

## PUBLICATION INFORMATION

This is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in the Environmental Policy and Governance journal. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/eet.1669>

Digital reproduction on this site is provided to CIFOR staff and other researchers who visit this site for research consultation and scholarly purposes. Further distribution and/or any further use of the works from this site is strictly forbidden without the permission of the Environmental Policy and Governance journal.

You may download, copy and distribute this manuscript for non-commercial purposes. Your license is limited by the following restrictions:

1. The integrity of the work and identification of the author, copyright owner and publisher must be preserved in any copy.
2. You must attribute this manuscript in the following format:

This is a pre-print version of an article by Rantala, S., Kontinen, T., Korhonen-Kurki, K., & Mustalahti, I. 2015. **Equity in REDD+: Varying logics in Tanzania**. *Environmental Policy and Governance*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/eet.1669>



## Equity in REDD+: varying logics in Tanzania

### Abstract

Equity is frequently cited as one of the key design aspects of environmental governance regimes. In the context of Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+), a forest-based climate change mitigation instrument, the manner in which 'equity' is understood will be of critical importance for the impacts and acceptance of REDD+ policies and initiatives. Whereas the concept has been extensively studied in the academic literature, references to equity in REDD+ policy debates and documents are often vague, leaving room for various interpretations and modes of implementation. In our case study of the Tanzanian national REDD+ policy domain, we provide a conceptual framework based on an institutional logics approach for analysing the various underlying rationales in the 'equity in REDD+' debate. We apply it to demonstrate how the involved policy actors draw from heterogeneous equity logics in their support for and opposition to different governance models, highlighting the importance of precise contextualization and operationalization of broad international principles in national REDD+ initiatives.

**Keywords:** REDD+, equity, institutional logics, policy, Tanzania

## Introduction

Climate change poses enormous governance challenges and has profound social implications for people. One of the key challenges currently faced by policy makers relates to understanding variation among the short- and long-term priorities of different groups of stakeholders, and balancing them for legitimate and effective climate change policies. In policy and academic debates on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+), a climate change mitigation mechanism based on incentives and compensation for the maintenance and enhancement of carbon stocks in tropical forests and trees, concerns over social justice are accentuated (Peskett *et al.*, 2011; McDermott *et al.*, 2012). It is argued that while REDD+ might have potential to bring benefits to local communities in developing countries in the form of rewards for forest conservation and sustainable forest management, REDD+ also carries the risk of livelihood losses and marginalization of forest-dependent people due to recentralization of forest governance and appropriation of benefits by states and other more powerful actors (Griffiths, 2008; Cotula and Mayers, 2009; Agrawal *et al.* 2010; Phelps *et al.*, 2010; Sandbrook *et al.*, 2010). Framing the REDD+ debate around winners and losers – the latter invariably identified as forest-dependent communities and indigenous peoples – is central to the critique towards REDD+ articulated by a number of environmental and social organizations (Griffiths, 2008; Di Gregorio *et al.*, 2013). At the same time, there is a growing consensus that effective and equitable participation by a wide range of stakeholders, including local forest users, is needed for REDD+ to succeed (cf. UNFCCC, 2011).

Consequently, 'equity' is frequently cited as one of the key aspects for the design of national and sub-national REDD+ interventions (Angelsen, 2008; Angelsen *et al.*, 2009; Peskett *et al.*, 2011). Yet, the term is generally left undefined (McDermott *et al.*, 2012) or mentioned in passing among the other "three E:s", effectiveness and efficiency (Angelsen 2008, Angelsen *et al.* 2009). In the 3E framework, equity is seen to concern the fair distribution of REDD+ benefits within and among countries (Angelsen and Wertz-Kanounnikoff, 2008). A key concept in the literature on environmental justice, *distributive equity* is concerned with the "distribution of 'goods' and 'bads' in society and

1  
2  
3 the principles by which these benefits and burdens are, or should be, distributed”  
4 (McDermott *et al.*, 2012, p. 3). The focus in the Northern hemisphere has tended to be  
5 on the unequal distribution of environmental burden, while in the South, on that of  
6 benefits (Schroeder *et al.*, 2008). While REDD+ implementation is still incipient, equity  
7 in REDD+ is most frequently discussed in relation to potential benefit-sharing  
8 mechanisms between governments and forest custodians (Peskest *et al.*, 2011;  
9 Balderas Torres and Skutsch, 2012; Pham *et al.*, 2013; Skutsch *et al.*, 2013; Luttrell *et*  
10 *al.* 2013).

11  
12 Partly as a response to critique of too narrow a definition of equity in terms of  
13 distribution of burden or benefits (Schroeder *et al.*, 2008; McDermott *et al.*, 2012),  
14 attention has been drawn to the *procedural equity* of planning and decision-making  
15 processes. Matters of choice, access, recognition, participation, representation and  
16 distribution of power shape the fairness of political, legal, market, and other processes  
17 that allocate resources and resolve disputes (Paavola, 2007; Schroeder *et al.*, 2008;  
18 McDermott *et al.*, 2012; Wutich *et al.*, 2013). Procedural and distributive equity are thus  
19 intrinsically linked (Paavola, 2007; Schroeder *et al.*, 2008). McDermott *et al.* (2012)  
20 discuss the effect of previous distributive and procedural inequities on current Payments  
21 for Environmental Services (PES) and REDD+ interventions as contextual equity; the  
22 political, economic and social conditions present at the start of an intervention that  
23 shape access to it (cf. Brown and Corbera, 2003). It has been warned that strong social  
24 safeguards are needed so that REDD+ will not reproduce or further strengthen the  
25 existing regressive conditions, the “uneven playing field”, present in many countries  
26 preparing REDD+ interventions (Ribot and Larson, 2012; Mustalahti and Rakotonarivo,  
27 2014).

28  
29 In climate change and REDD+ documents and debates, equity issues, principles  
30 and criteria are often presented in a normative tone and as impetus for desired practice,  
31 i.e. ideal descriptions of how things should be (Heyward, 2007; Angelsen *et al.*, 2009;  
32 Mustalahti *et al.*, 2012). But what is considered equitable by whom? Varying  
33 conceptions of equity are based on particular actors’ perspectives and circumstances  
34 instead of universal, shared meanings, and equity principles are used in accordance to  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 users' interests (Heyward, 2007). This has important implications for the design of  
4 'optimal' REDD+ strategies and initiatives. As noted by Wiegandt (2001, p. 148), "there  
5 is no rational nor scientific basis on which to choose among different conceptions of  
6 ethics". Lack of clarity on which dimensions of equity should be targeted further  
7 complicates the operationalization of the concept in REDD+ planning, decision making  
8 and implementation (McDermott *et al.*, 2012). Various conceptions of equity are thus  
9 likely to come into conflict in the national and sub-national REDD+ processes in which  
10 distinct actors, often dissimilar in their interests and influence, participate.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 This paper explores the various rationalities and logics regarding equity employed  
19 by organizational actors participating in the development of a national REDD+ strategy  
20 in Tanzania. Recognizing the conceptual as well as normative plurality in the equity in  
21 REDD+ debate, we turn to the theory of institutional logics (Friedland and Alford 1991;  
22 Thornton *et al.*, 2012) which provides us with a useful conceptual angle to understand  
23 the logics and rationalities used to interpret and implement the global REDD+ debate at  
24 the level of organizational fields and individual organizations. Identifying the multiple  
25 rationalities and logics in the conceptualization of equity facilitates the understanding of  
26 the dynamics and outcomes of REDD+ policymaking and implementation. For instance,  
27 in our case study country, Tanzania, much of the debate surrounding the development  
28 of a national REDD+ strategy is focused on the design of a benefit-sharing mechanism  
29 between the government and local forest custodians. The government agencies  
30 spearheading the national REDD+ initiative argue that the best way to ensure equitable  
31 outcomes is state-controlled benefit distribution through a national trust fund, while civil  
32 society organizations, mainly domestic and international NGOs, critique the model for  
33 maintaining previous inequalities, namely state capture of forest benefits (Rantala and  
34 Di Gregorio, in press). We propose that central to this debate are the different,  
35 unspoken logics related to equity in the specific natural resource governance context in  
36 Tanzania, which are likely to continue to cause friction as REDD+ moves from the  
37 national debates to local level implementation.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 Acknowledging previous, commendable efforts to conceptualize equity in PES and  
55 REDD+ interventions based on thorough reviews of relevant theoretical frameworks  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (e.g. McDermott *et al.*, 2012; Di Gregorio *et al.*, 2013), our contribution to this literature  
4 distinguishes itself by an inductive, data-driven approach. We depart from a working  
5 definition that draws from the theories of distributive and procedural equity, considering  
6 equity to be concerned with issues of negotiation power, participation in REDD+  
7 decision making and implementation, and allocation of costs and benefits among the  
8 stakeholders and groups involved. Within that broad definition, we identify the kind of  
9 vocabularies and arguments that policy actors use in reference to equity in REDD+, and  
10 associate them with distinct institutional logics that guide the actors' preferences  
11 regarding REDD+ policy proposals. Our approach discloses the heterogeneity of logics  
12 related to equity within the nascent REDD+ policy field in Tanzania, suggesting that  
13 enhanced deliberation should be promoted in the operationalization of broad  
14 international principles in national policy processes instead of assuming that shared,  
15 taken-for-granted rationalities exist.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 **Institutional Logics Perspective to Equity in REDD+**

28  
29 The institutional logics approach is one of the most prominent approaches in the  
30 contemporary sociological organization theory (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Friedland and  
31 Alford, 1991; Thornton and Ocasio, 1999; 2008; Greenwood *et al.* 2011; Thornton *et al.*,  
32 2012), though it has not yet been applied extensively in contexts spanning both the  
33 North and the South (but see Carter *et al.*, 2011, for an application in the analysis of the  
34 global climate change negotiations). The approach suggests that institutional logics  
35 connect individual organizations, organizational fields revolving around certain products  
36 or services, and wider societal contexts. The societal institutional systems such as  
37 family, religion, state, market, profession, corporation and community function according  
38 to their own logics which facilitate the interpretation of social situations in different ways  
39 (Thornton *et al.*, 2012; Friedland and Alford, 1991). For example, the logics of the state  
40 in modern societies revolve around bureaucratic rationality according to which the  
41 equity of citizens is guaranteed by a well-functioning governmental 'machine' (Weber,  
42 1947). The logics of the family, in turn, have been attributed to the nuclear family  
43 characterized by close emotional relations (Friedland and Alford, 1991). The logics  
44 affect organizational fields and organizational behaviour by providing meanings and  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 material practices which are reproduced and reinterpreted at the organizational level  
4 (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Thornton and Ocasio, 1999; p.  
5 804). Fields and organizations also face institutional complexity (Greenwood *et al.*,  
6 2010; 2011; Yu, 2013; Kraatz and Block, 2008), and draw from multiple logics in their  
7 everyday functions. Thus, the identification of specific logics emerging in selected fields  
8 and organizations remains a question of empirical inquiry.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 The institutional logics approach contributes to our analysis of the 'equity in  
16 REDD+' debate in Tanzania in three important ways. First, it provides grounds for  
17 organizational understanding of "what constitutes appropriate behavior" (Thornton, 2004,  
18 p. 70), and hence analysing the underlying institutional logics of 'appropriate equity'  
19 enables novel understanding of the rationalities behind REDD+ interventions. Second,  
20 we propose that REDD+ facilitates an emerging transnational field composed of  
21 organizational actors ranging from international negotiators to national and local  
22 governments, domestic and transnational civil society actors, local communities and  
23 forest users. The REDD+ field is partly a novel resource environment for these  
24 organizations in terms of material and conceptual resources, and partly overlaps with  
25 the existing fields of international development aid (cf. Tvedt 2006) and forest  
26 management and conservation, the requirements and resources of which enable and  
27 constrain REDD+ planning and implementation (e.g. Kanowski et al. 2011). Within the  
28 system, the concept of equity gains different theoretical, normative and practical  
29 meanings, and fits various forms of rationality. Third, we contend that the emerging  
30 organizational field of REDD+ is characterized by institutional complexity illustrated by  
31 inherent contradictions in the logics articulated (Greenwood *et al.*, 2011). In a similar  
32 vein with, for example, the Canadian health care field characterized by competing logics  
33 of medical professionalism and business (Reay and Hinings, 2009), and Bolivian micro-  
34 finance organizations struggling to balance the logics of development and banking  
35 (Battilana and Doraro, 2010), at least the logics of market and bureaucracy may be  
36 expected to apply to REDD+ as a transnational field, given the basic features of the  
37 mechanism that entail international financial transfers to national governments.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1  
2  
3 heterogeneous logics will help understand the diversity of policy models that are all  
4 proposed to lead to equity.  
5  
6

## 7 8 **Study Context and Methods**

### 9 10 **REDD+ in Tanzania**

11  
12 Tanzania is one of the countries participating in the United Nations Programme on  
13 REDD+ (UN-REDD), and has received substantial support for 'REDD+ readiness'  
14 activities from the Norwegian government since 2008. These activities include the  
15 development of a national REDD+ strategy under the leadership of a national REDD+  
16 Task Force, implementation of pilot REDD+ projects, as well as REDD+ research and  
17 capacity building. The final draft National REDD+ Strategy (URT, 2013) outlines two key  
18 structures for operationalizing REDD+ in Tanzania: a national trust fund for the  
19 administration and distribution of REDD+ rewards (payments), and a National Carbon  
20 Monitoring Centre which will provide technical services on measuring, reporting and  
21 verification of carbon stocks and REDD+ activities across the country. In March 2013,  
22 the government of Tanzania endorsed the National REDD+ Strategy and Action Plan  
23 (Daily News, 2013). The National REDD+ Strategy lists several general goals related to  
24 the development of equitable governance and institutional mechanisms for benefit  
25 sharing and capacity building (URT, 2013, p. 41, 42, 44, 45) but without defining what is  
26 meant by 'equitable' or detailing any explicit actions to operationalize it.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 **Data Collection and Analysis**

43  
44 Data on the equity logics of REDD+ actors were collected through in-depth, semi-  
45 structured interviews with policy actors (organizational actors active in the REDD+  
46 policy formulation and consultation processes in Tanzania) in March-June 2011 (Table  
47 1). The interviews formed part of a larger study on the REDD+ policy process in  
48 Tanzania and did not solely target aspects of equity, which nevertheless came up  
49 extensively in the interviews. Equity was primarily discussed in relation to the  
50 development and content of the first draft national REDD+ strategy (URT, 2010) that  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 had just been released for public comments. The approach to defining and identifying  
4 relevant policy actors was through a panel of seven experts (individuals well-acquainted  
5 with the REDD+ process in Tanzania and involved in it in different roles) who were  
6 asked to nominate organizational actors that considered themselves as part of the  
7 REDD+ policy domain and were recognized by other actors as such. In other words, our  
8 approach to defining policy actors was realist in emphasising reputational relevance  
9 (Laumann *et al.*, 1992), resulting in the exclusion of, for instance, local communities and  
10 forest users that were not considered actors in the national policy formulation despite  
11 being stakeholders in REDD+. For each organization, a high-ranking official that could  
12 plausibly speak for the whole organization or the official that normally represented the  
13 organization in the national REDD+ strategy process was interviewed on the position  
14 and perspectives of their organization on REDD+. In total, 41 interviews were  
15 conducted.  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 The interviews were recorded and transcribed. Qualitative content analysis  
28 software was first used to extract relevant material, as longer strands of text, with  
29 reference to our working definition of equity. A manual thematic analysis of the resulting  
30 text extracts from 28 interviews was repeated three times by the first and the third  
31 author and based on input by the other authors, as the main patterns of different  
32 institutional logics on equity in REDD+ started to emerge and were sharpened. Since  
33 institutional logics are ideal types (Thornton *et al.*, 2012), their identification requires a  
34 close inductive engagement with the vocabularies of practice and arguments uttered.  
35 Hence, we looked for repetitions of certain vocabulary and arguments, specific  
36 expressions, analogies and metaphors, as well as transitions and connectors in the  
37 interviewees' narratives to see how distinct arguments were linked (cf. Ryan and  
38 Bernard, 2003) in our effort to categorize the institutional logics of equity and their inner  
39 contradictions. The previous literature on institutional logics (Thornton *et al.*, 2012)  
40 provided ideas for scoping the data, while we also intended to identify logics that might  
41 be specific for the Tanzanian context as well for REDD+ as a transnational  
42 organizational field.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 The distribution of different types of organizational actors among the final set of  
5 interviews included in the analysis is presented in Table 1. It is representative of the  
6 distribution of different types of actors in the REDD+ policy domain in Tanzania in 2011  
7 as identified by the expert panel. The actual organization names are not disclosed  
8 because we guaranteed the interviewees full anonymity. It should be reiterated,  
9 however, that in line with the idea of analytical generalization typical of qualitative  
10 research (e.g. Mitchell, 2000), we have intended to describe the multiple institutional  
11 logics within the REDD+ policy domain in Tanzania, and more specifically, at the level of  
12 organizational actors as participants in this particular domain. Therefore, the emphasis  
13 is not on the frequency of utterances of distinct logics by certain types of actors, but on  
14 a 'thick description' (Geertz, 1973) of all the logics that could be identified.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

#### 24 **Findings: Institutional Logics for Equity in REDD+**

25  
26 The arguments of the interviewed REDD+ actors were associated with several logics  
27 that could be related to three dimensions of the equity debate: first, *why* equity is a  
28 concern for REDD+ policies and initiatives; second, *how* equity in REDD+ interventions  
29 should be addressed; and third, *what stands in the way* of achieving equitable REDD+  
30 processes and outcomes. Some of the logics resonated with the ideal types presented  
31 in the previous literature (e.g. market, bureaucracy, family), but certain arguments  
32 related to the importance of inclusive participation by a broad range of stakeholders  
33 could be considered specific to the current context of multilevel, multiactor governance  
34 not only in REDD+ but as a general recent trend in natural resource governance  
35 (Thompson *et al.*, 2001; Forsyth, 2009). We identified six main categories of institutional  
36 logics, four of which were considered to possess inner tensions or distinctions. In  
37 resonance with the previous literature on institutional complexity, the interviewees  
38 typically presented arguments that could be related to several types of logics, that is,  
39 the main categories were not mutually exclusive. The results have been summarized in  
40 Table 2.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 First, one of the most salient logics, in terms of the frequency of related  
54 arguments by all types of actors, was the market logic. It posits that REDD+ needs to  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 provide sufficient financial incentives at the local community level so that the changes in  
4 behaviour and livelihood strategies required for a reduction in deforestation and forest  
5 degradation are achieved. This view stresses distributive equity in compensating for  
6 forgone income and opportunities; an aspect which, in the view of the interviewees, the  
7 previous approaches to forest conservation and community-based forest management  
8 in Tanzania had failed to address (e.g. Vyamana, 2009; Blomley *et al.*, 2010; Rantala *et*  
9 *al.*, 2012). Hopes were therefore placed on REDD+ funds to provide the needed  
10 incentives and compensation, as reflected in this comment by one of the interviewed  
11 government officials:

12  
13  
14 “The problem has been money and how do we make them [*local communities*] work.  
15 We give them incentives, so far not much. Then, when we heard about REDD+, we said  
16 OK, if it is to enhance carbon stocks and reduce emissions, making people who are in  
17 the rural areas, the poor, not to cut trees but to keep them and maintain them, then if  
18 viable alternatives can come forward, then people can appreciate” (Government forestry  
19 official, April 26, 2011).

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Second, the logic of rights, including both legal and moral rights to resources and to compensation for REDD+ related restrictions on resource access, constituted an important rationale to argue for equity in REDD+. These arguments were presented in relation to the Tanzanian context in which a distinction between legal and moral right-holders is relevant for the on-going discussion on defining REDD+ beneficiaries. Who is a legal right-holder may be subject to widely differing views in REDD+ implementation, due to varying interpretations of the national land and forest laws on tenure, not to mention the still-unresolved question of carbon rights. Parallel to the global REDD+ debate, civil society actors in Tanzania have campaigned for a more straightforward recognition of local communities' land and forest rights, which are intertwined in the decentralized legal framework. The government, as evident in the interviewees' comments as well as in the national policy documents on REDD+, continues to interpret the laws and regulations in such a way that the majority of land and forest still falls under its control (TFCG and MJUMITA, 2011; Rantala and Di Gregorio, in press). The moral rights argument sidesteps this quandary by stressing that all those whose

1  
2  
3 livelihoods are affected by REDD+ should be taken into account, regardless of their  
4 legal position.  
5  
6

7  
8 Third, our analysis revealed that there was a prevalent inner tension between the  
9 logics of an ideal type of modern bureaucracy (Weber, 1947) referring to efficient,  
10 transparent and impartial state machinery, and that of the existing bureaucracy in  
11 Tanzania as perceived and experienced especially by the civil society actors. They  
12 framed the problem as one of clientelistic governance in which the state captures all  
13 resources while failing both the equity and effectiveness aspects of REDD+. They did  
14 not favour the proposed national REDD+ trust fund because it was seen at risk of  
15 replicating their experience with previous natural resource management schemes in  
16 which governmental bureaucracy had swallowed most of the benefits, with very little left  
17 to be distributed at the local levels. As one of the NGO representatives justified the  
18 position of his organization, based on what they had observed in relation to benefit  
19 sharing from hunting concessions:  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 “The closest thing we see to that is 20% of the revenue is returned to districts, but even  
30 that doesn’t then reach the communities where it has happened. So there’s just no  
31 precedent in Tanzania. There’s no history. There’s a precedent of the exact opposite.  
32 So we don’t think that a national reward system will work [...] If they’re talking 90% of  
33 the income going to communities, then maybe that’s fair. If they’re talking about 20%  
34 which is like traditional here, right, with wildlife, then it’s silly. It’s not remotely equitable”  
35 (Domestic NGO technical advisor, April 5, 2011).  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 In contrast, notions of the logic of (an ideal type of) modern bureaucracy could be  
43 detected in the arguments of the governmental actors, who saw the state bureaucracy  
44 in a very different light; as an unbiased and efficient apparatus that guarantees the  
45 equity of REDD+ processes and outcomes. Although they, too, admitted that there was  
46 room for improvement in the performance of the national forest governance system, the  
47 interviewed governmental officials expressed a firm belief that the state could best  
48 oversee the administration of REDD+ accounting and reward payments, as long as  
49 principles such as good governance and transparency and accountability were actively  
50 promoted and followed. We saw this as related to the fourth identified logic of  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 standards, which clearly connected the Tanzanian REDD+ equity debate to the  
4 international sphere. Within this logic, too, two contradictory sides could be identified:  
5 one taking the adoption of international standards and subsequent equity outcomes for  
6 granted, the other questioning their relevance in the current context. According to the  
7 sub-logic of established standards, equity and other good governance principles  
8 naturally flow from the international standards, agreements and partnerships, such as  
9 the UNFCCC and UN-REDD+, that Tanzania has agreed to follow. The flipside to this  
10 was pointed out by some NGO and international actors, referring to what we identified  
11 as the sub-category of 'buzzwords'. According to this logic, equity goals have been  
12 copied from the global discourse for a wider legitimacy of the national REDD+ strategy,  
13 but without clearly defining measures through which such goals might be achieved, so  
14 as to avoid accountability. As described by an NGO interviewee:

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 “It is very nicely written, these things, fairness, equity, gender balance, in the [policy]  
26 documents. But when it comes to actually doing, it is a different story [...] If you don't  
27 put up a very effective way of implementing to ensure that, life will go on as usual, yeah,  
28 business as usual” (Domestic NGO director, March 24, 2011).  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Fifth, seen as both a justification for and a pathway to equitable REDD+  
34 outcomes, the logic of participatory governance relates to the idea of REDD+ as a prime  
35 manifestation of multilevel, multi-actor governance spanning various jurisdictional scales  
36 and multiple sectors (Forsyth, 2009). The rationale that legitimate and effective policies  
37 require the equitable participation, direct or indirect, of as many stakeholders as  
38 possible, was salient in the arguments of all types of actors. Goals related to inclusive  
39 participation are frequently explicit in decentralization reforms taking place in many  
40 countries across the developing tropics (e.g. Larson *et al.*, 2010), including Tanzania,  
41 where decentralized policies and legal frameworks for land, forest and local government  
42 were introduced in the late 1990s-early 2000s. Since then, a focus on the national  
43 Participatory Forest Management policy has dominated academic and policy  
44 discussions in the Tanzanian forest sector (e.g. Wily and Dewees, 2001; Lund and  
45 Treue, 2008; Blomley and Iddi, 2009; Blomley *et al.*, 2010) in which many of the current  
46 REDD+ policy actors have a long history. The inputs by non-state actors required for  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 effective and equitable policies were seen to span various types of expertise, as the  
4 below comment illustrates:  
5  
6

7  
8 “I think it is high time we do away with the conservative way of thinking, being of what  
9 the government constitute. We should broaden consultation by taking on board people  
10 who can add value to the processes given the fact that REDD+ is multidisciplinary, it is  
11 a very wide ranging issue. They could involve people from the civil society, from the  
12 academia, from Zanzibar [...] You bring a professor of forestry, a professor of law, a  
13 representative of women’s groups, a representative of the disabled, a representative of  
14 business community and so on and so forth. If that is done, I think REDD can develop  
15 well because people can inform, it can represent diverse views and expertise,”  
16 (Domestic NGO technical advisor, April 21, 2011).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Finally, based on the conceptualization of community and family logics in the  
25 previous literature (Thornton *et al.*, 2012), existing social ties within communities and  
26 households might be expected to positively shape distributive and procedural equity in  
27 REDD+. In our data, however, references to the social embeddedness of equity were  
28 presented mainly in the negative light. There was concern over inadequate attention to  
29 traditional gender roles in REDD+ planning and implementation and the subsequent risk  
30 that women would not be able to access the benefits, while bearing the consequences  
31 of forest use restrictions in their daily lives. Examples of unilateral decision making by  
32 village leaders and entering into contracts with project proponents without the consent  
33 of the broader community were given (cf. Mustalahti and Rakotonarivo, 2014). The  
34 concerns over the capture of REDD+ benefits by village elites at the cost of weaker  
35 actors, such as women, the poorest farmers and landless villagers engaging in ‘illegal’  
36 activities such as charcoal making, were related in the arguments of the interviewees to  
37 a question which a national REDD+ benefit sharing mechanism as well as individual  
38 projects have to consider: whether benefits should be communal or distributed  
39 according to individual opportunity costs of REDD+.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Discussion and Conclusions

The findings of our study suggest that the concept of equity may be related to highly heterogeneous institutional logics in the national REDD+ policy domain. They support our conceptual approach which proposes that the REDD+ domain represents an emerging international organizational field characterized by institutionalised meanings and practices, building on and overlapping with the more established fields of 'development' (Tvedt, 2006) and forest conservation and management. At least in the current readiness phase, the international flow of money in REDD+ is part of the development aid enterprise. The logics of international standards and buzzwords in REDD+ are very similar to those which may be found in the dynamics of international development and previous efforts of forest conservation, with their changing standards and discourses that are adopted and used in different ways when confronted with local realities. In particular, governments that aspire to be part of a certain international community, such as the 'REDD+ countries', may be susceptible to normative discourses employed by international organizations and adopt similar language and standards out of legitimacy and reputational concerns (Bernstein and Cashore, 2007; Happaerts, 2012). In a context where previous government policies to enhance social equity are perceived to have fallen short of their promises, the operationalization of such standards is likely to be met with particular caution and scrutiny by non-state actors.

Two logics emerged as particularly salient among the Tanzanian REDD+ actors: the market logic, addressing primarily the distributive dimension of equity, and the logic of participatory governance, mostly concerned with procedural equity.

It is perhaps unsurprising that the market logic appears so pervasive. After all, REDD+ is essentially based on the idea of putting the right price on the saved carbon and thus offering a sufficient incentive to change the behaviour and activities driving deforestation and forest degradation. Lack of incentives was widely cited as the main reason why previous forest conservation efforts had failed, suggesting that market approaches were perhaps seen as 'the thing to try next', again reflecting global trends and discourses. Delimiting the study to concern only policy actors, i.e. those actors participating in and having a voice – to varying degrees – in the national REDD+ policy

1  
2  
3 process, may partly explain the relative scarcity of other types of arguments that might  
4 represent more 'endogenous' views on equity in the current context. Most of those  
5 policy actors, at least in 2011, were national level organizations with a specific  
6 environmental mandate. Other concerns may override those of environmental  
7 effectiveness at the local (sub-national) level.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Nevertheless, it is striking that the market logic as relating to such elementary  
14 resources for rural livelihoods as land and forest was not really questioned by the  
15 national REDD+ policy actors. There is mounting empirical evidence from Tanzania and  
16 elsewhere of the challenges of compensating lost access to natural resources with  
17 money (Cernea and Mathur, 2008; Rantala *et al.*, 2013). In fact, the literature on  
18 development-related displacement has highlighted the associated risks since the 1970s  
19 (Cernea and Guggenheim, 1993; Cernea, 2003). The poorest and most vulnerable  
20 groups may be at a disadvantage when handling cash and "quickly left both cashless  
21 and assetless" (Cernea, 2003; p. 41). Furthermore, it may be difficult or even impossible  
22 to replace the knowledge, skills and identities related to particular resources, which also  
23 importantly condition people's resilience, with money (Cernea, 2003; Rantala *et al.*,  
24 2013). Therefore, considering equity in REDD+ to be merely a question of the right  
25 amount of compensation reaching the right people is potentially problematic.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 The salience of the logic of participatory governance, which emphasizes multiple  
38 ways of public participation, hearing different voices and engaging with different  
39 perspectives, suggests widespread concern over procedural equity in REDD+ among  
40 the interviewed policy actors. What we have labelled 'participatory governance' could  
41 also be described as multilevel, polycentric or network governance (McGinnis, 1999;  
42 Forsyth, 2009) or "a negotiated order rather than an order defined by formalized legal  
43 frameworks" (Peters and Pierre, 2004; p. 71). Often discussed in relation to a transition  
44 from government to governance, the participatory logic could be expected to challenge  
45 not only the clientelistic logic of existing bureaucracy, but also the logic of modern  
46 bureaucracy. While stressing transparency, objectivity and rules as characteristics of a  
47 Weberian ideal type, the modern bureaucracy logic still represents a closed national  
48 bureaucratic system that according to some actors fails to address the demands of a  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 dynamic, multi-scale REDD+ world. The interviewed government actors, however,  
4 clearly did not perceive the logic of participatory governance as incompatible with their  
5 rather positive idea of state administration. This may be related to the prominent role of  
6 participatory forest management in the formal forest policy and discourse in Tanzania  
7 during the past decades. Perhaps they conceive different roles reserved for modern  
8 bureaucracy and participatory governance; the latter playing a role in REDD+ planning  
9 and decision making, whereas equity in implementation and outcomes is seen as best  
10 guaranteed by the state.  
11

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 In the global REDD+ policy debates, there are calls to develop social safeguards  
19 to monitor not only the carbon outcomes but also the delivery of broader co-benefits in  
20 the national REDD+ initiatives (UNFCCC, 2011; 2013) as well as to define the  
21 safeguards more precisely and make their monitoring binding (The REDD+ Safeguards  
22 Working Group *et al.*, 2014). Observations on how the distinct equity logics are rooted in  
23 the national policy contexts and continuum highlight the need to go beyond broad  
24 international principles and standards in these processes, and instead stimulate detailed  
25 discussions on how concepts such as equity might really be operationalized in REDD+  
26 initiatives in varying contexts. Such debates could reveal the often unidentified and  
27 unspoken underlying logics that guide the practices and preferences of distinct actors,  
28 and the assumptions and risks associated with those preferences. The enhanced  
29 deliberation, in turn, might increase the chances that participatory modes of governance  
30 result in more legitimate, and perhaps equitable and effective, REDD+ regimes –  
31 according to the expectations of the policy actors.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 46 **References**

- 47  
48 Agrawal A, Nelson F, Adams WM, Sandbrook C. 2010. Governance and REDD: a reply  
49 to Wunder. *Oryx* **44**: 337–338.  
50  
51 Angelsen A (ed). 2008. *Moving ahead with REDD: Issues, Options and Implications*.  
52 Center for International Forestry Research: Bogor, Indonesia.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Angelsen A, Brockhaus M, Kanninen M, Sills E, Sunderlin WD, Wertz-Kanounnikoff S (eds). 2009. *Realising REDD+: National Strategy and Policy Options*. Center for International Forestry Research: Bogor, Indonesia.
- Angelsen A, Wertz-Kanounnikoff S. 2008. What are the key design issues for REDD and the criteria for assessing options? In *Moving ahead with REDD: Issues, Options and Implications*, Angelsen A (ed). Center for International Forestry Research: Bogor, Indonesia, pp11–21.
- Balderas Torres A, Skutsch M. 2012. Splitting the difference: a proposal for benefit sharing in reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+). *Forests* **3**(1): 137–154.
- Battilana J, Dorado S. 2010. Building sustainable hybrid organizations: the case of commercial microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal* **53**(6): 1419–1440. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2010.57318391
- Bernstein S, Cashore B. 2007. Can non-state global governance be legitimate? An analytical framework. *Regulation and Governance* **1**(4): 347–371. doi:10.1111/j.1748-5991.2007.00021.x
- Blomley T, Iddi S. 2009. *Participatory Forest Management in Tanzania 1993 -2009. Lessons Learned and Experiences to Date*. Forestry and Beekeeping Division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism: Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. <http://www.tzonline.org/pdf/participatoryforestmanagement2009.pdf> [10 June 2014]
- Blomley T, Ramadhani H, Mkwizu Y, Böhringer B. 2010. Hidden harvest: unlocking the economic potential of Community-Based Forest Management in Tanzania. In *Governing Africa's Forests in a Globalized World*, German LA, Karsenty A, Tiani AM (eds). Earthscan: London and Sterling, VA, pp126–143.
- Brown K, Corbera E. 2003. Exploring equity and sustainable development in the new carbon economy. *Climate Policy* **3**, Supplement 1, S41–S56. doi:10.1016/j.clipol.2003.10.004
- Carter, C., Clegg, S., Wählin, N. 2011. When science meets strategic realpolitik: the case of the Copenhagen UN climate change summit. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* **22**: 682–697.

- 1  
2  
3 Cernea MM. 2003. For a new economics of resettlement: a sociological critique of the  
4 compensation principle. *International Social Science Journal* **55**: 37–45.  
5  
6  
7 Cernea MM, Guggenheim SE (eds). 1993. *Anthropological Approaches to*  
8 *Resettlement: Policy, Practice, and Theory*. Westview Press: Boulder, CO.  
9  
10 Cernea MM, Mathur HM (eds). 2008. *Can Compensation Prevent Impoverishment?*  
11 *Reforming Resettlement through Investments*. Oxford University Press: New  
12 Delhi.  
13  
14  
15 Cotula L, Mayers J. 2009. *Tenure in REDD – Start-point or Afterthought? Natural*  
16 *Resource Issues No. 15*. International Institute for Environment and  
17 Development: London. <http://pubs.iied.org/13554IIED.html> [8 October 2013]  
18  
19  
20 Daily News, April 10th 2013. *Dar to Establish Carbon Monitoring Centre*. Daily News:  
21 Dodoma, Tanzania.  
22  
23  
24 Di Gregorio M, Brockhaus M, Cronin T, Muharrom E, Santoso L, Mardiah S,  
25 Büdenbender M. 2013. Equity and REDD+ in the media: a comparative analysis  
26 of policy discourses. *Ecology and Society* **18**(2): 39.  
27  
28  
29 DiMaggio PJ, Powell W. 1983. The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and  
30 collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review* **48**:  
31 147–60.  
32  
33  
34 Forsyth T. 2009. Multilevel, multiactor governance in REDD+: participation, integration  
35 and coordination. In *Realising REDD+: National Strategy and Policy Options*,  
36 Angelsen A, Brockhaus M, Kanninen M, Sills E, Sunderlin WD, Wertz-  
37 Kanounnikoff S (eds). Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR):  
38 Bogor, Indonesia, pp113–122.  
39  
40  
41 Friedland R, Alford R. 1991. Bringing society back in: symbols, practices and  
42 institutional contradictions. In *The New Institutionalism in Organizational*  
43 *Analysis*, Powell WW, Maggio PJ (eds). University of Chicago Press: Chicago,  
44 pp232–263.  
45  
46  
47 Geertz, C. 1973. Thick description: toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The*  
48 *Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, Geertz, C. Basic Books: New York,  
49 pp13-30.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Greenwood R, Díaz AM, Li SX, Lorente JC. 2010. The multiplicity of institutional logics  
4 and the heterogeneity of organizational responses. *Organization Science* **21**(2):  
5 521–539.  
6  
7  
8  
9 Greenwood R, Raynard M, Kodih F, Micelotta ER, Lounsbury M. 2011. Institutional  
10 Complexity and Organizational Responses. *The Academy of Management*  
11 *Annals* **5**(1): 317–371.  
12  
13  
14 Griffiths T. 2008. *Seeing 'REDD'? Forests, climate change mitigation and the rights of*  
15 *indigenous peoples and local communities*. Forest Peoples Programme (FPP):  
16 Moreton-in-Marsh, UK.  
17  
18  
19 Happaerts S. 2012. Are you talking to us? How subnational governments respond to  
20 global sustainable development governance. *Environmental Policy and*  
21 *Governance* **22**(2): 127–142. doi:10.1002/eet.1577  
22  
23  
24 Heyward M. 2007. Equity and international climate change negotiations: a matter of  
25 perspective. *Climate Policy* **7**: 518–534.  
26  
27  
28 Kanowski PJ, McDermott CL, Cashore, BW. 2011. Implementing REDD+: lessons from  
29 analysis of forest governance. *Environmental Science and Policy* **14**: 111–117.  
30  
31  
32 Kraatz MS, Block ES. 2008. Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In *The*  
33 *Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, Greenwood R, Oliver C,  
34 Sahlin-Andersson K, Subbady R. (eds). Sage: London, pp 243–275.  
35  
36  
37 Larson AM, Barry D, Dahal GR, Colfer CJP. (eds). 2010. *Forests for People:*  
38 *Community Rights and Forest Tenure Reform*. Earthscan: London.  
39  
40  
41 Laumann EO, Marsden PV, Prensky D. 1992. The boundary specification problem in  
42 network analysis. In *Research Methods in Social Network Analysis*, Freeman LC,  
43 White DR, Romney AK. (eds). Transaction Publishers: New Brunswick, pp61–  
44 709.  
45  
46  
47  
48 Lund JF, Treue T. 2008. Are we getting there? Evidence of decentralized forest  
49 management from the Tanzanian Miombo woodlands. *World Development*  
50 **36**(12): 2780–2800.  
51  
52  
53  
54 Luttrell C, Loft L, Gebara MF, Kweka D, Brockhaus M, Angelsen A, Sunderlin WD.  
55 2013. Who should benefit from REDD+? Rationales and realities. *Ecology and*  
56 *Society* **18**(4): 52.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 McDermott M, Mahanty S, Schreckenber K. 2011. Examining equity: a  
4 multidimensional framework for assessing equity in payments for ecosystem  
5 services. *Environmental Science and Policy*. doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2012.10.006  
6  
7  
8  
9 McGinnis MD (ed). 1999. *Polycentric Governance and Development: Readings from the*  
10 *Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis*. University of Michigan Press.  
11  
12 Meyer JW, Rowan B. 1977. Institutional organizations: formal structure as myth and  
13 ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology* **83**: 340–63.  
14  
15 Mitchell, C. 2000. Case and situation analysis. In *Case Study Method*, Romm R, Foster  
16 P (eds.). London: Sage, pp 234-258.  
17  
18  
19 Mustalahti I, Bolin A, Boyd E, Paavola J. 2012. Can REDD+ reconcile local priorities  
20 and needs with global mitigation benefits? Lessons from Angai forest, Tanzania.  
21 *Ecology and Society* **17**(1): 16.  
22  
23  
24  
25 Mustalahti I, Rakotonarivo OS. 2014. REDD+ and Empowered Deliberative Democracy:  
26 learning from Tanzania. *World Development* **59**: 199–211.  
27  
28  
29 Paavola J. 2007. Institutions and environmental governance: a reconceptualization.  
30 *Ecological Economics* **63**(1): 93–103. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2006.09.026  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Peskett L, Vickers B, Graham K. 2011. *Equity Issues in REDD. Working Paper*  
*produced for the project "Safeguarding Local Equity as Global Values of*  
*Ecosystem Services Rise"*. Overseas Development Institute.  
[http://www.threddesk.org/resources/reports/equity\\_issues\\_in\\_redd](http://www.threddesk.org/resources/reports/equity_issues_in_redd) [9 October  
2013]
- Peters BG, Pierre J. 2004. Multi-level governance and democracy: a Faustian bargain?  
In *Multi-level Governance*, Bache I, Flinders M (eds). Oxford University Press:  
Oxford, pp75–89.
- Pham TT, Brockhaus M, Wong G, Le ND, Tjajadi JS, Loft L, Luttrell C, Assembe  
Mvondo S. 2013. *Approaches to Benefit Sharing: A Preliminary Comparative*  
*Analysis of 13 REDD+ Countries*. Center for International Forestry Research:  
Bogor, Indonesia.
- Phelps J, Webb EL, Agrawal A. 2010. Does REDD+ threaten to recentralize forest  
governance? *Science* **328**: 312–313.

- 1  
2  
3 Rantala S, Bullock R, Mbegu MA, German LA. 2012. Community-Based Forest  
4 Management: what scope for conservation and livelihood co-benefits?  
5 Experience from the East Usambara Mountains, Tanzania. *Journal of*  
6 *Sustainable Forestry* **31**(8): 777–797.  
7  
8  
9  
10 Rantala S, Vihemäki H, Swallow BM, Jambiya G. 2013. Who gains and who loses from  
11 compensated displacement from protected areas? The case of the Derema  
12 Corridor. *Conservation and Society* **11**(2): 97–111.  
13  
14  
15 Rantala S, Di Gregorio M. (in press). Multistakeholder environmental governance in  
16 action: REDD+ discourse coalitions in Tanzania. *Ecology & Society*.  
17  
18  
19 Reay T, Hinings, CR. 2009. Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics.  
20 *Organization Studies* **30**(06): 629–652. doi: 10.1177/0170840609104803  
21  
22  
23 The REDD+ Safeguards Working Group, The Accra Caucus, members of the  
24 Indigenous Peoples' Caucus. 2014. *Submission by The REDD+ Safeguards*  
25 *Working Group, The Accra Caucus and members of the Indigenous Peoples'*  
26 *Caucus on the methodological issues related to non-carbon benefits resulting*  
27 *from the implementation of REDD+ activities.*  
28  
29  
30 <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2014/smsn/ngo/409.pdf> [4 June 2014]  
31  
32  
33 Ribot, J, Larson, A. 2012. Reducing REDD risks: affirmative policy on an uneven  
34 playing field. *International Journal of the Commons* **6**(2): 233–254.  
35  
36  
37 Ryan GW, Bernard HR. 2003. Techniques to identify themes. *Field Methods* **15**(1): 85–  
38 109. doi:10.1177/1525822X02239569  
39  
40  
41 Sandbrook C, Nelson F, Adams WM. 2010. Carbon, forests and the REDD paradox.  
42 *Oryx* **44**: 330–334.  
43  
44  
45 Schroeder R, Martin KS, Wilson B, Sen D. 2008. Third World environmental justice.  
46 *Society and Natural Resources* **21**(7): 547–555.  
47  
48 doi:10.1080/08941920802100721  
49  
50 Skutsch M, Simon C, Velazquez A, Fernández JC. 2013. Rights to carbon and  
51 payments for services rendered under REDD+: options for the case of Mexico.  
52 *Global Environmental Change* **23**(4): 813–825.  
53  
54  
55 doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.02.015  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG), MJUMITA. 2011. A one-step guide to  
4 making the National REDD strategy more pro-poor. Tanzania Forest  
5 Conservation Group: Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.  
6  
7 [http://www.tfcg.org/pdf/MJUMITA%20and%20TFCG%20Policy%20Brief%20on%  
8 20Land%20Issues%20and%20REDD.pdf](http://www.tfcg.org/pdf/MJUMITA%20and%20TFCG%20Policy%20Brief%20on%20Land%20Issues%20and%20REDD.pdf) [10 June 2014]  
9  
10  
11  
12 Thompson MC, Baruah M, Carr ER. 2011. Seeing REDD+ as a project of environmental  
13 governance. *Environmental Science and Policy* **14**: 100–110.  
14  
15  
16 Thornton PH. 2004. *Markets from Culture: Institutional Logics and Organizational*  
17 *Decisions in Higher Education Publishing*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.  
18  
19 Thornton PH, Ocasio W. 1999. Institutional logics and the historical contingency of  
20 power in organizations: executive succession in the higher education publishing  
21 industry 1958-1990. *American Journal of Sociology* **105**(3): 801–843.  
22  
23  
24 Thornton PH, Ocasio W. 2008. Institutional logics. In *The Sage Handbook of*  
25 *Organizational Institutionalism*, Greenwood R, Oliver C, Sahlin-Andersson K,  
26 Subbady R. (eds). Sage: London, pp 99–129.  
27  
28  
29 Thornton PH, Ocasio W, Lounsbury M. 2012. *The Institutional Logics Perspective. A*  
30 *New Approach to Culture, Structure and Process*. Oxford: Oxford University  
31 Press.  
32  
33  
34  
35 Tvedt T. 2006. The international aid system and the non-governmental organisations: a  
36 new research agenda. *Journal of International Development* **18**(5): 677–690.  
37  
38  
39 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). 2011. *Report of*  
40 *the Conference of the Parties on its Sixteenth Session, Held in Cancun from 29*  
41 *November to 10 December 2010 (FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1)*. Cancun, Mexico.  
42  
43 <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2010/cop16/eng/07a01.pdf> [8 October 2013]  
44  
45  
46 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). 2013. *The*  
47 *timing and the frequency of presentations of the summary of information on how*  
48 *all the safeguards referred to in decision 1/CP.16, appendix I, are being*  
49 *addressed and respected (Decision -/CP.19)*. Warsaw, Poland. [http://www.redd-  
50 monitor.org/wordpress/wp-  
51 content/uploads/2013/11/cop19\\_safeguards\\_1cp16a1.pdf](http://www.redd-monitor.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/cop19_safeguards_1cp16a1.pdf) [4 June 2014]  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 United Republic of Tanzania (URT). 2010. *The First Draft National Strategy for Reduced*  
4 *Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+)*. Dar es Salaam,  
5 Tanzania.  
6  
7  
8  
9 United Republic of Tanzania (URT). 2013. *National Strategy for Reduced Emissions*  
10 *from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+)*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.  
11  
12 Vyamana VG. 2009. Participatory forest management in the Eastern Arc Mountains of  
13 Tanzania: who benefits? *International Forestry Review* **11**(2): 239–253.  
14  
15 Weber M. 1964. [orig. 1947] *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*.  
16 Translated by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York: The Free Press.  
17  
18 Wiegandt E. 2001. Climate change, equity and international negotiations. In  
19 *International Relations and Global Climate Change*, Luterbacher U, Sprinz DF  
20 (eds). MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, pp127–150.  
21  
22 Wily LA, Dewees PA. 2001. *From Users to Custodians: Changing Relations Between*  
23 *People and the State in Forest Management in Tanzania*. World Bank Policy  
24 Research Working Paper 2569. World Bank: Washington, DC.  
25  
26  
27  
28 Wutich A, Brewis A, York AM, Stotts R. 2013. Rules, norms, and injustice: a cross-  
29 cultural study of perceptions of justice in water institutions. *Society and Natural*  
30 *Resources* **26**(7): 795–809. doi:10.1080/08941920.2012.723302  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35 Yu K-H. 2013. Institutionalization in the context of institutional pluralism: politics as a  
36 generative process. *Organization Studies* **34**(1): 105–131.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1. Distribution of organizational actors in the interview data on REDD+ institutional logics.**

<b>Organizational type</b>	<b>n</b>
Domestic NGO	8
Government ministry or executive department	7
International NGO	4
Foreign government agency (embassy)	3
Intergovernmental organization	3
Academic (national university)	1
Domestic business	1
International business	1
Total	28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

**Table 2. REDD+ equity institutional logics identified based on the arguments of interviewed policy actors.**

<b>Logic</b>	<b>Inner tension / Distinction within</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Central vocabulary / arguments</b>	<b>Representing (types of organizations)</b>
<b>Market</b>	-	WHY equity: Benefits/rewards should go to those whose behaviour needs to change in order to achieve effective REDD+ and who incur costs from REDD+. Enhancing local participation may also lower transaction costs and increase the cost-efficiency of REDD+.	Incentives, benefits, benefit sharing, costs, alternative income	All types
<b>Rights</b>	<b>Legal</b>	WHY equity: benefits belong to those holding legal rights to forests and land.	Ownership, tenure, property rights	Government, domestic NGO
	<b>Moral</b>	WHY equity: it is appropriate to involve and share benefits with those whose livelihoods are affected by REDD+, regardless of their legal position.	Rights, marginalization, eviction	Domestic NGO, academic
<b>State bureaucracy</b>	<b>Modern</b>	HOW equity: equity will result from an efficient state bureaucratic system administering REDD+ accounting and payments.	Transparency, accountability, good governance	Government, academic

	<b>Existing</b>	WHAT hampers equity: equity is undermined by existing power structures; decision making and benefits are concentrated in the central government.	Precedent/ history/experience of unequal benefit sharing, weak government, corruption	Domestic NGO, domestic business, academic, international NGO, foreign government
<b>Standards</b>	<b>Established standards</b>	WHY and HOW equity: equity follows from international standards, agreements and collaboration, properly implemented at national and local levels.	Goal, mission, strategy, action plan	Government, domestic NGO, intergovernmental
	<b>Buzzwords</b>	WHY equity: equity discourse is a superficial reflection of imposed standards for approval and legitimacy, not properly implemented.	Lipservice, “making the right noises”, non- implementation, business as usual	Domestic NGO, domestic business, international NGO, intergovernmental
<b>Participatory governance</b>	-	WHY and HOW equity: stakeholder participation across scales guarantees effectiveness and equity, because the state needs wide support for successful policies. Equity of outcomes is enhanced if different perspectives are represented.	Participation, inclusion, involvement, engagement, stakeholders, representation, multidisciplinary, local knowledge	All types

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

<b>Social embeddedness</b>	<b>Community</b>	WHAT hampers equity: equity outcomes are shaped by unbalanced power relations and practices of the community.	Elite capture, “weak voices”, vulnerability	Domestic NGO, academic, foreign government
	<b>Family / household</b>	WHAT hampers equity: equity is not realized within households due to gendered positions and division of labour.	Gender, culture, traditions	Government, international NGO (esp. Zanzibar)

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

For Peer Review