



REDD-plus in friction

Local concerns in discourse and policy

Moeko Saito-Jensen
Postdoc fellow
Forest & Landscape
University of Copenhagen, Denmark





Global environmental governance

- Growing number of cross-border environmental problems (e.g. acid rain, floods, hurricane, climate change)
- Global environmental governance
 - To facilitate global level discussions and to develop a common understanding of and solutions for the problems
 - Multiple actors with different interests and power positions
 - States, multilateral organizations, NGOs, private sector, scientific community, indigenous people
- Questions about the role of “local” in global environmental governance
 - How are concerns of locals (who are often users and managers of the environmental resources) addressed?
 - To what extent are they able to represent their interests?





Discourse and policy practice

- The important role of global discourse
 - Frame a collective knowledge about what are the most important issues and how to solve or improve them (Martello and Jasanoff 2004)
 - Knowledge and power under discourse (Foucault 2004)
 - A discourse has powerful effects on human and nature subjects
 - How certain knowledge become dominant is linked to power exercise
- Studies of discourse (e.g. Ferguson 1990, Escobar 1995, Fogel 2004 and Goldman 2005)
 - Political elites tend to dominate discourse formation processes to represent their views on the subjects and possible solutions
 - Alternative views for example of local people are rendered less important
 - > caution that such discourse may lead to policies and activities that may adversely impact locals





Discourse and policy practice (cont.)

- Relation between discourse and policy practice
 - Discourse may be influential but not deterministic in framing policies and related activities (Agrawal 1996 and Mosse 2005)
 - Actors have the ability to adopt a certain discourse into their own actions (Latour 1986)
 - “Friction” (Tsing 2004) may occur when an alternative discourse meets a dominant one... to either promote the dominant discourse or to reject or challenge the discourse

Call for a close examination of how a discourse and policy interact

– Questions

- How is a discourse constituted to represent whose interests?
- How does a discourse frame policies and related activities?
- Do frictions occur in discourse formation and policy making?
- If so, to what extent are local concerns addressed through frictions?





Objective of the study

- To investigate how concerns of locals are addressed in discourse and policy practices
 - based on a case study REDD-plus
- Methods
 - An analysis of a dominant discourse of REDD-plus
 - An analysis of national policy procedures proposed by the UN-REDD and World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) (key organizations to facilitate the policy design and implementation of REDD-plus in developing countries)
 - Case study
 - Tanzania and Papua New Guinea's REDD-plus national plans
 - Policy board meetings of FCPF and UN-REDD in Nov, 2010 attended as a Danish delegation where these plans were discussed





Dominant discourse within REDD-plus

- Deforestation contributes to about 20 % of global GHG emissions through deforestation and degradation of forests (IPCC report 2007)
- ➔ Focuses upon a specific function of forest as “carbon” sequestration
- Avoiding deforestation is the most quick and cost effective way to tackle climate change (Stern review, 2006)
- Deforestation and degradation is due to market failure. Thus payments are needed to compensate those who otherwise would deforest or degrade forests to cover the forgone opportunity costs
- ➔ Problems and solutions are framed within neo-liberal economics
- Developing countries should:
 - set national baseline of carbon emission from their forests
 - devise strategies for how to maintain and increase carbon stocks
 - regularly monitor, report and verify carbon emission from forests
- ➔ Proposed strategies closely aligned with the above discourse
- ➔ Local concerns??: Indigenous and forest dependent people created limited friction in the discourse. Their concerns are sidelined as safeguards





Brief info about FCPF and UN-REDD

- FCPF
 - 16 donors, 37 participant countries
 - Board members: 14 donors and 14 participant countries
- UN-REDD (consisted of FAO, UNDP, UNEP)
 - 3 donors (Denmark, Norway, Spain), 9 pilot countries, 20 partner countries
 - Board members: 3 donors, 1 FAO, 1 UNDP, 1 UNEP, 1 NGO, 1 indigenous people

Local representatives may have more power in influencing UN-REDD policy practices





REDD-plus policy procedures facilitated by FCPF and UN-REDD

1. Preparation: REDD countries to prepare a REDD national plan
 - Diagnoses of key causes of deforestation and forest degradation
(= to identify causes of carbon declines in forests)
 - Development of implementation strategies to combat deforestation and forest degradation
(= to increase carbon storage in forests)
 - Monitoring and evaluation of changes in carbon stock
(= for performance based payments)
2. Review: Selected reviewers to evaluate the plan
3. Board approval: FCPF and UN-REDD policy board members to approve the plan

Proposed policy procedures are closely aligned with the dominant REDD-plus discourse





Case 1: Tanzania's REDD national plan submitted to FCPF

1. Preparation

- Done by the Tanzanian government with international consultants

2. Review

- Country reviews: Argentina and Denmark explicitly highlighted the lack of clarity in how stakeholders may be involved in REDD-plus even though they were "consulted". Australia asked Argentina and Denmark to tone down criticisms by converting them into the words of recommendations. Reviews in friction but a consolidated review notes an overall high quality of the plan
- Technical review: highlighted many strengths of the plan but noted the need to consider the representation of stakeholders in REDD processes

3. Board approval (Policy board meeting, Nov, 2010)

- A concern was raised from the Tanzanian civil society
- Policy board members commented on the high quality of the proposal with the conclusion of an approval





Case 2: Papua New Guinea's REDD national plan submitted to UN-REDD

1. Preparation

- Done by the PNG government with international consultants (e.g. Mckensey)

2. Review

- Secretariat review: indicated an unclear stakeholder consultation process
- Technical review: explicitly noted that there is a problem with the stakeholder consultation processes.
- PNG's Civil society (unofficial): expressed their grave concerns that stakeholders had been excluded in the preparation.

3. Board approval (policy board meeting, Nov, 2010)

- PNG's civil society, international NGO and Denmark noted on the problem and requested the PNG government to ensure stakeholder engagement
- Norway, the largest donor, urged the board not to block the plan
- The PNG's plan was approved on the conditions that a set of requirements are met including the issue of stakeholder consultation





Summary: Local concerns in REDD-plus discourse and policy?

- A dominant discourse of REDD-plus
 - Framed mainly by countries participating in climate change negotiations
 - Forests as carbon sequestration
 - The need of payments from developed to developing countries (neo-liberal solution) to sequester carbons
 - The need for countries to devise strategies to increase carbons
 - The need to measure, report and verify carbons for payment transfer
- Policy procedures under FCPF and UN-REDD
 - Procedures closely aligned with the dominant discourse

Little room for locals (stakeholders) to create frictions to challenge the dominant discourse

- Their concerns are sidelined and addressed as safeguards





Summary: Local concerns in REDD-plus discourse and policy? (cont.)

- National policy practice of Tanzania and PNG
 - Preparation led by the governments and international experts leaving little room for local people (TZ and PNG)
 - But frictions with the dominant discourse occurred
 - A reviewer from Denmark criticized against unclear stakeholder engagement (Tanzania)
 - Participants of policy board meetings such as NGOs, and Denmark expressed serious concerns for the lack of consultation process (PNG)
 - Yet strong urge to push forward REDD-plus
 - The Danish reviewer was requested to make positive comments (Tanzania)
 - Even if a critical evaluation was made, the policy board nevertheless approved it along with several conditions (PNG)





Conclusion: Local concerns in REDD-plus discourse and policy?

- A dominant REDD-plus discourse
 - Largely framed policy practices but....
 - It does not “determine” these practices because of **the occurrence of frictions** with the dominant discourse
 - from the actions taken not only by local representatives (such as NGOs, indigenous people) but also by other actors such as countries, external reviewers etc...
 - Although such frictions were effective in addressing local concerns, they did not completely challenge the dominant discourse
- Important to pay attention to how effectively local concerns can be incorporated into the dominant discourse and policy
 - Their formal representations with veto power in decision making arenas
 - Forming alliance of local actors among them and with other actors to seek an effective influence over decisions that concern them





Thank you

Your suggestions, comments and advices would be greatly appreciated

