Can REDD+ social safeguards reach the ‘right’ people? Lessons from Madagascar
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Deforestation is responsible for up to 20% of greenhouse gas emissions

« UN-REDD »
REDD+ OFFERS FRESH INCENTIVES FOR MANAGING FORESTS TO REDUCE CARBON EMISSIONS AND TO MAINTAIN THE FULLEST RANGE OF VALUES SUCH AS BIODIVERSITY, WATER SUPPLY, SOIL PROTECTION, ECONOMIC PRODUCTIVITY, SUSTENANCE AND INDIGENOUS TERRITORIES.
“safeguards should be ‘promoted and supported’ while undertaking REDD+ activities “

Social safeguards, one way to compensate People Affected by REDD+ Project (PAP) who support forest use restrictions
371,000 ha protected area affected by REDD+ project

Population ~ 65000 living closer this forest depend mainly on Forest
Observations in our study sites:

**People Affected by REDD+ Project (PAP) ≈ Other Forest-dependent people NOT SELECTED as PAP**

What local factors increase the likelihood of being selected for compensation under REDD+ safeguards?
Sampling & data collection

- Identified villages close to the forest
- Collect list of all households in each village
- Mapped 468 households in total in 8 villages
- 203 interviewed after random sampling
- 40 of the surveyed HHs found to be selected as PAP

Investing significant time
Who face opportunity costs under REDD+?

Given the assumption PAP HHs should

- closer to the forest (further from the fokontany center)
- own more tavy land (slash and burn agriculture)
- depend more on wild-harvested products
- recently established (new clearer of forest land)

Expectation PAP could be also (based on other decisive factors which reflect socio-political power)

- education of HH head
- food security
- livestock holding
- membership in COBA (local group managing community forest)

We explore by **BINOMIAL General Linear Model** which variable predict whether a HH is identified as a PAP
Factors which influence the likelihood of being identified as a PAP

- Decision-making member in community-based forest mgmt assoc
- General member in community-based forest mgmt assoc
- Livestock owned
- Food security
  - Collect additional wild harvested products
  - Household age
  - Seed used in swidden agriculture
  - Literate household head
- Distance to household's dwelling from village access point

**Odds Ratios**

- 20.28 **
- 5.77 **
- 1.31
- 1.30 **
- 1.04
- 1.01
- 1.00
- 0.77
- 0.59 **

**+ve influence**

**-ve influence**
Impacts of Access, Food Security, and COBA Membership on PAP Identification

- HHs with decision-making member (in COBA), high food security & close to access point are >20 X more likely to be identified as PAPs compared to those without membership, low food security & far from access point.
Many households not identified as PAP
Key Findings

A systematic bias in safeguard assessments process due to local elite capture

Very difficult to avoid with poor information on the population and unwillingness to ‘self-identify’

Reliance on existing non-representative institutions may have exacerbated inequalities
Policy Implication

Effective social safeguard assessment to identify individual households affected may not be practical (or cost-effective) in settings with poor information on local populations and challenging access.

Blanket compensation of all households may be the optimal solution.

Strong and effectively enforced safeguards in REDD+ is a must if it is to avoid worsening forest people’s historical exclusion from equitable benefits.
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