Guide for country profiles

Global Comparative Study on REDD (GCS-REDD)
Component 1 on National REDD+ Policies and Processes

Maria Brockhaus
Monica Di Gregorio
Sheila Wertz-Kanounnikoff

February 2010 (revised May 2011)

CIFOR

Global Comparative Study on REDD (GCS-REDD)
Component 1 on National REDD+ Policies and Processes

Guide for country profiles

Maria Brockhaus

Monica Di Gregorio

Sheila Wertz-Kanounnikoff

February 2010 (revised May 2011)

Cover photo by Manuel Boissiere
Kwerba, Mamberamo Raya, Papua.

Background for this guideline

This document contains an overview of the rationale of the country profiles. It outlines the main sections and the roles of the research team members, and provides guiding questions to facilitate and standardise the elaboration of the profiles across countries.

The purpose of the country profile is to provide an overview of the contextual conditions that affect the REDD+ policy environment in a specific country, along with a preliminary 3E (effective, efficient and equitable) assessment of the REDD+ proposals for that country. The profile is compiled based on reviews of existing literature, national and international data and reviews of legislation and policies, as well as selected expert interviews. As such, it provides the background and the preliminary analysis of the context in which national REDD+ strategies are being developed.

The country profile is structured under five main sections.

The first section begins by reviewing the main forest and land use trends. This section contains an investigation of the main country-specific drivers of deforestation and degradation, including an approximate quantitative disaggregation of post-deforestation land uses, degradation by type of agent, and by major in-country deforestation frontiers. After the examination of the direct drivers of deforestation and degradation, the analysis expands to consider the underlying causes (Angelsen and Kaimowitz 1999).

The second section contains a review of the major institutional factors linked to governance and rights, with a particular emphasis on access rights to forestland and forest resources. Not only are governance aspects, such as illegal logging and, more generally, rule of law and law enforcement, lack of transparency in licensing, and recognition of local rights, relevant for deforestation and degradation, they also have distributional implications. A number of researchers consider some governance aspects, particularly issues related to the rule of law, as preconditions for effective REDD+ strategies

(Kanninen et al. 2007). Furthermore, the broader principles of good governance, encompassing accountability and transparency, can contribute to reducing corruption and increasing bargaining capacity and inclusiveness in decision-making; although they might not directly influence REDD+ effectiveness, such principles are likely to strengthen equity outcomes or at least the legitimacy of new policies. Consequently, this section not only illustrates the possible role of these institutional factors for deforestation (e.g. deforestation as a way of establishing or consolidating land tenure; Rudel 2007), but also outlines the challenges or opportunities such factors create for the development of effective REDD+ policies and for the realisation of equity and poverty-alleviating co-benefits (Kanninen *et al.* 2007, Griffith 2008). The review of institutional factors related to rights-based conditions – rights to carbon, rights to forestland and forest resources – will pay particular to differences between *de jure* and *de facto* rights, land tenure (including forest conversion rights) and resource extraction rights, and the different characteristics of the various regional deforestation frontiers of the country in question.

In the third section, the analysis is expanded to encompass political-economic factors depicting the broader context in which drivers of deforestation and degradation operate. This detailed portrayal of the contextual socio-economic and political conditions related to deforestation and degradation collates the previous sections. With a strong emphasis on institutional dimensions, it aims to provide an understanding of the political-economic background conditions in which the national REDD+ strategies and policies are developed, shedding light on both opportunities for and constraints on successful policy development and implementation. The analysis pays particular attention to the role of agricultural policies, infrastructure development, investment policies (including subsidies, easy credit, tax breaks and low rent appropriation), non-compliance with environmental and sustainability standards, interest constellations facilitating collusive practices, international influences on development strategies, and tensions between legitimate development

strategies and the objectives of reduced deforestation and degradation.

The fourth section examines more specifically the development of national REDD+ policy strategies, thus serving as initial input for the subsequent, more detailed REDD+ policy process investigation. It first presents basic information about national REDD+ options under discussion, policy processes, the main actors involved and the main national policy events. It then provides an initial analysis of the main incentive structures and governance issues specific to the REDD+ policy domain in the country. Finally,

it provides some background information on the R-PP (Readiness Preparation Proposal or R-Plan) consultation process.

In the final section, the team draws on the analyses in the previous sections to identify the implications for prospective REDD+ outcomes in terms of assessment of national policies linked to the main drivers of deforestation and degradation, in relation to possible policy options for positive carbon impact and the implications for monitoring, reporting and verification during the implementation phase.

! Note for authors:
- Each section is linked to a set of indicators (see appendices), which should be completed after having finished a section.
- The country profile requires an executive summary, an introduction and a short concluding section with policy recommendations.
- Literature, including grey literature and documentation of conducted interviews, needs to be provided in a separate folder.
- Ensure group work and regular meetings among authors to avoid overlap between sections, particularly between Sections 2 and 4.

! Some practical notes to ensure that you provide a reader-friendly document:
1. Explain briefly to the reader the rationale for each section (see for example the justifications for the sections provided in these country profile guidelines).
2. Provide as much analysis and discussion (in all sections) as possible
   Examples:
   - In the chapter on mitigation potential, most country profilers provided 'only' a list of measures undertaken by the government to address deforestation and degradation with little discussion as to whether or not the government will be able to implement them. Besides, the original intention of this question/paragraph was to identify which deforestation and degradation activity provides the greatest potential for reducing greenhouse gas emissions (i.e. provide answers to the question of which activity is currently causing the highest emissions – in absolute terms) in order to get a sense where REDD+ actions would have to focus (based on current knowledge). It can be assumed that this information will be difficult to get for many countries, but a discussion of this question is necessary to inform effective REDD+ policy priorities (and could serve as input to a REDD+ strategy assessment where discourse is compared to actual needs)
   - In the section on the political-economic context, country profiles sometimes list 'key national policies' and underlying power groups, yet the sections could be strengthened by a more explicit analysis of the various interests and interest groups at play. It would also be useful to know which (according to current literature) is the most powerful lobby group.
3. Prioritisation and 'big picture':
   - Don't forget that the reader needs to be shown the big picture from time to time.
   - Indicate the relative contribution and importance of the listed causes (e.g. in Sections 1 and 3)
   - Provide clear 'take-home messages' (priority action points or priority observations for REDD+).

Table of contents and structure of the guidelines

Executive summary
(around 2000 words)

1. Introduction

(around 500 - 1000 words)

2. Analysis of the drivers of deforestation and degradation

A number of causes of deforestation and degradation are highlighted in the literature. These range from direct causes such as small-scale agricultural expansion and poverty, to more indirect drivers such as state policies and wealthy business interests within and outside the forestry sector (Rudel 2007). Powerful economic incentives appear to be behind the most relevant drivers, often acting in 'tandem' (Lambin *et al.* 2001). Notable elements are economic booms in forest extraction, agricultural colonisation and increased national and international demand for food and non-food agricultural products (e.g. biofuels), agricultural subsidies and other promotional policies, infrastructure policies, and possibly weak land and forest governance (Soares-Filho *et al.* 2004_. In particular, the main drivers of deforestation today lie outside the forestry sector, and they interact in complex ways (Rudel 2007). The aim of this section of the country profile, therefore, is to provide an overview of the current forest cover conditions and the past trends in forest cover change, as well as an assessment of the main drivers of deforestation and degradation for the country in question.

2.1. Current forest cover and historical overview of forest cover change

- What are the current macro forest and land use conditions?
  - % of forest cover
  - Distribution of forest cover
  - Forest types and forest conditions
- What have been the trends in land use, land use change and deforestation/degradation over the past 20 years, in the major in-country deforestation frontiers? (Provide FAO statistics along with data from national statistics and reports, and assess these critically as to their completeness and accuracy.)
  - Deforestation and degradation trends (past 20 years): areas converted on average, areas logged on average, main subperiods of trends and trend changes, recent tendencies. Where in the country are the deforestation 'hot spots', and

how do they compare in terms of dominant actors and sectors? Include evidence about forestation (afforestation and reforestation) areas and related drivers.
  - Describe the approximate quantitative disaggregation of post-deforestation land uses. What is forestland being used for (disaggregated forest categories, e.g. production forest, conversion for agricultural/livestock development, etc.)? Which sectors dominate as 'takers'? Are lands in continuous use, or to what extent is there a temporary or permanent abandonment of deforested land? After clearing, do lands typically change owner, or do they remain in the possession of the deforestation actor?
  - Describe the quantitative disaggregation of conservation forest areas, and indicate the forest conditions of these areas, including biodiversity conditions (identify biodiversity hotspots).

2.2. Review of the main drivers of forest cover change

This review is based on economic and policy conditions, both national and international. The investigation of direct drivers of deforestation and degradation should concentrate on specific regional areas under the greatest threat of deforestation and degradation.

During the past 20 years, what have been the main drivers of forest cover change (both national and international)?

- Consider the following structure:
  - Drivers: What drives the processes of deforestation and forest degradation and forestation? (deal with proximate causes)
    o Describe the main spatial differences in terms of conditions and drivers of deforestation and degradation:
      - identify main geographical areas where deforestation and degradation are particularly pronounced;

- identify areas where the current threat of deforestation and degradation is highest;
- focus the analysis of direct drivers of deforestation in these areas.

  o Describe the main economic and social factors driving deforestation and degradation in these areas.

- Agents: Who are the main actors involved in deforestation and forest degradation?

  o Identify main government, commodity sector and social actors (national and international) that are behind the main drivers of deforestation and degradation. Describe their activities and their main interests within high-deforestation regions. Also describe their main policy demands in the past and how they have tried to affect policies that facilitated their interests.

- Root (or underlying) causes: What are the ultimate reasons explaining these drivers?

  o macroeconomic conditions

  o policies and political-economic factors

  o national and international influences.

- Dynamics: Are there links between events and between agents that help explain the dynamics of deforestation?

  o Describe relationships between agents.

  o Describe the typical sequence leading to deforestation/degradation: Historical development shows different prevailing forces in different time periods (Rudel 2007) and relative positions (by regions) on the forest transition curve (Kanninen *et al.* 2007, Angelsen 2007).

  o Do some of these causal factors typically operate 'in tandem' (Lambin *et al.* 2001), i.e. jointly pushing and explaining forest clearing (e.g. road building plus timber demand plus population growth)?

- In terms of drivers of deforestation and degradation, take into account, among others:
  - Direct causes:

    o Commercial logging development (legal and illegal). Investigate also the link with timber prices and their trends.

    o Small-scale agricultural expansion and agricultural colonisation of the forest frontier (including livestock development, shifting and permanent cultivation – annual

versus perennial crops). These are often linked to level of and changes in prices for agricultural products.

  o Large-scale tree and crop plantations and agribusinesses (including livestock), driven by high prices for agricultural products. These are often linked to level of and changes in prices for agricultural products.

  o Infrastructure development (transportation, government-planned settlements, pipelines, etc.)

  o Lack of employment opportunities and wages outside the forestry/agricultural sector

  o Access to roads

- Indirect (root or underlying) causes (these may or may not be important drivers of deforestation and degradation, depending on contextual conditions; the more indirect and distant the links, the more difficult it is to assess the extent of the specific influence):

  o Demographic factors (population growth and migration trends)

  o Income levels (can increase deforestation and degradation because of higher demand for agricultural products, but can also increase off-farm employment)

  o Technological factors (extensive agricultural and livestock management, technology affecting profitability of timber and mineral resource extraction, etc.)

  o Cultural factors (consumption patterns, use and value of forest resources beyond monetary values, local rules related to forest use; Bray *et al.* 2003)

  o Fluctuating macroeconomic conditions, international factors and national policies:

  - currency devaluations, international debt and conditionalities on loans

  - trade policies

  - national and international economic booms in forestry and mineral resource extraction

  - changes in international demand for food and non-food agricultural products (e.g. biofuels) and meat products, etc.

- Include an assessment of how the drivers, processes and impacts are currently being monitored at national and subnational levels. Who and which institutions are responsible and how are the

activities and forest changes tracked in space and time?

– Create a table listing the drivers and collect information on who is behind the activities and how the activities are monitored.

– Detail what is known about the importance (area affected nationally, carbon impact such as emissions or removals) for each specific driver process.

– Describe any datasets available that describe the driver/process activities.

2.3. Mitigation potential

Based on the trends outlined above, explore and analyse the mitigation potential of forests (based on both literature review and expert interviews). It is also important in this analysis to consider any information on expected future activities (increase or decrease of importance) and understanding of how easy it is, policy-wise, to encourage or discourage the driver activities and to maintain the forest carbon stocks in the long term. The mitigation potential (e.g. 'the ideal REDD+ implementation case') would be greatest if there is one driver that creates a lot of emissions, is easy to monitor (all capacities in place), and easily addressed through a policy process. Also take into account the existing capacity for reporting and monitoring.

In assessing the mitigation potential of forests, consider the rate of deforestation and degradation over time (in terms of carbon emissions), current forest cover and main drivers of deforestation and degradation. Identify the location and extent of 'threatened areas' (if possible, separate the threats for deforestation and degradation) and provide estimates of the areas affected and the average carbon emissions or removal per unit area for historical periods.

• Assess the carbon impact at the national level (historical).

• Assess country-level capacity for reporting and monitoring:

– What is the level of national forest inventory capacity (growing stock and/or biomass)?

– Are there country-level accounting systems for the carbon impact of land use changes (from aboveground and belowground biomass)? What needs remain for capacity building? What active programmes for strengthening this capacity are underway?

• Comment on mitigation potential:

– indicators for assessing interim performance in the case of inadequate capacity.

– willingness of the actors to participate in the long term

– co-benefits for other ecosystem services.

2.4. Appendix 1

Using the results of the above analysis, complete the indicator table in Appendix 1.

2.5. Documentation appendix

In an appendix, list the sources consulted for the preparation of this section:

• short description of methods

• reviewed documents (full citations)

• key informant names, affiliation and contact details (e-mail and phone if possible).

3. Institutional, environmental and distributional aspects

Two further institutional factors are likely to affect levels of deforestation and degradation: weak forest governance and arrangements regarding property rights to forest and land resources. However, their effects are likely to vary according to context (Angelsen and Kaimowitz 1999, Chomitz et al. 2007). In addition, governance and land rights are particularly central to the REDD+ debate. Some researchers consider strengthening of forest governance and securing of local rights to be important preconditions for the development of effective REDD+ policies (Griffiths 2008, WRI 2009). Effecting such changes, however, represents a major challenge for REDD+ policy design and implementation (Kanninen *et al.* 2007) because these institutions are often difficult to change in practice, given the strong interests involved (Meinzen-Dick *et al.* 2008). Tenure issues in particular will likely influence benefit-sharing arrangements. The answer to the question of who effectively owns carbon, land and trees and controls access to them will co-determine the question of who will benefit from potential REDD+ scheme rewards, or alternatively, who will lose out from REDD+-related command-and-control improvements.

Another institutional feature likely to affect distribution of the benefits of REDD+ schemes is decentralisation. The type and level of decentralisation of government authority and of administrative and fiscal functions determine the territorial distribution of costs and benefits foremost among levels of government, but – in the case of devolution – also among actors outside the government sphere (Larson and Ribot 2009). Therefore, information on decentralisation of the forestry sector can provide insights into how to best structure REDD+ national strategies and into some of the distributional aspects of REDD+ mechanisms.

In addition, and particularly for states such as Indonesia, which has a substantially decentralised government structure (and special autonomy for two of its provinces), or Brazil, a federal state, the implementation of national REDD+ strategies will need substantial subnational capacity as well as coordination between national and subnational levels.

3.1. Governance in the forest margins

The aim of this section is to explore in some detail the governance conditions beyond their effects on deforestation and degradation alone. While weak governance has increasingly been recognised as a contributor to deforestation and degradation, it is also considered one of the main challenges in the development and effective implementation of policies on REDD+ (Kanninen *et al.* 2007). In addition, illegal logging and the uncertainty of the rule of law are endemic problems in many tropical forested countries (Brack 2005, Tacconi 2007).

There are likely to be links between general governance conditions and governance conditions affecting the REDD+ policy process (WRI 2009). Therefore, this section will begin with a brief background description of the country's position within the global forest governance arena, particularly looking at the position of the government vis-à-vis several international agreements. In addition to the country's participation in the UN Forum on Forests, its position on international agreements with respect to biodiversity, wildlife and indigenous rights is recognised as relevant to both national forestry and REDD+ agendas (Christy 2007, Griffiths 2008).

The next part of this section will summarise the governance conditions (illegal logging, rule of law, corruption, elite capture) in those forest margins where the threat of deforestation and degradation is highest. Evidence will be based both on a review of existing literature, legislation and other national documentation and on expert interviews. The investigation will cover legal/regulatory requirements and actual local governance practices. The review will also explore existing spaces and strength of civil society to hold local (and national-level where relevant) government and state institutions accountable to citizens' needs.

Next, the country profile will describe the country's existing decentralisation policies. Decentralisation of forest management has often been seen as one way to increase accountability in the forestry sector (Agrawal and Ribot 1999), although empirical evidence is

rather mixed (Ribot *et al.* 2006), with negative outcomes of elite capture also reported (Edmunds and Wollenberg 2003). In practice, however, the main reasons for undertaking decentralisation reforms are often political (Colfer and Capistrano 2005). Since REDD+ policies will need to encompass scales from national to local in an integrated way, experiences from decentralisation can help assess existing conditions and can inform the design of a REDD+ national strategy and its implementation across scales. In addition, current patterns of decentralisation will likely affect the design of benefit-sharing arrangements in the REDD+ policy arena. Although presenting a country-level overview, the assessment of decentralisation in regions under high threat of deforestation and degradation should be emphasised.

With regard to both governance and decentralisation, it is important to distinguish between the *rules* in terms of governance (laws and regulations) and the actual *practices*. Actual practices are best investigated through informal interviews with trusted key informants (Daviet *et al.* 2009, Davis *et al.* 2009).

3.1.1. Broader context: Global governance aspects and international agreements

- Major international agreements:
  - List the agreements the country has ratified (e.g. CBD, FLEGT, FLEG, CITES, and involvement in UNFF).
- Based on legislative reviews, media reports and expert interviews:
  - Describe the government position to date towards international agreements that affect forestry (including participation in UNFF).
  - Report in particular on international law enforcement and governance programmes active in the country: the main activities so far and the main outcomes, including, if relevant, the major challenges and shortcomings related to FLEGT and FLEG programmes and other international efforts to improve forest governance.

3.1.2. Governance conditions in areas under high threat of deforestation and degradation

- Focusing on the regions under high threat of deforestation and degradation and on the main

sectors driving these processes, report on the rule of law, corruption, elite capture and the voice of civil society in land use decisions. Information will be taken from the existing literature and expert interviews.
  - What is the current situation of illegal logging and rule of law in land use planning, enforcement and monitoring?
    - o Comment on the geographical focus of illegal logging – distinguishing between forest land use categories (production areas versus protection areas) – main causes of illegal logging, regulations and compliance with environmental and sustainability standards in other land uses (sustainable forest management (SFM), agriculture, livestock management, etc.) in areas under high threat of deforestation and degradation.
  - What is the current situation of corruption and elite capture in relation to land use decisions in areas under high threat of deforestation and degradation (in regions where REDD+ schemes are underway or are likely to be implemented)?
  - What is the current situation in terms of civil society/local participation in land use (including forest management) decision-making in regions of high deforestation and degradation?
    - o Comment on the degree of self-organisation and mobilisation around land use decision-making and monitoring, and on the extent to which participation is embedded in patron–client relationships compared to deliberative democratic processes.
- To what degree are weak governance aspects due to lack of governance capacity?
  - What are the main weaknesses in capacity (human and material resources for strategic, planning and regulatory improvements) in relation to governance for main land uses areas under high threat of deforestation and degradation?

3.1.3. Implications for REDD+

- What implications can be drawn with regard to REDD+ policymaking and policy implementation (in terms of effectiveness, equity, poverty alleviation and other co-benefits) from the governance conditions in the forest margins?

3.1.4. Appendix 2.1

Based on the results of the above analysis, complete the indicator table in Appendix 2.1.

3.1.5. Documentation appendix

In an appendix, list the sources consulted for the preparation of this section:
- short description of methods
- reviewed documents (full citations)
- key informant names, affiliation and contact details (e-mail and phone if possible), transcribed interviews.

3.2. Decentralisation and benefit-sharing

3.2.1. Detailed account of decentralisation for those sectors that mainly drive deforestation and degradation in the country

- What is the degree of decentralisation of decision-making in the sectors that most affect deforestation and degradation in the forest margins? (Refer to decentralisation in production and conservation forestry/small-and large-scale cropping/livestock management and land use decisions.) How do legislative decentralisation provisions differ from actual local practices? Which administrative functions related to land use apply to which government and local government agency levels? Are these clearly defined?
- Compare relevant laws in the main sectors driving deforestation and degradation (forestry, agriculture, etc.) to decentralisation/regional or state autonomy laws (if in place). Are these harmonised or contradictory in terms of delegation of roles and functions?
- What are the current legislative provisions on benefit-sharing mechanisms from land use and land use revenues between levels of government, and between governmental and non-governmental entities?

3.2.2. Implications for REDD+

What implications can be drawn with regard to REDD+ policymaking and policy implementation (particularly in terms of benefit-sharing and of co-benefits) from the decentralisation conditions in the forest margins?

3.2.3. Appendix 2.2

Based on the results of the above analysis, complete the indicator table in Appendix 2.2.

3.2.4. Documentation appendix

In an appendix, list the sources consulted for the preparation of this section:
- short description of methods
- reviewed documents (full citations)
- key informant names, affiliation and contact details (e-mail and phone if possible).

3.3. Rights: Indigenous rights and rights to carbon, land and trees

Indigenous rights – and access to forest for local users more generally – are among the central concerns related to REDD+ policy design of domestic and transnational civil society actors, as well as researchers (e.g. Rights and Resources Initiative). Whereas governance aspects contribute to the effectiveness of REDD+ policies, the constellation of property rights not only to carbon but also to land and trees – including indigenous rights – are likely to substantially influence the actual distribution of benefits (Meinzen-Dick *et al.* 2002, White and Martin 2002). In fact, property rights represent the entitlement to benefit streams (Bromley 1991). Consequently, rights are directly linked to benefit-sharing of REDD+ rewards and the two potential co-benefits of REDD+: poverty alleviation and increased equity. Because they affect legitimacy of state rules and incentives to comply with these rules, rights can also affect governance and effectiveness of REDD+ policies in terms of reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. One important aspect in the investigation of property rights is to distinguish between statutory law (*de jure* rights) and the actual practice of property rights on the ground (*de facto* rights), which often differ, particularly in the forest margins. This discrepancy is often the cause of land conflicts where overlapping tenure rules – statutory and customary – contradict each other. Arguments about the importance of property rights are often framed within the concept of tenure security (WRI

2009), but the implications are related not only to uncertainty of rights, but also to the distribution of these rights.

The following gives guidance on how to investigate rights-based issues. The suggested structure is to begin by describing the country's position within the international and national framework on indigenous rights, and the trends in and levels of grassroots mobilisation in relation to indigenous rights issues. This is followed by consideration of the national debates on rights to carbon, and then reports on forest, land and tree tenure conditions in the forest margins under high threat of deforestation and degradation.

3.3.1. Broad context: Indigenous rights in the international and national context

- Is the country a signatory to the ILO Convention No. 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries? (adopted on 27 June 1989 and in force since 5 September 1991)? Is the country a signatory to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (adopted by the General Assembly on 13 September 2007)? Draw conclusions on the official government position and discourse regarding indigenous rights.

- What type of legal recognition exists at the national level for indigenous rights, particularly in relation to self-governance, land tenure and rights to carbon?

- What is the extent of grassroots mobilisation in relation to indigenous rights? (Include a brief history and assessment of the strength of the indigenous movement in the country. Highlight linkages between national and international indigenous movements.)

- What is the position of the indigenous movement in relation to REDD+? How have policymakers responded to this position?

3.3.2. National tenure context

- Carbon tenure:
  - Has there been any explicit or implicit discussion of carbon tenure at the national level? Has any official decision been made that directly affects carbon tenure rights? Describe and list major policy decisions that affect carbon tenure

rights. Refer also to subnational-level decisions if relevant.
  - What can be inferred about carbon tenure rights given the broader land use regulatory context in the forest margins? (See also the following questions on the issue of tenure.)

- Land and tree tenure (focusing on forest and forest margins)

  Following is guidance for reviewing the rural land tenure arrangements[1] in the country, with particular attention to forest areas under high threat of deforestation and degradation. The suggested structure is to begin with a short review of the legal structure of tenure in these forest margins. This is followed by a review of the degree to which legislative provisions are reflected in everyday practices, and of the alternative property rights arrangements that are most prominent. After this, the country profile can highlight tenure-related challenges, land and resource conflicts, and examine the existence and effectiveness of state efforts for conflict resolution in these areas.

  - What are the main state (*de jure*) forest tenure rules and agricultural tenure rules in forest margins at high risk of degradation and deforestation, and how have they changed over time? To what extent do forest tenure practices (*de facto*) differ from state rules?[2]

  - Who owns what (by forest categories and land use categories)? Who makes decisions about land use? Who allocates rights and approves permits? What percentage of land/forest is under the control of the various entities?

  - What are the legal procedures and actual practices for converting forestland to agricultural land?

  - How are resource rights expressed in constitutional forest laws?

---

1   Tenure rules are based on property rights arrangements. Property rights can be more or less complete. They encompass rights from the less to the more complete: rights to access, rights to withdraw, rights to manage, rights to control (including selling the resource to others) (Schlager and Ostrom 1992). Therefore, for example, the right to enter a forest area is part of the possible tenure arrangements, as are the right to harvest forest resources (even within limits) and the right to sell them. A rights-holder might be entitled to only one of these rights, or to more than one.

2   *De jure* rules are official written state laws and regulations, whereas *de facto* rules reflect the actual practices on the ground; the latter often fall under customary law.

– To what extent are forest laws consistent with laws governing other, related sectors (e.g. land tenure, mining, infrastructure)?

– What is the relationship between land tenure and tree tenure in both statutory (written) and customary (or practised) law? What are the likely implications for rights to carbon and REDD+ schemes?

– How widespread are conflicts over land tenure in these areas? Are there effective channels to address and resolve these disputes at national and local levels? Is there evidence that external land grabbing is avoided in these areas, even at the agricultural frontier?

3.3.3. Implications for REDD+

• What implications for future REDD+ policy design and likely outcomes can be identified (particularly in terms of equity, poverty alleviation and other co-benefits, as well as effectiveness) from the tenure conditions in the forest margins?

• How are REDD+ debates and policies likely to reflect current recognition of indigenous rights

and tenure arrangements with regard to land and forest resources? How is this likely to affect benefit-sharing rules? How is this likely to affect REDD+ co-benefits?

• What is the likely effect of the conditions of land tenure conflicts on REDD+ policy design and implementation? Are conflicts and legitimacy issues likely to affect REDD+ implementation and effectiveness? If so, how?

3.3.4. Appendix 2.3.

Based on the results of the above analysis, complete the indicator table in Appendix 2.3.

3.3.5. Documentation appendix

In an appendix, list the sources consulted for the preparation of this section:

• short description of methods

• reviewed documents (full citations)

• key informant names, affiliation and contact details (e-mail and phone if possible), transcribed interviews.

4. The political economy of deforestation and degradation

Next, the country profile explores the political-economic component of deforestation and degradation, which brings forward the importance of underlying political and economic factors within the broader economy as well as at the international level (Jomo *et al.* 2004). It describes the political economy of the root causes of deforestation and degradation and gives an indication of the opportunities and constraints for national REDD+ policies. It also has the aim of locating the need to protect forest resources through REDD+ within broader national development goals. The analysis should focus on those areas under greatest threat of deforestation and degradation.

4.1. Exploration of the political-economic context of the main drivers of deforestation and degradation as they affect the REDD+ policy context

- What are the political-economic processes at both national and international levels that explain the deforestation and degradation trends?
  - Investigate the political-economic conditions related to national public policies that have facilitated deforestation and degradation (e.g. agricultural policies, infrastructure development, investments policies such as subsidies, easy credit, tax breaks, low rent appropriation by the state, etc.). How have broader development strategies affected deforestation and degradation? To what extent are these policies justified by legitimate development objectives?
  - How does the relative importance of single commodity sector drivers of deforestation and degradation affect the likelihood of deforestation and degradation trends being reversed? (If possible indicate the contribution of regional incomes for regions with high levels of deforestation and degradation as well as national level as a share of GDP, measured at the regional level for areas with a high level of deforestation and degradation.) To what extent are deforestation and degradation outcomes or the speed of deforestation also linked to inability to effectively implement existing policies or to

non-compliance with existing environmental and sustainability standards? Is this because of weak governance structures, strong interests facilitating collusive behaviour, and/or entrenched bureaucratic interests and practices? Are patron–client networks reducing the level of implementation of environmental standards? To what extent is lack of enforcement caused by lack of government capacity, including financial resources devoted to law enforcement?

  - To what extent has the opening of commodity and capital markets facilitated deforestation and degradation (e.g. international demand and prices)? How have domestic policies on foreign investment facilitated deforestation and degradation? To what extent are deforestation and degradation triggered by national versus international demands and related political conditions? How does this affect the country's ability to counter deforestation drivers?
  - To what extent have the interventions of international financial institutions in the country affected incentives to deforest or degrade forest? (Consider major infrastructure projects, development of timber industry for foreign exchange earnings for debt repayment, etc.)
  - How is the country balancing the need to constrain deforestation and forest degradation with legitimate development objectives? Are there tensions between diverse state interests? How have the tensions been addressed to date?

4.1.1. Appendix 3

Based on the results of the above analysis, complete the indicator table in Appendix 3.

4.1.2. Documentation appendix

In an appendix, list the sources consulted for the preparation of this section:
- short description of methods
- reviewed documents (full citations)
- key informant names, affiliation and contact details (e-mail and phone if possible), transcribed interviews.

5. The REDD+ policy environment: Actors, policy events, policy process

The aim of this section of the country profile is to provide a preliminary description of the policy environment in which national REDD+ strategies are being developed and information on institutional factors related specifically to the national REDD+ policy process. Most of the information will be collected through national documents, media outputs and expert interviews, although some review of the literature may be included.

This is a preliminary research step, which presents a very general description of the national REDD+ policy environment. The activities under this heading are expressly targeted at informing subsequent research, in particular the subsequent social organisation surveys and the strategy assessment.

5.1. Broader climate change policy context

Begin with a descriptive section based on a literature review, expert interviews and legislative and policy reviews:

- What are the major climate change mitigation and adaptation activities to date? What is their focus? (e.g. Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) activities, afforestation and reforestation, NAMA (Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action) process, etc.)
- What are the national policies directly related to climate change? What formal government position can be inferred from the policies on mitigation and adaptation? What is the status of the implementation of these policies?
- Is there a climate trust fund or donor coordination committee? What has been the experience with this mechanism?
- Assess the experience with CDM so far. What is the capacity of the Executive Board and the Designated National Authorities?
- What role have REDD+ strategies played in the national NAMA process?
- What can we learn from these for REDD+ schemes?

5.1.1. Appendix 4.1.

Based on the results of the above analysis, complete the indicator table in Appendix 4.1.

5.1.2. Documentation appendix

In an appendix, list the sources consulted for the preparation of this section:

- short description of methods
- reviewed documents (full citations)
- key informant names, affiliation and contact details (e-mail and phone if possible).

5.2. REDD+ policy actors, events and policy processes

5.2.1. Policy processes

- Present a preliminary chronology of the developments in the REDD+ policy process, starting from when REDD+ first became a relevant policy issue at the national level (period of analysis from December 2005 onwards unless a milestone event occurred earlier).
  - What have been the major policy events and the main policy decisions related to national REDD+ debates (e.g. regulations, debates presented to Parliament, etc.)?
  - Has there been any protest action by civil society actors linked to REDD+ policy events?
  - Who are the core actors in the REDD+ policy domain? (Consider government, business, NGO and international actors relevant in the national policy domain. This usually refers to organisations, but may exceptionally include individuals if these are relevant independently of their organisational affiliation.)
- Methods: Base the identification and description of policy and protest events and actors on key informant interviews and review of policy documents.

- Definitions:
  – Core actors are defined as: actors (organisations) that take part in substantive national policy debates and initiatives on REDD+, and that consider themselves and are perceived by others as relevant actors in the REDD+ policy arena.
  – Policy events are defined as: decision points that determine the selection of binding policy options (producing specific policy outputs from documents (R-PIN and R-PP) to legislation, new institutions or organisations), and meetings/occasions of national relevance where important policy proposal options have been discussed by authoritative actors.
  – Protest events are defined as collective public actions central to REDD+ issues, organised mainly by non-state actors. This information is elicited from civil society key informants or media sources.
- This analysis should provide three lists:
  – The **policy events list** should contain the following information: a short description of each policy event including the main authoritative decision or main policy proposal, the date of the event and the leading organisation/institution. Limit the list to 15 major events (see Appendix 4.2.1 for the template).
  – The **protest events list** should contain the following information: a short description of each protest events complaint and indicate specific links to specific policy events. Limit the list to 15 major events (see Appendix 4.2.2 for template).
  – The **core actor list** contains the full name and acronym/abbreviation of the core organisation, the main contact person's name and contact information (e-mail or phone). (Note that this list does NOT have an upper limit in terms of number of organisations. ALL those identified that fit the definition should be included at this stage.)

5.3. Consultation processes and multi-stakeholder forums

The main aim of this section is to assess governance aspects of the consultation processes undertaken in the policy formulation of the national REDD+ strategies. Consultation processes and multi-stakeholder forums are increasingly used with the aim of expanding participation of non-governmental entities in policy formulation.

Definitions:

- *'Consultation'*: The meaningful and timely process of seeking, discussing and considering carefully the views of others, in a manner that is cognisant of all parties' values and, where feasible, seeking agreement. 'Consultation processes' refers to mechanisms set in place with this specific purpose, which purposefully include an extensive array of stakeholders.
- *'Multi-stakeholder process'*: Multi-stakeholder processes are loosely defined as those that aim to bring together key stakeholders in a new form of communication, decision-finding (and possibly decision-making) on a particular issue.

In the country profile, the main multi-stakeholder forum and consultation processes linked to the national REDD+ strategy should be identified and presented along with an overview of the extent of the use of these forums to consult stakeholders, to advise policymakers and to participate in authoritative policy decisions.

This section will contain a descriptive qualitative assessment and a coding exercise (see Appendix 4.3.1).

Section 5.3.1 below is relevant for countries that have participated in the R-PP process. Section 5.3.2 is relevant for countries that are not participating in the R-PP process.

5.3.1. R-PP consultation process

Collection of relevant documentation

This section is based on FCPF requirements for the Preparation Proposal (R-PP) template and refers to point 1a (National Readiness Management Arrangements) and 1b (Stakeholder Consultation and Participation). The following documentation and lists should be included in the R-PPs. Review these documents to determine whether they provide sufficient information to identify the major formal consultation processes undertaken so far, and whether they contain complete participant lists for these

major stakeholder consultations. As further research steps, identify the complete list of participants for up to four consultation processes: two of the most important national-level consultation processes and two of the important subnational consultation processes (the local-level choice of consultation processes should possibly link to Component 2 of this study). If the R-PP contains insufficient details, try to retrieve this information from relevant working groups or the World Bank country office.

Provide the following as attachments:

- 1a: **List containing the complete composition of existing or new working groups** (include a complete list of names of the member ministries, agencies, NGOs, community-based organisations, Indigenous Peoples' organisations and individuals represented in the in the working group that will be responsible for managing readiness).
- 1a: **List of all practical activities** conducted as part of the management of readiness (workshops, meetings for key government agencies beyond the forestry sector and other stakeholder consultations; include the schedule and sequencing of such activities).
- Annex 1a: Work programme or ToR (Terms of Reference) for activities to be undertaken under 1a (National Readiness Management Arrangements).
- 1b: Stakeholder Consultation and Participation: brief summary activity
- Annex 1b-1: Stakeholder consultations held on the R-PP: **List of all stakeholder consultations held so far.**
- Annex 1b-2: Stakeholder Consultation and Participation Plan: List of all stakeholder consultations to be held and list of prospective participants. If any of these events has taken place in the meantime, **retrieve the complete list of actual participants**.
- Gather documentation about meeting discussion points and outcomes.

5.3.2. Consultation process for countries not participating in the R-PP process

For those countries not taking part in the R-PP process, identify other consultation channels used at the national or subnational level that have led to policy decisions related to REDD+. Identify the

major consultation processes whose mechanisms and debates are documented, and describe these processes (for countries where subnational-level decision-making is relevant for REDD+, investigate subnational processes as well), and collect documentation that documents that process. For the identified consultation processes, gather the following documentation, as available, and attach it as additional appendices:

- documentation on consultation procedure
- documentation on actual meetings (participant lists, discussion minutes)
- documentation of output of the consultation process (statement, press releases, final reports).

5.3.3. Coding and analysis of consultations and multi-stakeholder processes

The above documentation will be used to assess the consultation processes. Undertake a formal coding exercise for each consultation forum identified (see Appendix 4.3.1 for detailed instructions). The output of the coding exercise will be entered in the Excel template provided (XLS_Template_Consultation_Coding_Database). Using the investigation of the documentation and to support the coding results, assess the authority of the forums and participants, the criteria for participation, the extent of alignment of interests within the forums, the extent of representativeness of REDD+-related interests, the degree of institutionalisation of the consultation process and any evidence provided regarding the implementation of effective governance mechanisms. Briefly describe the most relevant forum, which should support and justify the coding choices below. Indicate also if these forums are linked in any way (e.g. if they are part of the same consultation process occurring at different levels).

5.3.4. Documentation appendix

In an appendix, provide, as necessary, any additional information on sources consulted for the preparation of this section:

- short description of methods
- reviewed documents (full citations)
- key informant names, affiliation and contact details (e-mail and phone if possible).

5.4. Future REDD+ policy options and processes

The aim of this section is to investigate future options for national REDD+ policy. Using the above analysis, existing national documentation and expert interviews, present the main existing REDD+ policy design proposals in terms of the following.

5.4.1. Type of REDD+

- What activities are being considered for REDD+ payments? Include a broad description of proposed location and scale.
- Are there any specific references to co-benefits from REDD+ activities? If so, report on these.

5.4.2. Financing

- What modes of REDD+ financing have been proposed and by whom?
- Have donors or investors expressed an interest in financing? If so, have they made firm financing commitments? In what sort of activity?
- Is the proposed donor funding in the form of ODA?
- What alternatives for upfront funding are on the table? (e.g. government budgetary commitments, private sector loans, subsidy provision to investors, etc.)

5.4.3. Monitoring, verification and reporting (MRV)

- What are the current proposals around the reference level setting? Which actors are driving the various proposals?
- What are the political rationales and implications of the different options? (In terms of new institutional set-up needed, assess the feasibility and responsibilities of the various actors.)
- What are the implications for effectiveness and efficiency of the different policy options?
- How do the proposals for MRV match the existing capacities (as outlined in Sections 2.3 and 3.1.2 and Appendices 1 and 2.1)?

5.4.4. Benefit-sharing

- What are the current proposals for sharing benefits and costs? Which actors are driving the different proposals?
- What are the broader distributional implications of these proposals?
- What are the current debates around co-benefits?

5.4.5. Proposed participation mechanisms

- What are the proposed mechanisms for future decision-making for REDD+?
- What participation, consultation and oversight mechanisms are proposed for REDD+? (Highlight any differences from present consultation processes.)

5.4.6. Policies and institutions

- What requirements in terms of new policies and institutions are associated with these proposals?
- What institutional mechanisms are proposed for channelling finance (e.g. trust fund, World Bank, UN, government bodies, etc.)?
- What coordination issues need to be addressed for existing REDD+ proposals?
- Which ministries and sectors are actively involved in current REDD+ debates? Are any potentially important institutional actors not involved?
- What policy reforms are needed to enable the above proposals?

5.4.7. Policy learning

- What mechanisms ensure learning from pilots and other early REDD+ activities at the local level?
- Have lessons been drawn from successes and failures of national policies/programmes for combating deforestation? If so, what are the main lessons? To what degree have these lessons entered the REDD+ debate? Are there mechanisms in place to ensure transfer of those lessons for effective learning?

6. Implications for the 3Es

The aim of this section is to identify implications for REDD+ using the aspects investigated in preceding sections. Implications should be drawn with respect to the 3Es (refer to the table in Appendix 5 to prompt thinking on 3E implications).

6.1. 3Es and national policies and policy options

- Provide for each main driver of deforestation and degradation an assessment of existing national policies (refer to Section 2) that could discourage or encourage the driver in terms of its 3E impact.
- Include any policy options (whether in the national strategy or not) and REDD+ opportunities (refer also to Section 5) for each driver that could discourage or encourage the activities in terms of a positive 3E impact.

6.2. 3E assessment of major REDD+ aspects

Use the 3E lens to assess the main results of the country profile analysis. Identify key barriers and limits and factors influencing successful REDD+ implementation in your country. Do this in relation to the following points:

- 3E implications of the broader governance and institutional context of your country
- 3E implications of tenure and property rights conditions
- 3E implications of MRV capacity
- 3E implications of REDD+ financing and cost–benefit policy options
- 3E implications of participation and vertical coordination
- 3E implications of horizontal coordination
- 3E implications of other issues relevant for REDD+, if applicable
- General outlook: 3E and prospective REDD+ policy outcomes.

7. Conclusion and policy recommendations
(between 500 - 1000 words)

8. References

Agrawal, A. and Ribot, J.C. 1999 Accountability in decentralization: a framework with South Asian and West African cases. Journal of Developing Areas 33: 473–502.

Angelsen, A. and Kaimowitz, D. 1999 Rethinking the causes of deforestation: lessons from economic models. World Bank Research Observer 14(1): 73–98.

Angelsen, A. 2007 Forest cover change in space and time: combining the von Thünen and forest transition theories. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 4117.,. World Bank , Washington, DC.

Brack, D. 2005 Controlling illegal logging and the trade in illegally harvested timber: the EU's Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade initiative. Review of European Community and International Environmental Law 14(1): 28–38.

Bray, D.B., Merino-Pérez, L., Negreros-Casillo, P., Segura-Warnholtz, G., Torres-Rojo, J.M., Vester, H.F.M.2003. Mexico's community-managed forests as a global model for sustainable landscapes. Conservation Biology 17(3): 672–677.Bromley, D. 1991 *Environment and economy: property rights and public policy.* Basil Blackwell, Inc., Cambridge, MA.

Chomitz, K.M., Buys, P., De Luca, G., Thomas, T.S., Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S. 2007 At loggerheads? Agricultural expansion, poverty reduction, and environment in the tropical forests. World Bank Policy Research Report. World Bank, Washington, DC.

Christy, L.C. 2007 Forest law and sustainable development: addressing contemporary challenges through legal reform. World Bank, Washington, DC.

Colfer, C. and Capistrano, D. (eds) 2005 The politics of decentralization. London: Earthscan.

Daviet, F. Davis, C., Goers, L. Nakhooda, S. 2009 Ready or not? A review of the World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership R-Plans and the UN-REDD Joint Program Documents. WRI Working Paper. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC. Ready or not? A review of the World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership R-Plans and the UN-REDD Joint Program Documents [23 May 2012].

Davis, C., Daviet, F., Nakhooda, S., Thuault, A. 2009 A review of 25 Readiness Plan Idea Notes from the World Bank Forest Carbon Partnership Facility. WRI Working Paper. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC. www.wri.org/gfi [23 May 2012].

Edmunds, D. and Wollenberg, E. 2003 Local forest management: the impacts of devolution policies. London: Earthscan Publications.

Griffiths, T. 2008 Seeing 'REDD'?: Forests, climate change mitigation and the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities. Moreton-in-Marsh, UK, Forest Peoples Programme.

Herold, M. 2009 An assessment of national forest monitoring capabilities in tropical non-Annex I countries: recommendations for capacity building. Final report prepared for The Prince's Rainforests Project and The Government of Norway. Oslo, Norway.

Jomo, K.S., Chang, Y.T., Khoo, K.J. 2004. Deforesting Malaysia: the political economy and social ecology of agricultural expansion and commercial logging. London and New York, Zed Books.

Kanninen, M., Murdiyarso, D., Seymour, F., Angelsen, A., Wunder, S., German, L. 2007 Do trees grow on money? The implications of deforestation research for policies to promote REDD. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.

Lambin, E., Turner, B., Geist, H., Aghola, S., Angelsen, A., Bruce, J., Coomes, O., Dirzo, R., Fischer, G., Folke, C. *et al.* 2001 The causes of land-use change and land-over change: moving beyond the myths. Global Environmental Change 11: 261–269.

Larson, A. and Ribot, J. 2009 Lessons from forestry decentralization. *In:* Angelsen, A., Brockhaus, M., Kanninen, M., Sills, E., Sunderlin, W.D. and Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S. (eds.) Realising REDD+: national strategy and policy options. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.

Meinzen-Dick, R., Di Gregorio, M. and Dohrn, S. 2008 Pro-poor land tenure reform and democratic governance. Discussion Paper 3. Oslo Governance Centre, Oslo, Norway.

Meinzen-Dick, R.S., Knox, A., Place, F. and Swallow, B. 2002 Innovation in natural resource management: the role of property rights and collective action in developing countries. Johns Hopkins University Press, Washington, DC.

Ribot, J., Agrawal, A., & Larson, A. M. 2006 Recentralizing while decentralization: How national governments reappropriate forest resources. World Development, 34(11), 1864-1886.

Rudel, T.K. 2007 Changing agents of deforestation: from state-initiated to enterprise driven processes, 1970–2000. Land Use Policy 24(1): 35–41.

Schlager, E. and Ostrom, E. 1992 Property-rights regimes and natural resources: a conceptual analysis. Land Economics 68: 249–262.

Soares-Filho, B.S., Alencar, A., Nepstad, D., Cerqueira, G., Del Carmen Vera Diaz, M., Rivero, S., Solórzano, L. Voll, E. 2004 Simulating the response of land-cover changes to road paving and governance along a major Amazon highway: the Santarém–Cuiabá corridor. Global Change Biology 10: 745–764.

Tacconi, L. (ed.) 2007 Illegal logging: law enforcement, livelihoods and the timber trade. London, Earthscan.White, A. and Martin, A. 2002. Who owns the world's forests? Forest tenure and public forests in transition. Forest Trends and Center for International Environmental Law, Washington, DC.

World Resources Institute 2009 Governance of Forests Initiative. DRAFT Indicator Framework. http://pdf.wri.org/working_papers/gfi_tenure_indicators_may09.pdf

Wunder, S. 2003 Oil wealth and the fate of the forests. London, Routledge.

See also the Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI), which is a very active publisher in the area of rights to forest. http://www.rightsandresources.org/publications.php

Appendix 1. Indicators of the drivers of deforestation and degradation

Select or enter only one answer for question unless otherwise specified (variable names are in grey)

Topic	Questions and indicators	Enter number or text
Forest cover	Total forest cover in ha:	FC:
Total forest cover as percentage of total land area	% of total land area:	FC%:
Proportion of country area with tree canopy cover > 40%	1. None: 0% 2. Some: 1–50% 3. High: >50%	FC40:
Total area affected by fires (average 2000–2008)	1. Low: 0% 2. Medium: >0% of land area burnt annually (on average) 3. High: >10% of area with >40% tree cover burnt annually (on average)	FIRE:
Forest transition (based on historical trends) (identify the country's overall position on the forest transition curve)	Mainly undisturbed (primary) forest Logged-over (secondary) forest Forest/agricultural mosaic (agricultural colonisation and expansion) Forest/plantations/agricultural mosaic	FT:
Direct causes of deforestation and degradation: What is the single most relevant sector driving deforestation and degradation?	Commercial logging development Small-scale agricultural expansion and agricultural colonisation of the forest frontier (including livestock development) Large-scale tree and crop plantations and agribusinesses Infrastructure development (transportation, settlements, pipelines, etc.) Other, specify:	DC:
	What is this sector's contribution to GDP in USD?	GDPshare: US$
	What is this sector's contribution to total exports?	GDP%: %
Indirect causes of deforestation and degradation	What is the single most relevant underlying condition driving deforestation and degradation, and the economic importance of the main related sectors of production? Domestic macroeconomic conditions National policies International factors Demographic factors Technological aspects Cultural factors In relation to the above question, if relevant, specify the economic importance of the main related sectors of production: Main related sector: MAINSEC Comment on the economic importance of this sector for the national economy: MAINSECCOM	INDC:

Topic	Questions and indicators	Enter number or text
Assessment of carbon stock and MRV capacity	Are there country-level accounting systems covering carbon impact of land use changes?	MRVcap:
	1. None	
	2. Yes, but only broad estimates, or limited to aboveground mass	
	3. Yes, more detailed estimates or including both above- and belowground mass	
	What is the level of forest inventory capacity (growing stock and/or biomass)?	INVcap:
	1. Very low: No inventory available	
	2. Limited: Inventories available but externally produced	
	3. Some: Inventories available and produced in-country (before 2000)	
	4. Good: Inventories available (in-country), most recent after 2000	
	If available: What is the carbon impact on a national level? % of land use change emissions out of total emissions:	YCI:
	Total carbon emission (most recent data available)	
	Year: YCI Amount CO_2: CI	CI:
	Select methods: Tier 1=1 / Tier 2=2 / Tier 3=2	CIM:
	What are the predictions for business as usual projects on CO_2 emissions?	BU:
	1 = decrease	
	2 = stationary	
	3 = increase	

Note: The indicators in the above section are based on Herold, M. 2009 An assessment of national forest monitoring capabilities in tropical non-Annex I countries: recommendations for capacity building. Final Report prepared for The Prince's Rainforests Project and The Government of Norway. http://unfccc.int/files/methods_science/redd/country_specific_information/application/pdf/redd_nat_capacity_report_herold_july09_publ.pdf

Appendix 2.1 Governance indicators

Select or enter only one answer for each question unless otherwise specified

Topic:	Select answer (variable name)	Select answer	Select answer
Global governance	Did the country ratify the CBD? (CBD) 1. Yes 2. No	If yes: Is the country effectively applying the CBD? (CBDa) 1. Yes 2. Partly 3. Not at all 4. Does not apply: Country has not ratified the CBD	
	Is the country a signatory to CITES? (CITES) 1. Yes 2. No	If yes: Is the country effectively applying the CITES convention? (CITESa) 1. Yes 2. Partly 3. Not at all 4. Does not apply: Country has not ratified CITES	
	Is the country involved in FLEGT/FLEG programmes? (FLEG) 1. Yes 2. No	Have these programmes improved forest governance? (FLEGa) 1. Yes 2. Partly 3. Not at all 4. Does n ot apply: Country is not involved in FLEG	
Governance in the forest margins	Is illegal logging a major problem in the country? (LOG) 1. Yes 2. No	Is the monitoring of sustainable logging practices effective? (LOGSM) 1. Yes 2. Partly 3. Not at all	Is lack of local capacity (human and financial resources) a major determinant of illegal logging? (LOGcap) 1. Yes 2. No
	Are there laws that specify the right of local users to make their own management decisions in forest areas? (SF) 1. Yes, including commercial use of forest products 2. Yes, but limited to specific uses 3. No	Are these laws effectively applied? (SFa) 1. Yes 2. Partly 3. Not at all	How many people in fact benefit from the implementation of these laws? (SFben) 1. Very few 2. A substantial part 3. The majority of people living in the forest margins

Topic:	Select answer (variable name)	Select answer	Select answer
Governance in land use planning[a]	To what extent does the law encourage diverse and meaningful participation in land use planning processes? (LAWPART) (Select all that apply) 1. Laws require public participation in the land use planning process. 2. Laws define a clear process for public participation in all stages of the land use planning process. 3. Laws require public disclosure of how public input was reflected in the final land use plan.	To what extent does the public have access to information regarding the land use planning process? (INFOACC) (Select all that apply) 1. A broad range of documentation is available. 2. Documentation is easily accessible by a range of stakeholders. 3. Documentation is available in a timely fashion. 4. Records of land use planning process are maintained and updated regularly.	To what extent do civil society organisations have the capacity to work on and influence land use planning processes? (CSPART) (Select all that apply) 1. They possess expertise on land use planning. 2. They have sufficient financial resources to support independent land use planning reporting. 3. Civil society organisations participate in decision-making or monitoring of the land use planning process.
Governance capacity	Does the national government keep a registry and data/performance evaluations on capacity? (CAPGOV) 1. Yes 2. No	Are there active government programmes aimed at strengthening local government capacity for effective land use planning? (CAPPRO) 1. Yes 2. No	Which of these weaknesses in government capacity present serious limitations to effective local land use planning administration? (CAPWEAK) (Select all that apply) 1. Lack of human resources 2. Lack of financial and material resources for strategic, planning and regulatory improvements 3. Lack of financial resources for enforcement and monitoring

a This row employs indicators used by WRI's Governance of Forests Initiative

Appendix 2.2 Decentralisation indicators

Note: 'Local government level' here refers to the level of local government that is the main target of devolution policies.

Topic	Select answer (variable name)	Select answer	Select answer	Select answer
Political decentralisation	Is there a decentralisation or regional autonomy law? (DEC) 1. Yes 2. No	Is the decentralisation law applied in practice? (DECa) 1. Yes 2. Partly 3. Not at all	Are local governments democratically elected? (DECdem) 1. Yes 2. No	Is the head of the local government directly elected? (DECdir) 1. Yes 2. No
Local participation in policy decisions	Are local governments legally required to provide mechanisms for participation (access to hearings and committees, town meetings)? (DECpart) 1. Yes 2. No			
Financial decentralisation	What percentage of the state budget is transferred to local governments according to law? (DECfin) ....%	Do local governments have the authority to define and collect local taxes? (DECtax) 1. Yes 2. No		
Decentralisation (of sector that drives deforestation and degradation) in the forest margins	Is there a law that delegates forest management decisions to local government? (DECf) 1. Yes 2. No Are there laws or regulations delegating forest management decisions directly to local forest users? (DECfu) 1. Yes 2. No	Are there laws or regulations delegating forest management decisions to local branches of the forestry department? (DECfs) 1. Yes 2. No	Are the functions of the various levels of these agency branches clearly defined by laws/regulations? (DECfcoor) 1. Yes 2. Partly 3. No	Is the division of functions between these branches effectively applied in practice? (DECfeff) 1. Yes 2. Partly 3. Not at all Do these allow users to derive incomes from forest? (DECinc) 1. Yes, including for commercial use 2. Only for non-commercial use and for NTFP 3. No

Topic	Select answer (variable name)	Select answer	Select answer	Select answer
Land use planning in areas under high threat of deforestation and degradation	Is there a law that delegates land use planning decisions to local government? (DEClu) 1. Yes 2. No	Does local government have substantial decision-making power in land use decisions in these areas? (DEClup) 1. Yes 2. No	Are there laws/regulations defining a coordination mechanism for land use planning across scales? (DEClucoor) 1. Yes 2. No	Is this coordination mechanism effectively implemented? (DEClucoora) 1. Yes 2. Partly 3. No
Elite capture (in localities under high threat of deforestation and degradation)	Elite capture in local government is … (ECgov) 1. widespread 2. occasional (in some localities but not others) 3. quite rare	Elite capture in local user forest management systems is … (ECfm) 1. widespread 2. occasional (in some localities but not others) 3. quite rare		

Appendix 2.3 Rights indicators: Indigenous rights and rights to carbon, land and trees

Topic	Select answer	Select answer	Select answer	Select answer
Indigenous rights	Has the country ratified ILO Convention 169? (ILO) 1. Yes 2. No		If yes: Is the country effectively applying the ILO convention? (ILOa) 1. Yes 2. Partly 3. Not at all 4. Does not apply: Country has not ratified the ILO convention	
Indigenous rights	Is the country a signatory to UNDRIP? (UNDRIP) 1. Yes 2. No		If yes: Is the country effectively applying the UNDRIP convention? (UNDRIPa) 1. Yes 2. Partly 3. Not at all 4. Does not apply: Country has not ratified the UNDRIP	
Recognition of indigenous rights	National legislation: Are Indigenous Peoples recognised in national law? (IND) 1. Yes 2. No		To what extent is the national law on Indigenous People actually implemented? (INDa) 1. For the most part 2. Partly 3. Not at all	
Indigenous People mobilisation	Is there an independent national-level indigenous rights organisation with elected representatives in the country? (INDorg) 1. Yes 2. No		Does this organisation have the ability to influence policies at the national level? (INDorga) 1. Not at all 2. Some 3. Substantial	
Carbon tenure	With respect to carbon tenure, there has been/ is: (CT) 1. no explicit formal discussion on carbon tenure at the national policy level 2. formal and informal debates at the national policy level, but rights are not clearly defined 3. clearly defined assignment of carbon tenure rights			
Land and tree tenure	In relation to land and tree tenure, which of the following best represents the situation in this country? (LT) 1. The state has formal property rights to most forestland. 2. Indigenous People/communities hold formal property rights to most forestland. 3. Private individuals/business hold formal property rights to most forest areas. 4. Formal control over forestland is more or less equally distributed between state, private entities and indigenous communities.			
Land conflicts	Conflicts over land tenure are: (LTcon) 1. Rare 2. Quite common 3. Widespread	Is there a clear law addressing land conflict resolution mechanisms? (LTres) 1. Yes 2. No	People tend to use predominantly: (LTrestype) 1. Formal state resolution mechanisms (e.g. courts) 2. Customary resolution mechanisms	Are formal conflict mechanisms for the resolution of land tenure conflicts effective? (LTresreff) 1. Yes 2. No

Appendix 3. Political-economy indicators

Topic	Select answer	Select answer	Select answer	Select answer
Public policies	Are there sectoral policies providing financial incentives that accelerate deforestation? (PF) 1. Yes 2. No	Which of these sectoral policies has most facilitated deforestation? (PS) 1. Forest policies 2. Agricultural policies 3. Infrastructure policies and development		
Main international triggers of land use change	Are policies that trigger extensive land use changes due in main part to needs for foreign currency to repay debts? (PD) 1. Yes 2. No	Are policies that trigger extensive land use changes part of international financial institutions loan repayment requirements? (PIFI) 1. Yes 2. No	Which of these international aspects has most facilitated deforestation? (Pint) 1. International demand for wood 2. International demand for agricultural products	
Compliance with sustainable forest management (SFM) regulations	Is there a national law requiring SFM practices for logging? (SFM) 1. Yes 2. No	Is this policy effectively implemented? (SFMe) 1. Yes 2. No	Is corruption a major limiting factor in the enforcement of SFM regulations? (SFMcor) 1. Yes 2. No	Is lack of capacity (human and financial resources) a major limiting factor in the enforcement of SFM regulations? (SFMcap) 1. Yes 2. No
Level of overall budgeting for law enforcement in forestry	Is there a law enforcement division in the forestry department? (BLaw) 1. Yes 2. No	What is the budget for law enforcement in forestry? (Btot)..........amount (Bc).........currency (B%)...... % of total forestry budget	What percentage of human resources is devoted to law enforcement in forestry? (HR%)….. % of total forestry personnel	
Clientelistic behaviour (land use and forestry sector; see theoretical categories)	Are licences/contracts and rights often allocated through patron–client networks at the national level? (PC) 1. Often 2. Sometimes 3. Rarely		Are licences/contracts and rights often allocated through patron–client networks at the local government level (in areas of high deforestation and degradation)? (PClic) 1. Often 2. Sometimes 3. Rarely	

Appendix 4.1. The REDD+ policy environment: Actors, policy events, incentives, influence and governance

Indicator	Enter number/text or select answer (variable name)		
Total number of CDM projects in the country	(CDM)		
Number of CDM projects related to afforestation and reforestation	(CDMn)		
NAMA process	The country is committed to a NAMA process: (NAMA) 1. Yes 2. No		
Engagement in internationally supported REDD+ initiatives (UN-REDD, FCPF, bilateral government support)	Is the country involved in UN-REDD initiatives? (UNRED) 1. Yes 2. No	Is the country involved in FCPF programmes? (FCPF) 1. Yes 2. No	Does the country receive major funds from bilateral agreements for REDD+? (BA) 1. Yes 2. No
Main government agency responsible for REDD+ policies	Is there a main government agency responsible for REDD+? (GOVAG) 1. Yes 2. No If yes, what is the name of the main government agency responsible for REDD+? (GOVAGN) …………………………………………………		Is this a new institution set up in relation to the national REDD+ strategy? (AGNEW) 1. Yes 2. No
List all new national institutions set up in relation to REDD+ policy development	(AGNEW1) ………………………………………………… (AGNEW2) ……………………………………………….. (AGNEW3) …………………………………………………		

Appendix 4.2.1 Policy events in the national REDD+ policy domain

(max. 15 events)

Code	Date (month/year)	Policy event name (or brief description)	Main policy decision/policy proposal related to the event
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			

Appendix 4.2.2 Protest events linked to REDD+

(max. 15 events)

	Event (brief description)	Scale*	Date	Main demand or policy suggestion	Leading organisation
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					

Scale: 1 = international
        2 = national
        3 = subnational/local

Appendix 4.2.3 Core actors in the national REDD+ policy domain

Core actors are *actors that define themselves AND that are perceived by others as part of the national policy domain. (Usually these are organisational actors, but in some cases individuals might be relevant independently of their organisational affiliation. The latter is quite rare and applies only if the person acts on a personal basis and not on behalf of the organisation he or she might be affiliated with.)*

NOTE: ALL relevant actors identified in the research should be listed. Increase the number of rows to accommodate all actors, using multiple pages as necessary.

Government and state agencies:

Code	Abbreviation/ acronym	Full name of organisation (or individual)	Contact person	Contact e-mail/phone
1				
2				
3				
…				

Businesses and business organisations:

Code	Abbreviation/ acronym	Full name of organisation	Contact person	Contact e-mail/phone
1				
2				
3				
…				

Unions, community-based and non-governmental organisations:

Code	Abbreviation/ acronym	Full name of organisation	Contact person	Contact e-mail/phone
1				
2				
3				
…				

International organisations:

Code	Abbreviation/ acronym	Full name of organisation	Contact person	Contact e-mail/phone
1				
2				
3				
…				

Appendix 4.3.1 Consultations and multi-stakeholder processes

- Using as the starting point the information collected in the country profiles and through analysis of the R-PPs (or R-PINs) and (if necessary) interviews with key informants, identify and describe the multi-stakeholder processes set in place for advisory, consultation and authoritative REDD+ policy formulation processes. Compile a list of all multi-stakeholder and consultation forums. (Use the List of Consultation Forum and Multi-Stakeholder Meetings below and provide the name of each forum/meeting, indicate whether it refers to a national or subnational/local-level event, and whether it refers to a one-time meeting or a long-term forum. Give date(s) of meetings).
- Identify up to four main consultation or multi-stakeholder processes for the coding exercise (two national and two subnational/local-level consultations). Compile the complete list of participants (or members if there is a fixed membership). [3]Select the most relevant forums (two at the national and two at the subnational/local level).
- For these four processes:
  - Provide a short description of the forum, which should support and justify the coding choices below; indicate also if these forums are linked in any way (e.g. if they are part of the same consultation process occurring at different levels).
  - Drawing on all relevant documentation, undertake the coding exercise.

List of multi-stakeholder forums and consultation meetings

N	Name of forum/meeting	Date(s) of meetings (can be multiple)	Level[b]	Frequency[c]
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
…				

a Level: national = 1; subnational = 2
b Frequency: one-time meeting = 1; recurrent meetings = 2

---

3 Note: For R-PPs, this should be included in the document annexes.

Coding of multi-stakeholder forums and consultation meetings

Each forum is uniquely identified by the sequential ID number. The coding is most easily compiled in an Excel file, where each column corresponds to one of the variables (an Excel template is provided).

ID

This variable is a sequential number (1 to 4) that uniquely identifies each forum.

NAME

This is a string variable which contains the name of the multi-stakeholder or consultation forum/meeting. Consistency of names across documents is very important, because it identifies the forum (together with the n number).

AUTH

This variable refers to the authority of the whole multi-stakeholder or consultation forum:

1. The forum has a consultation role to disseminate information and to inform authoritative actors about the positions of different interests.

2. The forum has an advisory role to authoritative actors: it provides expert knowledge that authoritative actors are expected to take into account in policy decisions.

3. The forum has an authoritative decision-making power: participants have a mandate to make binding decisions (e.g. they have voting rights).

ACTAUTH

This variable refers to the authority of most of the participants:

1. Includes mainly authoritative state actors

2. Includes authoritative state actors, technical experts and academics with advisory functions

3. Includes only actors with an advisory role (active advisers)

4. Includes both authoritative state actors and actors with consultative functions (more passive, mainly being informed)

5. No authoritative actor involved, only advisory and consultative actors (clearly outside formal decision-making processes)

ACTLEVEL

This variable refers to cross-level participation of actors:

1. Includes mainly international-level actors

2. Includes mainly national-level actors

3. Includes mainly national- and international-level actors

4. Includes mainly national- and subnational-level actors[4] (possibly also international-level actors)

5. Includes national, subnational- and local-level actors[5] (possibly also international-level actors). (This last choices indicates a comprehensive cross-scale representation.)

6. Includes mainly subnational- and local-level actors.

7. Includes mainly local-level actors.

ACTTYPE

This variable refers to the type of *organisational* actors that are involved:

1. Mainly government actors

2. Mainly intergovernmental organisations (these are also by definition international organisations)

3. Mainly academia

4. Mainly civil society organisations

5. Mainly business organisations and representatives

6. Balanced representation of state and intergovernmental organisations

7. Balanced representation of state and academia

8. Balanced representation of state and business organisations

9. Balanced representation of state, academia and business organisations

10. Balanced representation of state, business and civil society organisations

11. Balanced representation of state, academia, business and civil society organisations

---

4, 5 'Subnational level' refers to state level in federal systems, 'local-level actors' refers to municipal/district level.

INTEREST

This variable refers to the variety of constellation of interests of the multi-stakeholder forum:

1. Interests of all actors are strongly aligned, and no major stakeholder is excluded

2. Interests of actors are varied, but there is willingness and political space to build consensus

3. Interests of actors are very polarised in distinct factions indicating strong differences in interests

4. Evidence absence (either by choice or by exclusion) of key stakeholders holding specific interests, denoting a conflictual polarisation

MEMB

This variable refers to the criteria or participation or membership in the forum:

1. Membership is specific to selected/invited organisations (and no specific selection criteria are identifiable)

2. Membership is open to organisations that meet certain criteria of relevance

3. Membership is open to organisations that meet certain criteria of expertise

4. Membership is open to organisations that meet specified criteria different from relevance or expertise

5. Membership is open to any organisation that wants to participate

TIME

This variable indicates the temporal characteristics of the multi-stakeholder forum:

1. *Ad hoc*, one-time consultation

2. Temporary, but recurrent consultation

3. Institutionalised long-term consultation (often institutionalised through the establishment of a permanent organisation)

GOVERNANCE RULES

TRANS

This variable refers to rules that ensure transparency. Does the (R-PP or other) consultation process provide evidence of procedures that ensure transparency in consultation in terms of clarity of rules, disclosure of information and (if relevant) transparent decision-making procedures?

1. Yes, they are clearly present
2. Partly
3. No, they are not present
4. Not mentioned

ACCOUNT

This variable refers to rules that facilitate accountability. Does the consultation process provide evidence of the presence of specific mechanisms that clearly define authority, roles and responsibilities of forum participants, and that ensure that all claims are responded to?

1. Yes, they are clearly present
2. Partly
3. No, they are not present
4. Not mentioned (not enough information to judge)

COORD

This variable refers to rules that facilitate coordination. Does the consultation process provide evidence of the presence and effectiveness of mechanisms or actions that facilitate coordination among forum participants?

1. Yes, they are clearly present
2. Partly
3. No, they are not present
4. Not mentioned (not enough information to judge)

CAPAC

Does the consultation process provide evidence of the presence of sufficient resources and expertise to facilitate consensus-building activities? (e.g. adoption of consultative learning techniques, use of independent facilitators, decision-making rules aimed at consensus building)

1. Yes, they are clearly present
2. Partly
3. No, they are not present
4. Not mentioned (not enough information to judge)

Appendix 5. 3Es checklist

Following is information to be collected that will enable us to assess the 3Es.

	Effectiveness	Efficiency (cost–benefit)	Equity
MRV	- Ability to achieve permanent emission reductions - Clarity of forest definitions and reference levels - Systems for learning and feedback - Mechanisms for dealing with leakage	- Existence of data - Existence of technical capacity - Existence of human capacity - Existence of national organisation with the capacity for monitoring	- Cost matches potential returns - Transparency and accountability mechanisms
Institutions	- National ownership over the agenda - Role of the private sector - Policies which address deforestation and degradation - Capacity to cope with increased volumes of finance	- Need for additional regulations - Positions of civil society commentators - Level of capacity of existing structures and for MRV	- Type and level of political administrative and fiscal decentralisation - Transparency and accountability mechanisms - Mechanisms for participation and consultation - Legal recognition of rights of local and Indigenous Peoples - Capacity to guard against misappropriation of increased financial flows - Rule of law in natural resource sectors
Coordination and commitment	- Coordination between ministries - High-level commitment - Involvement of bodies outside the forestry sector (e.g. Ministry of Finance, Cabinet) - Coordination between national and subnational levels - Decision-making power of local government	- Clarification of responsibilities - Alignment with ongoing policy processes (development and environment policy) - Alignment with mitigation strategies (NAMA)	- Level of interaction and distribution of transaction costs
Benefit-sharing and participation	- Consensus around participation, benefit-sharing and tenure security	- Requirement for separate fiduciary systems vs reliance on existing systems - Compensation for activities foregone	- Representation on decision-making bodies - Systems for participation - Decentralised taxation systems - Clarity of land, carbon rights and associated forest resources

Appendix 6. List of interviewees

Name	Organisation	Date

Acknowledgements

cifor.org **blog.cifor.org**

NORWEGIAN MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT
NORWEGIAN MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Australian Government
AusAID

DFID Department for International Development

USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Center for International Forestry Research
CIFOR advances human wellbeing, environmental conservation and equity by conducting research to inform policies and practices that affect forests in developing countries. CIFOR is a CGIAR Consortium Research Center. CIFOR's headquarters are in Bogor, Indonesia. It also has offices in Asia, Africa and South America.

CGIAR