



TFD STEERING COMMITTEE 2013

Chris Buss

International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Estebancio Castro Diaz

Fundación para la Promoción de Conocimientos Indígenas

Peter Dewees

The World Bank

Gary Dunning

The Forests Dialogue

Peter Gardiner

Mondi

Jeannette Gurung

Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture & NRM

Kalyan Hou

The Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC)

Chris Knight

PricewaterhouseCoopers

Skip Krasny

Kimberly Clark

Joseph Lawson, TFD Co-leader

MeadWestvaco Corporation

Eduardo Mansur

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

James Mayers

International Institute for Environment and Development

Jan McAlpine

United Nations Forum on Forests

Sara Namirembe

World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)

Milagre Nuvunga

Micaia Foundation

Ghan Shyam Pandey

Global Alliance of Community Forestry

Herbert Pircher

Stora Enso Wood Supply

Miriam Prochnow

Apremavi

Carlos Roxo

Fibra

Antti Sahi

Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners (MTK)

Päivi Salpakivi-Salomaa

UPM-Kymmene

Teri Shanahan

International Paper

Nigel Sizer

World Resources Institute

Rod Taylor, TFD Co-leader

WWF International

Dominic Walubengo

Forest Action Network (FAN) Kenya

The Forests Dialogue

ENGAGE! EXPLORE! CHANGE!

Field Dialogue on REDD+ Benefit Sharing

24–27 September, 2013 | Lam Dong, Vietnam
Co-Chairs' Summary Report

By Chris Buss, Cuong Manh Pham, Tan Quang Nguyen and Milagre Nuvunga

1. INTRODUCTION

In partnership with the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), The Forests Dialogue (TFD) is organizing a series of international dialogues under its initiative on REDD+ Benefit Sharing. The initiative is part of IUCN's project entitled *REDD+ Benefits: Facilitating countries and communities in the design of pro-poor REDD+ benefit sharing schemes*, funded by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), International Climate Initiative (ICI). The initiative aims to:

- ➔ Develop understanding of the current state of REDD+ Benefit Sharing in key REDD+ countries and identify the challenges for designing and implementing those mechanisms more broadly;
- ➔ Build a “community of practice” among locally-rooted, well-connected REDD+ practitioners to share experiences and develop practical tools that support effective, efficient and equitable benefit sharing for REDD+;
- ➔ Promote appropriate economic, policy and institutional arrangements at the local, national and international levels to facilitate equitable, effective and efficient delivery of REDD+ Benefit Sharing mechanisms.

Under this initiative, TFD organized a scoping dialogue, hosted by the World Bank in March 2013, to identify key issues and challenges for designing REDD+ benefit sharing mechanisms. As well as key issues and challenges being identified it was also agreed to run a series of field dialogues to further explore the concept. A first field dialogue was organized in Lam Dong, Vietnam between 24–27 September 2013. The dialogue engaged 18 international participants from 17 countries and 33 national experts and it was co-hosted by the Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC) and the Vietnam Administration of Forestry (VNForest).



Co-chair Cuong Manh Pham

Dialogue participants spent two-days in the field where they discussed with local communities and government representatives about lessons learnt from Payment for Forests Ecosystem Services (PFES) and other application of other forest management activities/mechanisms, and how REDD+ Benefit Sharing may be designed based on those lessons learnt. Based on the field trip experiences as well as information shared by experts from Vietnam, dialogue participants had two days of facilitated discussions in both plenary and small groups in Dalat, Lam Dong.

This report summarizes key observations and discussions from the dialogue.



Co-chair Milagre Nuvunga

2. OVERVIEW OF REDD+ BENEFIT SHARING IN VIETNAM¹

Since 2009, Vietnam has taken significant steps to align its forestry sector with REDD+ and develop national capacity and infrastructure to support the implementation of REDD+ related activities. Vietnam was one of the first countries to participate in UN-REDD Programme and join Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF). Vietnam received USD4.3 million for UNREDD Phase I and USD3.6 million from FCPF to build capacity and plan for REDD+. In July 2013, Vietnam became the first country globally to move into UN-REDD phase two—a proposed USD30 million programme which will focus on piloting REDD+ activities in six provinces across the country over the next three years. Besides the support from UN-REDD and FCPF, other donor agencies including JICA, USAID, NORAD and BMZ have also been active in Vietnam, mostly focusing on capacity building and piloting REDD+ at the local level.



Co-chair Tan Quang Nguyen

The Vietnam government has identified the design of a transparent and equitable benefit sharing system as a priority of its REDD+ work. Over past 20 years, the Vietnam government has piloted various national programs designed to provide incentives for forest users/managers to improve forest management and increase forest cover that provide a solid basis for the development of the benefit sharing system: For example, the Five Million Hectare Reforestation Program (Program 661, launched in 1997), which introduced the idea of forest protection contracts; and Payment for Forest Environmental Services (PFES), which collects funds from water users and tourist service providers to support forest conservation in, and around, watersheds, and builds upon the forest protection contract model. Building on existing experiences in Vietnam and internationally, the Vietnam government has identified 16 policy recommendations required to ensure equitable, effective and efficient REDD+ Benefit Sharing.²



Huu Cai Hoang

3. FIELD TRIP OBSERVATIONS

Located in the Central Highland of Vietnam, Lam Dong, a mountainous province, has 591,476 ha forest land (60% of the land cover) with high biodiversity. The major driver of deforestation in Lam Dong is agriculture expansion, particularly coffee plantations. Since early 1990s, forest tenure reforms in Vietnam have moved towards the devolution of forest user rights. However, in Lam Dong, the devolution has progressed much slower compared to other provinces: state actors control over 95% of forest area while local community hold only 1.5%. Local communities can access and collect Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) in state-owned forests by entering into forest protection contracts for a renewable duration of 12 months.

Lam Dong started to pilot PFES mechanism in 2009. Currently, 202,251 ha of forest is allocated and covered by PFES, with an average of 20–30 ha forest area/household. 7,997 households entered PFES contracts to patrol and protect the forests, of which 6,328 households are from ethnic minority groups. PFES has been able to pay households between 270,000–450,000 VND/ha/year (about 12.8–21.3 USD/ha/year). The payment rate is largely dependent on the number of PFES users as well as the household numbers (service providers) located in each watershed area. The rates paid by the suppliers and to the providers are set by government. It is government policy that, in choosing households to participate in forest protection contracts (and thus also as PES service providers), priority be given to the poorest households.

Also, in 2009, REDD+ was introduced into Lam Dong. A lot of REDD+ readiness activities focusing on capacity building and awareness raising have been carried out in Lam Dong since then by UNREDD³, Lowering Emissions in Asia's Forests (LEAF)⁴, SNV⁵ and Winrock International⁶. Lam Dong is the first province in Vietnam to integrate REDD+ activities into its forest protection and development plan for 2011–2020 and has been actively developing its Provincial REDD+ Action Plan (PRAP).

Dialogue participants visited 4 communes located in Lam Ha and Di Linh Districts in Lam Dong Province. During the 2-day field visit, participants discussed lessons learnt from PFES and REDD+ Readiness activities that can be used to inform REDD+ Benefit Sharing with community members, local government officials and representatives of state-owned forest enterprises. Key observations include:

- **Strong awareness of PFES has set the stage for introduction of REDD+ but also has contributed to high (and perhaps unreasonable) expectations from REDD+:** Capacity building under both PFES and REDD+ Readiness activities have fostered deep understanding and appreciation of the ecosystem services offered by forests, especially pertaining to watershed protection and carbon storage. But since 2009, PFES has successfully delivered significant income to households while REDD+ has remained in planning phase. This has created frustrations among some local sellers of ecosystem services. Local state actors and community members see the main reason for the slower pace of REDD+ is to REDD+ being a global initiative constrained by international negotiations and donors while PFES is a national-led initiative, fully designed and led by the Vietnam Government. There is high expectation that REDD+ will be able to deliver monetary



Grung Re community member carrying non-timber forest product



Co-chair Chris Buss



Grung Re community member explains forest protection strategies



Three landscape uses: coffee, plantation and natural forest

benefits similar, if not greater than, PFES; whilst there is also a lack of understanding of the existing and potential non-monetary benefits under REDD+. Local communities also thought that any payments from REDD+ would come with an associated reduction in their use of the forest for firewood and other NTFPs;

- ➔ **Limited monitoring and verification capacity has resulted in a weak linkage between payments and performance under PFES, and as such poses challenge for REDD+:** PFES is intended to distribute payments based on performance. But the current payments are distributed largely based on area of land-owned/managed combined with poverty criteria. And the main reason is that there is a lack of guidance, capacity and investments in monitoring the compliance with PFES contracts. Key factors hampering efforts to monitor performance include lack of good quality data and poor capacity of government agencies to undertake monitoring, particularly at the local level. The lack of capacity in monitoring and evaluation can also pose challenges for a performance-based Benefit Sharing system for REDD+;
- ➔ **Payment co-efficiency (K-factor for PFES; R-factor for REDD+) designed to differentiate payments are hard to implement on the ground:** Under PFES, “K-factor” is proposed as a way to promote equity by weighing payments calculated on area of land with variables that reflect forest type (e.g., protection forest, production forest), forest origin (e.g., natural forest, planted forest), forest quality and level of difficulties in management. Building on the K-factor formula, R-factor was proposed for REDD+ payments to capture social and environmental co-benefits. But the trials of K-factor under PFES in Lam Dong show that a lot of local communities prefer equal payments instead of differentiated payments. And a lack of data and monitoring system also make application of K-factor on a provincial level difficult. Similar challenges exist for the application of R-factor as it is even more complicated to be understood by local stakeholders and to monitor;
- ➔ **A top-down approach under PFES delivers payments efficiently but falls short in creating community ownership for forest management:** In most PFES areas in Lam Dong, state or state owned enterprises have the ownership and user rights of the forest, and use PFES income to hire selected community members to patrol and protect the forests. Payment amounts and protection contracts are set by the state with little consultation with local communities. On one hand, a straightforward contract system and payment scheme moves cash through the government quickly to households. On the other, communities are reduced to being passive actors in the scheme and have no channels to give inputs and feedback;

- ➔ **Community forestry can be harnessed by PFES and REDD+ to create a participatory approach if coupled with capacity building on sustainable land management:** Lam Dong has recently started to pilot community forestry. Under the scheme, communities can receive 50 year concessions rights to manage forest plots. Community members have expressed clear interests in managing the forests to gain benefits beyond REDD+ and PFES, especially harvesting of NTFP and timber. Local stakeholders are also interested to learn how to increase tree cover in existing coffee plantations in order to reduce deforestation while ensuring a reasonable level of income. But there is a lack of technical support on how they can manage their forests land or trees on farm to maximize the bundle of benefits sustainably. Some community members, who are currently under PFES contracts, were hesitant to engage in community forestry as they are reluctant to take on responsibilities associated with forest management without sufficient knowledge and support. REDD+ can invest in capacity building for community members in order to provide them with the knowledge to manage their land sustainably and maximize the bundle of benefits (carbon, watershed protection, incomes from sustainable harvesting of timber and NTFPs).

4. LESSONS LEARNT FROM VIETNAM FOR REDD+ BENEFIT SHARING

Building on 20 years of experiences in forest protection, the Vietnam government is one of the leading REDD+ countries in the discussions and the design of REDD+ Benefit Sharing. The field trip in Lam Dong province and the information provided by various experts on PFES and REDD+ Benefit Sharing design in Vietnam stimulated interesting discussions and experience-sharing among all participants. Based on lessons learnt in Vietnam and their own experiences, participants provided insights for 4 key issues identified in TFD's scoping dialogue⁷: How to design national programmes that accommodate different local context? How to identify and work with beneficiaries when rights are unclear? On what basis can benefits be shared? How to deliver multi-benefits of REDD+ in a cost-effective way? Participants also made suggestions for the key next steps in Vietnam based on the insights on those key issues.

4.1 HOW TO DESIGN NATIONAL PROGRAMMES THAT ACCOMMODATE DIFFERENT LOCAL CONTEXT?

Recognize the differences and linkage between project-level and national-level approaches: Valuable lessons can be learnt from project-level experiences to inform national policy on REDD+ Benefit Sharing. But project-level approaches can't always be directly applied at the national-level. And some national-level approaches may not be available at the project-level. It is important to understand what approaches are applicable at what levels including the range of benefits that can be leveraged and the different issues each level needs to address. For example, at the national-level, government can invest in securing tenure/land use rights for local communities as benefits of REDD+ while projects need to work within current tenure context. While Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) may be achievable at a project scale, considerable challenges exist when seeking to secure FPIC at provincial or national levels. Projects can design horizontal benefit sharing based on local contexts down to household level while



Oda Kensei

it may not be appropriate for national policies to mandate household-level arrangements. Some participants also argue that while clarity over carbon-rights is important for REDD+ projects; at the national level, governments are the entities who will receive payments based on emissions reduction level and government can design benefit sharing within the country using other performance indicators and criteria instead of carbon to incentivize changes that can deliver on emission reduction.

Different investors may be interested in approaches at different levels: e.g., donor agencies may be more interested in national-level approaches while private sector actors may be more interested in projects. To leverage different sources of funding, government will need to understand approaches at both levels and design a national approach that can accommodate project-level activities.



Patrick Wylie

Design a macro framework under clear societal goals at the national-level to guide participatory design and implementation of Benefit Sharing based on sub-national contexts: At the national level, it is important to first set clear societal goals and priorities (e.g., poverty reduction) to guide national programs including REDD+. The REDD+ program can then be designed to deliver emission reduction from deforestation and degradation while contributing to those societal goals. For example, in Nepal, the REDD+ program specifically targets poor and marginalized households. In countries, where sustainable development goals already exist, REDD+ can be integrated into and linked with those goals and the programs under them. For example, in Mexico, REDD+ has been integrated into existing sustainable landscape management schemes.



Pham Thu Thuy

Participants suggested some key components that should be included in the national framework: national targets for emission reduction, incentives designed at the national-level for stakeholders to deliver on national targets, performance indicators combined with social/environmental safeguards against which sub-national activities will be evaluated. The national framework can also identify key stakeholders for REDD+ activities, set the responsibilities for different stakeholders and coordinate them to work towards same objectives.



Grung Re community members transporting materials

Under the guidance of a national framework, the details of REDD+ Benefit Sharing can be shaped through participatory processes at sub-national levels. Different provinces will have different local priorities thus the level of engagement in REDD+ will differ, and identification of the drivers of deforestation will result in different solutions being identified. For example, provinces with high forest cover will be more interested in participating in REDD+ and should be given priority when lending national support. Some of the key issues to consider at the sub-national level include: customary laws, drivers of deforestation in the region, existing communal system and forest management scheme. For example, in Lam Dong province, forest user rights are centralized thus it is easy

for government to disburse cash payments to individual households through contracts under PFES. In other provinces, where user rights have been disbursed to different households, sharing benefits based on decentralized user rights to household-level have proven difficult as the transaction costs are high in tracking down each household (e.g., some of them may have already moved away). And in areas where the number of households is high, payment to each household may be minimal. Some ethnic minorities also prefer to share benefits communally based on their own custom.

Ensure transparency and free access to information: Transparency and free access to information are critical to ensure the legitimacy of national program and that local contexts are integrated in REDD+ Benefit Sharing design and implementation at sub-national levels. Internationally recognized principles like Free, Prior, Informed Consent (FPIC) can be used to guide how the information is shared. Capacity to strengthen local negotiation skills is the key to enhance the integration of local priorities and needs.

The national framework and sub-national action plan for Benefit Sharing should be made publicly available. Feedback and grievance mechanisms should be put into place to encourage inputs from local stakeholders. Civil society actors can also help monitor the implementation of the programs and help update the program periodically as the local context changes through time. For example, local stakeholders think the price set under PFES in 2009 has not been adjusted to reflect the inflation and increasing competition from other land-uses in Lam Dong province.

Government should systematically and periodically review and share the experiences from piloting activities at sub-national levels with the public (e.g., Vietnam's 6 pilot provinces under UNREDD phase II). The experiences can help provide a menu of options for government and other stakeholders at sub-national levels to choose from and improve upon given their own local contexts.

4.2 HOW TO IDENTIFY AND WORK WITH BENEFICIARIES WHEN RIGHTS ARE UNCLEAR?

There are many types of rights that are relevant to REDD+ Benefit Sharing discussions. For example, rights related to land and natural resources (ownership, use, access); human rights (self-determination, participation, access to information). There are different rights at different levels (ranging from individual level all the way up to international level). At the community level, the rights recognized under customary laws can be quite different from those recognized at the national level under the prevailing legal framework. There are also overlapping rights across sectors and systems. Different beneficiaries may be interested in different sets of rights to ensure that they have access to certain sets of benefits. For example, in Lam Dong province, state-owned forest enterprises are interested in rights for watershed services and timber; while communities are most interested in ownership and use rights for timber and NTFPs.

While the ultimate goal is to clarify rights, given the complexity of rights discussed above, the goal may not be achievable in a short timeframe. Before rights are clarified, national government agencies can set criteria based on national priorities to guide identification of beneficiaries at the sub-national level.

Possible criteria include: low-emitting forest stewards; those incurring costs; facilitators of the process; as well as the poor and ethnic minorities. At the sub-national level, a participatory approach should be used to allow an open debate on who the beneficiaries are, based on local context. Participants at the dialogue argue that those living close to the forests, instead of absentee land owners, should be the main beneficiaries. Participants also highlighted that studies and experiences show that, if given the authority to do so, communities are very capable of defining beneficiaries for their own communities.

4.3 ON WHAT BASIS CAN BENEFITS BE SHARED?

Different mechanisms apply at different levels and through different phases of REDD+: REDD+ countries are most interested in receiving cash payments from donors to support their national activities on REDD+. And they will eventually be evaluated based on their performance on emission reduction from deforestation and degradation to receive cash payments. But at the sub-national level, both performance-based and input-based approaches can be used to share cash and non-cash benefits to incentivize positive land use change. While the national government can set framework/safeguards and provide a menu of options to share benefits, the type of benefits shared and the basis they are shared on can be tailored to local contexts. Each of the eligible land-use activities under REDD+ may require a different set of incentives thus different mechanisms. And the role of traditional and customary law can be taken into consideration when designing those mechanisms. For example, some communities may prefer an equal share of benefits among all participating households instead of differentiated payments based on performance in order to avoid conflicts among their members.

Different phases of REDD+ also call for different basis for sharing benefits: in the early phases of REDD+, benefits are shared mostly based on inputs. While in the later stage of REDD+, performance-based payments can become more relevant. Benefits shared at the early phases of REDD+ can be designed to create lasting impact and help incentivize sustainable land use behavior that will lead to emission reduction.

Leverage multiple benefit and emphasize non-cash benefits at sub-national level: Not all REDD+ investments are likely to translate into cash-based payments at sub-national levels. For example, investments by national government to improve forest governance or capacity building for communities will deliver broader societal benefits, but will not deliver individual cash benefits to sellers of ecosystem services. It is important, therefore, to manage expectations at sub-national level and emphasize the non-cash benefits (e.g., land use rights; direct access to market; easy access to credits) that REDD+ can deliver.

Simplified messages and approaches at local level: At the local-level, when working with communities, it is best to create simplified and clear messages about the type of benefits that will be shared and the basis under which they will be shared in order to avoid confusion and false expectation. For example, the proposed R co-efficiency that weights payments with multiple benefits of REDD+ (see session 3) will be hard for communities to understand and complicated to implement at local level.



Young forest guard

4.4 HOW TO REDUCE THE COSTS OF REDD+?

Understand the limitations of opportunity costs: Opportunity costs can be useful for planning purposes as long as its limitations are fully understood. In practice, costs are commonly decided based on negotiations among key stakeholders and may not reflect the true opportunity costs. And opportunity costs estimates can be misleading when a bundle of cash and non-cash benefits are used to leverage positive change in land uses.

Build on existing programs where appropriate: Starting REDD+ Benefit Sharing design and implementation from scratch is very challenging and costly. REDD+ Benefit Sharing can be built on existing strategies and programs in-country. However, it is important to highlight the differences between REDD+ Benefit Sharing, that will utilize non-cash benefits, and existing national programs that only use cash benefits. For example, in Vietnam, PFES provides valuable lessons for REDD+ but it does not cover non-cash benefits design. A sole focus on linking REDD+ with existing PFES program in Provincial REDD+ Action Plan can create false expectation that REDD+ will be able to deliver cash benefits. As well as PFES mechanisms further enhancement of community forestry models provide a framework within which to generate the multiple benefits through this land use management practice, whilst also strengthening rights and tenure. These models will also support a cycle of change driven at the local level, whilst existing mechanisms and proposed REDD+ actions are top down approaches. And in some countries, incorporating REDD+ requirements in the existing Payment for Ecosystem Schemes may not be the best option. For example, in Ecuador, the government decided not to include REDD+ in the Socio Bosque program, a program that provides direct cash payments to incentivize landowners and communities to protect forests, as the government found that REDD+ would require too many changes and disruptions of the current program.



Thi Truong Luong



Iwan Wibisono

Invest in sustainable forest landscape management in ways that can generate income while reducing deforestation and degradation: There is a misconception that REDD+ benefits and other incomes from a forest landscape (like timber and NTFPs) are mutually exclusive. On contrary, REDD+ can help enhance other existing benefits or build foundation for new sustained benefits. REDD+ can support participatory land use planning that reduces carbon emission whilst also realising other outcomes and benefits through the sustainable management of forests and conservation actions which delivers economic development. The role of community is the key to ensuring investments respond to local level priorities.



Field participants enter the Grung Re community forest

REDD+ activities can also focus on building capacity for communities to invest in their land and improving their income in a sustainable manner. For example, in Lam Dong, REDD+ can invest in research and capacity-building on how to increase tree cover on existing coffee farms to improve coffee quality and increase tree cover; REDD+ can also

invest in improving the quality of forests to increase the income community can generate from the allowable cut under a sustainable forest management plan.

4.5 SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS IN VIETNAM ON REDD+ BENEFIT SHARING:

In recognition of Vietnam government's commitment towards transparent, equitable, efficient and effective REDD+ Benefit Sharing, participants also suggested some additional immediate next steps for REDD+ Benefit Sharing in Vietnam

- ➔ **Identify the bundle of benefits that can be used to incentivize stakeholders:** UNREDD phase II provides a good opportunity to engage local stakeholders in open discussions on what types of benefits can incentivize positive land-use changes at the provincial level given different local context;
- ➔ **Strengthen community forestry:** concern still exists regarding how well communities will manage forests if given the rights to do so. Decentralization of user rights can be accompanied with increased investment in law enforcement and clear land use policies to guide communities in the land use practices. As discussed before, capacity building should also be offered to communities on how to manage land sustainably. Community Forestry Contracts should be given a longer duration to give more incentives for communities to manage land with a long-term vision. Contracts should also be negotiable between government and community members to ensure terms can reflect local context. Provisions can be included in the contract to ensure inclusion of minority groups. This can be a cost-effective way to deliver benefits from REDD+ and ensure benefits are shared equitably.
- ➔ **Study and learn from existing mechanisms beyond PFES:** for example, JICA's project in Bidoup-Nuiba National Park provides a revolving fund model that incentivized sustainable land-uses and improved community's livelihood; CERDA, a Vietnam-based NGO, is also piloting an interesting community owned/based REDD+ initiative model that harness the strengths of community cooperatives to increase income while improving forest management.
- ➔ **Strengthen existing multi-stakeholder platforms for information exchange and discussions on REDD+ Benefit Sharing among different stakeholder groups including government, NGOs, private sector and communities:** there are some existing multi-stakeholder platforms in Vietnam: for example, National REDD+ Network coordinated by Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) and led by VNForests. The National REDD+ Network was officially established by MARD in September 2009 to coordinate REDD+ activities by government and civil society in Vietnam and to support the development of REDD+ Readiness. Under the network, there is also a Sub-Technical Working Group (STWG) on financing and benefit distribution. Those networks can be strengthened to actively engage more civil society actors and private sector to exchange information and lessons learnt, especially on how to leverage multiple benefits of REDD+. The

networks can continue to support participatory design and implementation of REDD+ Benefit Sharing as Vietnam moves forward with UNREDD+ Phase II.

- **Build cross-sectoral collaboration and invest in sustainable land-use planning to maximize the benefits from forest landscapes:** land conversion for agriculture and land conversion for infrastructure are among the main drivers of deforestation in Vietnam. But currently REDD+ is only discussed within the forest sector. It is important to develop cross-sectoral collaborations to inform and develop capacity for stakeholders in other sectors to be involved in REDD+. Integrated landscape approach can stack carbon benefits on top of other economic benefits (e.g., incomes from SFM and agroforestry) to incentivize sustainable land use practices.
- **Institutionalize recourse and grievance procedures:** as discussed in 4.1., details of REDD+ Benefit Sharing must be designed based on local context and through participatory processes. As local context will change over time, a benefit-sharing mechanism must have a built-in grievance mechanism for stakeholders to revisit the arrangements and adapt terms based on changes when necessary.

5. NEXT STEPS

TFD will work with its local partners in Vietnam (RECOFTC and VNForest) to share the key lessons learnt from the Vietnam dialogue and inform policy design and implementation in Vietnam during UNREDD phase II. The key messages will also be shared with TFD's network internationally and be fed into future dialogues on REDD+ Benefit Sharing.

Building on lessons learnt from Vietnam, TFD will continue to build a community of practice on REDD+ Benefit Sharing, seek insights into the key practical issues identified at the Scoping Dialogue and identify ways forward in dialogue countries and globally. There will be three more field dialogues organized under the REDD+ Benefit Sharing initiative: Ghana in December 2013, Peru in February 2014 and Mexico in May 2014. A writers' workshop will be convened immediately afterwards to synthesize lessons learnt throughout the initiative. A TFD Review will be produced and shared at COP 20.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The summary draws on, and tries to do justice to, the work of 51 individuals participated in the Vietnam Field Dialogue. Co-chairs, TFD and its initiative partner IUCN would like to heartily thank all the participants for their contributions. We would also like to thank RECOFTC and VNFOREST for hosting and co-organizing the event and German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) for providing the financial support. The dialogue would not have been possible without them.

Xiaoting Hou (TFD) supported and coordinated the drafting and editing process of this summary. Comments were provided by many dialogue participants.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Pham Minh Thoa, REDD+ Benefit Sharing in Vietnam, http://tfd.yale.edu/sites/default/files/vietnam_background_paper_on_benefit_sharing_final.pdf
- ² UNREDD, Design of a REDD-Compliant Benefit Distribution System for Viet Nam, 2010
- ³ <http://www.un-redd.org/>
- ⁴ <http://www.leafasia.org/>
- ⁵ <http://www.snnworld.org/en/regions/world>
- ⁶ <http://www.winrock.org/>
- ⁷ http://tfd.yale.edu/sites/default/files/redd_cochairssummary_updated_small.pdf



Participants in the Grung Re community forest

ANNEX I: PARTICIPANT LIST

Adewale Adeleke	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
Inoguchi Akiko	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Massimo Bloch	World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)
Tom Blomley	Acacia Natural Resource Consultants Ltd
Daryl Bosu	A-Rocha Ghana
Tim Boyle	UN-REDD
Chris Buss	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
Delux Chhun	Forestry Administration, Royal Government of Cambodia
María del Rosario Sevillano Arévalo	Ministry of Environment, Peru
Cao Duc Vinh	International Cooperation Department, MARD
Gary Dunning	The Forests Dialogue (TFD)
Le Ha Phuong	Vietnam REDD+ Office
Xiaoting Hou	The Forests Dialogue (TFD)
Pham Hung	Lam Dong Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
Hoang Huu Cai	Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
Pham Manh Cuong	Vietnam REDD+ Office
Vo Minh Tham	VNFF, Lam Dong province
Pham Minh Thoa	Vietnam Forestry Association
Nguyen Ngoc Binh	Policy Coordinator, GIZ/MNR Program
Pham Ngoc Binh	CERDA's Pilot Project
Tran Ngoc Dan Thuy	Center for Forestry Science and Technology servicing and consultancy, Dak Lak
Le Ngoc Dung	Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Milagre Nuvunga	MICAIA Foundation
Kensei Oda	Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
Toshimizu Okada	Quy Nhon Plantation Forest Company (QPFL)
Cil Pham Ha Toan	Bidoup NuiBa National Park
Bui Nguyen Phu Ky	Vietnam Administration of Forestry (VNFOREST)—Vietnam Forest Protection and Development Fund (VNFF)
Nghiem Phuong Thuy	Vietnam Administration of Forestry (VNFOREST)
Nguyen Quang Tan	The Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC) Viet Nam
Pham Quoc Hung	Vietnam Administration of Forestry (VNFOREST)
Oscar Rojas	Defenders of Nature Foundation (FDN)
Martha Rosas	National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity

Dinh Tan Bai	Lam Ha district authority, Lam Dong province
Nguyen Thanh Tung	Vietnam Administration of Forestry (VNFOREST)
Ton That Minh	Director of International Center for Tropical Highland Ecosystem Research (ICTHER) of BNNBP
Ton That Minh	Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
Vu Thi Hien	Center for Research and Development in the Upland Areas (CERDA)
Nguyen Thi Hoa	Lam Dong Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
Nguyen Thi Mai Phuong	The Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC) Viet Nam
Luong Thi Truong	Center for Sustainable Development of the Mountainous Areas (CSDM)
To Thu Huong	Vietnamese German Forestry Program
Pham Thu Thuy	Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Le Thuong	Lam Dong Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
Bui Van Hung	Lam Dong Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
Le Viet Phu	Di Linh district authority, Lam Dong province
Dominic Walubengo	Forest Action Network (FAN)
Iwan Wibisono	REDD+ National Task Force, Indonesia
Paula Williams	Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities (FCMC)
Patrick Wylie	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
Do Xuan Lan	Department of Science, Technology and Environment, MARD