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 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