources: infrastructures, human, technical, financial etc.
Challenges/opportunities

1. Lowering transaction costs (working through existing structures)
2. Addressing transparency: corruption
3. Tailoring the benefit sharing at the local level, how to match what people wants at the local level with sub-national and/or national priorities - How to match local/communities needs with the government/national top-down approach
4. Decentralization is an opportunity to improve the matching
5. Having CSOs on board - to bridge the gaps between the 3 levels: local, sub-national & national – horizontally as well as vertically.
6. Lack of shared vision in sectoral (intra-ministries) policies
7. Improving previously neglected "geographically linkages (peripheral region)"
Challenges/Opportunities

• 8. Technological innovations for overcoming constraints (resources).
• 9. Local engagement (buy in) at higher level policies (local and sub-national engagement/participation into the making of policies etc.).
• 10. Understanding private sector role in the development of the linkages.
• 11. Difficulty to find strong leadership at the 3 levels
• 12. The challenge to find the incentives to encourage sectoral/inter-ministerial coordination.
Challenges/Opportunities

• 13. the link between previous incentive schemes and REDD+ schemes (when does REDD+ Kicks in?)

• 15. Consider diversity of institutional arrangements in different cultures (practices that do not deforest).
Group 4

• What are the barriers and challenges to make benefit sharing mechanisms effective, efficient and equitable?
• Think about 3 E’s separately but how can they still be linked and balanced?
• Efficiency and effectiveness linked to performance vs equity is linked to social/development
  – Performance based system and overlaying equity based on social and environmental factors
  – Sacrifice a bit of efficiency to achieve equity
  – Equity
    • Identify and include non-monetary benefits
    • Dividing the pie vs making the pie bigger
• How to develop a BSM when REDD+ activities and benefits are not defined yet? When rights may not have been defined/recognized?
• How to prioritize investments of benefits: climate goals vs additional benefits (social, health etc)?
• How to ensure sustainability of benefits in the long term to achieve effectiveness?
• Performance approach while including pro-poor approach
Scales

– Defining principles at international level and interpreting/adapting when scaling down while maintaining coherence

– Bridging the gap between community and national priorities while linking/aligning local with national level

– Bottom up approach: stakeholders, local context and practices analysis
Potential barriers

- Lack of capacity building
- Lack of transparency and accountability
- Conflicts
- Lack of participation in design
- Not learning lessons from existing systems