



THE LOCAL RELEVANCE OF REDD+

How can REDD+ be relevant for people depending on the forest?

Ciska Antink

Supervisor: prof.dr.ir. JWM van Dijk

Date: 12-01-2018

Course Code: LAW-80433

Student Number: 920622016080

Examiner: dr. FM Köhne

Abstract

The Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) is a programme developed by the United Nations (UN) that wants to motivate national governments to fight climate change by reducing forest greenhouse gas emissions. The aim of this thesis is to address the local relevance of REDD+ in Zambia. Through in-depth interviews and the use of different theories about access and state-forming this thesis looks at the REDD+ programme and how it can benefit the local people that depend on the forest for their livelihoods. In order for REDD+ to be beneficial, local people have to be involved in development and decision-making processes regarding REDD+ processes so they can get access to REDD+ benefits and the ability to benefit from it. The distribution of those benefits has to be equitable. Only when REDD+ addresses local problems without harming the local people, can it be locally relevant.

Table of Content

Abstract	1
1. Introduction	4
2. Methodology	6
3. Theory	8
3.1 History	8
3.2 Seeing Like a State	9
3.3 Power & Access	10
4. Forest Policies and Legislation.....	12
4.1 Policies	12
4.2 History	14
5. What is REDD+?.....	17
5.1 The Quick-Start Programme.....	18
5.2 The Potential of REDD+	19
5.2.1 Policy and Governance.....	20
5.2.2 Rights and Ownership	21
5.2.3 Benefit Sharing and Compensation	21
5.2.4 Intermediaries, Corruption and Elite Capture of Benefits	22
5.2.5 Wealth, Resources and Knowledge	23
5.2.6 Approaches to REDD+ Implementation	23
5.3 Remarks.....	24
6. Results	25
6.1 Mwamfushi and the Forest	25
6.2 Protecting the forest.....	26
6.3 Mwamfushi and the State	27
6.4 Mwamfushi and REDD+.....	29
7. Discussion	31
7.1 Policy and Governance.....	31
7.2 Rights and Ownership	34
7.3 Benefit sharing and Compensation.....	35
7.4 Intermediaries, Corruption and Elite Capture of Benefits	36
7.5 Wealth, resources and Knowledge	38
7.6 Approaches to REDD+ Implementation	39

7.7 The Consequences.....	40
8. Conclusion.....	42
9. References	43

1. Introduction

The Republic of Zambia is a country in the south of Central Africa. It has a population of 11.8 million, with 73% of them living below the poverty line. Zambia is one of the most urbanized countries in the South of Africa with 39% living in urban areas. The country surfaces over 750.000 square kilometers and of that surface about 50 million hectares exists of forests (UN 2010). This shows that 2/3 of Zambia exists of forest. Zambia is very dependent on these forests for its economy, because wood is an important material in the everyday lives of most people. A large part of the Zambians is dependent on natural resources for their everyday survival, especially the poor people who live in the rural areas. In addition, there is a lack of alternative energy sources for people living in the urban areas, who still very much depend on wood for the use of fuel. This is the case because often Zambia is not capable of generating enough electricity for the whole country which results in frequent power cuts, while only an estimated 25% of the population has access to electricity. About 75% of the population is very much dependent on charcoal as a source of energy. This high dependence on wood makes Zambia a country with one of the highest rates of deforestation in Africa with an estimated deforestation rate that lies between 250.000 and 300.000 hectares a year. The main drivers behind this deforestation are the use of wood for fuel, like charcoal, the use of wood for timber production and the use of forest land for agriculture or other purposes (UN 2010).

Over the years Zambia, sometimes in cooperation with the international community, has tried to stop the fast rate at which deforestation is taking place. However, this has never really succeeded. One of these recent initiative is the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) programme. Since 2007 the United Nations (UN) have been developing this programme. It is an initiative that aims to reduce the emission of greenhouse gasses by providing financial incentives to countries that have been able to reduce these emissions originating in deforestation (UN 2010; Anderson & Zerriffi 2014). REDD eventually became REDD+ with the addition of the idea that within REDD there is also a big role for 'conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks' (UN 2010, p.9). This means that beyond trying to prevent climate change, REDD+ also pays attention to the management of forests and its natural resources.

In preparation for the implementation of the REDD+ Programme the UN has started quick start programmes in certain countries all over the world and Zambia is one of them. This quick start programme is to determine how REDD+ can best be implemented and what is needed to achieve emission reductions, while conserving forests and their resources. The programme will eventually determine whether Zambia is committed to participate in the future REDD+ mechanism of the UN (UN 2010; Anderson & Zerriffi 2014).

However, the plans to realize the quick start programme and eventually have Zambia participate in the REDD+ mechanism raises a few questions. It seems that the REDD+ programme is a programme which will necessitate countries to change their governance for in a significant way. Then what would have to change in Zambia for it to be able to protect forests, reduce emissions and do this in a sustainable way? And will the country and its people be able to change in such a way? Furthermore, is this really what the country and local people need? Who will benefit from the programme? It is clear that protecting the environment and preventing climate change from happening is important not only for nature, but also for a sustainable future for populations worldwide. However, it needs to be taken into account that local people in Zambia are dependent on the forests for their everyday lives. Establishing a programme like REDD+ could harm their livelihoods in a way that would make it difficult for a lot of people to survive (Anderson & Zerriffi 2014). To be locally relevant, REDD+ needs to address local

problems and help local people to develop a livelihood that is less harmful for the forest, without causing new issues for local people and provide equality in benefit sharing. So, the question here is, what is the local relevance of REDD+? Meaning, in what ways does REDD+ benefit local forest people in Zambia without harming their local livelihoods and how are the local people able to benefit from it?

To answer these questions, I will use field data from a study I have done in the village of Mwamfushi, near Mpika town in Mpika district and literature studies on the subject. Through the field study I looked at the local livelihoods of the people living in Mwamfushi and the problems they encounter in relation to forest degradation and deforestation. Through this study I want to eventually answer the main question on local relevance of REDD+ for people living in Zambia. This paper then will assess the points mentioned above by asking the following questions:

The main research question of this research is: *What is the local relevance of REDD+ for (the livelihoods of) the local people in the Mwamfushi area?*

The answer to this question depends on whether and how REDD+ can be implemented in Zambia and the current situation in the country's forest governance. Therefore, this research will look at the following questions in order to answer the main question:

1. *What does the forest governance in Zambia currently look like?*
2. *What are the different power relations in relation to forests governance?*
3. *How do these relations determine access to the forests and forest resources?*
4. *In what ways are the local people in Mwamfushi dependent on the forest for their livelihoods?*
5. *What are the objectives and possible consequences of REDD+ with regards to forests, forest governance and people dependent on the forest?*
6. *What is the local knowledge and opinion on REDD+ among the people living in Mwamfushi?*

This paper will consist of six more chapters in which I will address these six sub questions and answer the main question posed above.

During my field study I have done in-depth interviews with officials from the district Forestry office in Mpika and with local people from the village of Mwamfushi near Mpika town. The results of these interviews and observations will help to answer the different questions in combination with literature about the topics. In chapter two I will outline the theories of Ribot & Peluso (2003) and Scott (1998) about access and seeing like a state that are used in this paper to analyze the case study and I will review the methodologies that were used to gather the information in the field. Chapter two will also contain a brief historical outline of the country and its forest governance. Chapter three will be about the current state of the forest legislation in Zambia. It will look at the stakeholders involved in forest legislation, the power relations involved and how this influences people's daily lives. The chapter will also describe in more detail what REDD+ entails and what influence it could have in Zambia. Chapter 4 will outline the data results from the interviews with local people and forestry officials in Mwamfushi and Mpika. It will show the daily lives of the local people in Mwamfushi, the role of the forest in their livelihoods and it will give the story of the forestry officials who work in Mpika district. The final chapter 5 will discuss and analyze the outcomes of the interviews and observations and will answer the questions outlined above. It will end the paper with a conclusion by answering the main research question.

2. Methodology

To gather the data necessary for this paper I used the methods of in-depth interviews and observation next to a literature study of the topic¹. To start, the literature study functioned as a way to explore the context in which this research was being done. I reviewed government documents like the several forests acts and land acts that have been developed by the Zambian governments over time, as well as documents of the United Nations explaining and outlining the REDD+ programme in general and the quick start programme in Zambia. Other additional papers I analyzed were other writings about the REDD+ programme.

To get to a lot of data in a short time I chose to do in-depth interviews in combination with focus group discussions and observations. I did this with the people of Mwamfushi after I spoke to a forest officer in the town of Mpika where I stayed. I first interviewed two officers and a volunteer who worked for the district Forestry department. This to get an overview of the situation in Mpika district and the governance structure of forests in Zambia. Because I did not have a location to do my interviews and observations at, I asked the forestry officer, who had been working in Mpika district for 10 years, for a fitting place to do my research. Especially because I did not have the means to travel long distances every day. He pointed me to the town of Mwamfushi, which is located 11 kilometers from the town of Mpika. He advised me to go to this town because it was relatively close to Mpika town and because people there are very dependent on the forest for their livelihoods. Therefore, they were the right people to talk to. To start the forestry officer advised me to go to the local primary school and ask the head teacher there for help in conducting the research. The head teacher pointed me to a local who could function as my interpreter, since the local people only spoke Bemba, and who could introduce me to the headmen of the village. Once I was introduced to the headmen I had the opportunity to interview the local people and get to know the local life better. In total I did 19 individual interviews and five focus group discussions. For the individual interviews I chose men and women randomly who were willing to do an interview with me. The Headman who functioned as my interpreter helped me to ask people for this. For the focus group discussions, I chose to do two women's groups and one men's group and in addition a focus group discussion with the Village Action Group. I did this because I wanted to interview more women, since I had interviewed more men in the individual interviews, and because I wanted to hear the answers of the women when they were together and not with their husbands. To contrast this, I also did a focus group discussion with a group of men. I chose the people who I did the focus group discussion with randomly. When we would encounter someone in the village I would ask if they wanted to join the next discussion, which they then did or did not do. The first village meeting I also count as a group interview, because I was given the opportunity to ask several questions already, which then turned into a group discussion that gave me a lot of information. During the interviews and group discussions I asked the people open questions concerning their activities during the day, the role of the forest in their lives, how the changes in the forest influenced them, what their relationship was with the forestry department, what they knew about REDD+, etc. The topics of these questions came from the literature study I did beforehand. Through the literature I saw several topics that could be relevant for this research. These topics I then included in the questions I wanted to ask

¹ My initial research proposal appeared to be impossible to do in practice, which is why I had to develop a new research proposal with only a month in Zambia left. This caused a major time constraint and forced me to collect a lot of data in a short time. This had its effect on how I did my research and the information I found. For one, I did not have the time to, after a few weeks, review what I had done and then adapt the research to what was needed. Also, I was not able to form a relationship of trust with the local people of Mwamfushi, because I could not be there for a long time. This must have affected the answers they gave during the interviews, although I cannot say in what ways.

the local people. Asking the interviewees open questions enabled me to ask questions without directing the direction of the interview too much and it gave the local people the opportunity to answer the questions in their own way. Especially the people who were very open could answer the questions in an elaborate way. It appeared to be more challenging to get more elaborate answers from the people who were hesitant and shy. With them I needed to elaborate more on the questions. The focus group discussions, including the first village meeting, were a good way to discover more about the village as a whole and their struggles with the forest and forest governance. Often there were plenty of discussions which gave me new information for the research.

In addition to the interviews and focus group discussions I used (participant) observation to gather data. Once I went to a forest near Mpika with the forestry officers and a second time I was shown the forest near Mwamfushi by the headmen of the village. During these trips I was shown the forest and its resources. The people showed me what trees, plants and other things they used for what purpose. This method of observation was beneficial in that it showed the issues people talked about in the interviews and this way I got a clearer image of what the people were talking about. It showed me the different situations within the forest and the effects of livelihood strategies and forest governance on the forest. It made very clear what the effects of forest degradation and deforestation is on the forest and its resources. In combination with the interviews this gave me a relatively complete image of the situation in Mwamfushi.

3. Theory

This chapter shows the different ways I want to look at the REDD+ programme and what theories I want to use to analyze whether REDD+ could be beneficial for local people in Zambia or whether it will just be another disappointment for them. By looking at the history of forest governance I want to see where REDD+ fits in when taking other programmes in account. I also want to see whether REDD+ has the potential to be beneficial or whether it will be just another programme that is going to fail. A third aspect I want to look at with regards to REDD+ are the power relations that will shape forest governance under REDD+ and how this will influence the way local people can benefit from it. In the chapter that lays out the discussion I will use these views to discuss the ways in which REDD+ would influence the livelihoods of local people in Zambia.

3.1 History

To see what the local relevance of REDD+ can be and how it could influence the lives of local people in Zambia I will analyze the situation in different ways. In the first place, I will look at the history of forest governance and legislation by the British colonizers, because it is imperative to learn from 'projects' in the past that related to the governance and protection of forests and see what their influences were on the lives of local people. For as I point out in the following parts of this paper, these projects were often not beneficial for the local people who lived in small villages and who were dependent on the forest for their livelihoods. Rather these projects that aimed to protect the forests were mostly a way to gain control over forests, lands, resources and people. In other words, it were ways to create a state from which the rulers could benefit completely. The question that one could then ask in relation to REDD+ is in what ways REDD+ will be different from these past projects or will it also turn out to be a way to gain more control over forests, resources and people?

So, when one wants to know whether a project like REDD+ could be beneficial for local people it is imperative to start by looking at the history of forest management in Zambia. However, when one starts to search for information about the (colonial) history in Northern Zambia, not much can be found. Especially in relation to forest management. There is some work on colonial governance of agriculture by Moore & Vaughan (1987) and Richards (1995), but these works are more concerned with food security and gender rather than forest governance. However, from these works one can get an idea of the colonial governance that the British established in (Northern Rhodesia) Zambia during the time they governed the country. Also, by looking at other countries that were colonized by the British, one can get an overview of the ideas of the colonizers on how forests should be governed. For example, when one looks at the history of colonization in India with regards to the role of forests, one can get an idea of how they would have treated forests in Northern Zambia (Arnold, 2012; Freeman, 2012).

During colonial times, areas with forests were seen as significantly different from areas without forests. This can be seen in the history of the colonization of India by the British. This history of the colonization of India is of importance for this analysis, because forest control started somewhat earlier in India and this experience was then taken to Africa when the colonization started there. When the British tried to get control over India, the local people that lived in or near forests would remain in the forest areas and use the environment and climate as a way of defense against the colonial rulers. This was an effective defense, because colonial soldiers were not able to survive in these environments for long. They were not equipped and trained to stay in the forests for very long and would often suffer significant losses because of attacks from the locals or diseases they caught while staying in the forests.

This made it very difficult for the colonial rulers to get control over these areas and the people that lived there. Eventually the forest areas were the only areas they did not get full control of. Because of this forest areas were seen as problematic. However, the British did want total control over the whole of India. This meant that in order to get more political control within the country, the British had to find different ways to get more control over these forest areas (Arnold, 2012; Freeman, 2012). Political control was the most important objective the rulers had in the countries that they colonized and to achieve this they changed the political and social order within those countries. Not only in India, but also in Zambia the British established strict rules that the local people had to follow, which made for a situation more suitable for controlling the local population. People had to start living in permanent settlements and adapt their livelihood strategies accordingly (Moore & Vaughan, 1987). One aspect of the local livelihood strategies of the local people in Zambia that the colonizers were very concerned about was the *chitemene system*. This system refers to the way local people cleared their lands for agriculture, by setting forest land on fire and cutting all the trees from that piece of land. The British found this method to be wasteful and harmful to the environment since this led to deforestation of the country. However, environmental concerns were not the only reasons for which the British wanted to modify the way local people did agriculture. It was also a way for the rulers to suppress the local population. Here the aspect of political control was very important in the decisions made about the *chitemene system*. Earlier studies of the Bemba people show that by modifying the system in which the local people in Zambia lived in the beginning of the 20th century, the rulers wanted to execute more control over the local Bemba authorities and make the system more suitable for raising taxes (Moore & Vaughan, 1987). Here we see that forests played a significant role in gaining political control over the country. To get control over the forests was to get more control over the local population.

In the next chapter I will lay out the approach of the British colonizers in their colonies and show what they did with regards to forest governance. By doing this I will be able to place REDD+ in its historical context next to these past projects and see whether REDD+ is the same or significantly different from them. Is REDD+ another way to take control of forests and resources or is it a new project that really wants to help a country in making its forest governance more sustainable?

3.2 Seeing Like a State

The second way I want to use to look at the potential of REDD+ is by using the theory of 'Seeing like a state by James Scott'. This theory addresses the concept of modifying systems, like programs or projects, that attempt to modernize societies (Scott, 1998). It adds to the history view I want to take in the first place, because this view also looks at projects as things that are developed not just to benefit society, but as a way to state formation and control. With this theory Scott answers the question on why most of these projects that were trying to change aspects of societies, failed. He claims that the reason why most of these projects failed is that they often simplify society and the environment too much. They see society as a blank slate which they can transform into anything they like. To do this they introduce standardization of society, which leads to an enormous simplification of reality. For in reality society is much more complex and impossible to divide into a simplified system. In reality societies exist of many different personalities and the environment is too complicated for humanity to understand completely. So, to put these elements into a standardized system ignores a lot of complexities within a state, since different people are in need of different things and live different lives. This in turn often leads to a failure of these plans and projects. As examples of these failures Scott lays out the cases of villagization programmes in Ethiopia, Mozambique and Tanzania and the collectivization in Russia where governments tried to control society by 'modernizing' it. These projects all led to 'great human tragedies' with lives lost or extremely disrupted (Scott, 1998). However, for

these plans to turn into a ‘full-fledged disaster’, four elements have to be present: 1) There has to be an administrative ordering of nature and society, 2) There has to be an uncritical, unskeptical and optimistic view on the ability of science and technology or as Scott calls it: a high-modernist ideology, 3) there has to be an authoritarian state that has the will and authority to implement these high-modernist designs and 4) there has to be a civil society that lacks the capacity to resist these plans (Scott, 1998, p.5). These four elements are needed for these plans to be implemented. The plans fail eventually because society is much more than structured interactions and systems. In all cases societies run on informal practices and practical skills (or *metis*) and when this is ignored or even suppressed by a planned social order, society cannot function the way it has to (Scott, 1998).

In my view, the implementation of REDD+ can be seen as another way to try and modify a system, in this case the system of forest governance. In the case of Zambia, the country has to adapt to fit the purpose and objectives of REDD+, which means that a lot has to change. The question this raises in connection to the theory of Scott is whether the REDD+ programme can be beneficial for local people in Zambia or whether it is doomed to fail like other projects before it. Another question we can link to this is not only if REDD+ will be able to modify reality and be beneficial locally, but also whether the Zambian state is able to do this. Does the state match the conditions for REDD+ to be beneficial? By using this theory, I aim to analyze the situation to see if REDD+ has the potential to become beneficial for local people. Also, using this theory in combination with the historic view I can analyze in what ways REDD+ is a new way of gaining control over certain systems in society, like other programs before.

3.3 Power & Access

However, looking at whether REDD+ can be beneficial and for whom through the historical view and the theory of Scott is not the only thing I aim to do. It is not only important to look at the system itself, but also at the relationships within the system since this is an important foundation of the system itself. Therefore, I also want to look at the case of REDD+ with the theory of power and access of Ribot and Peluso (2003). I do this because for a project like REDD+ to benefit the local people it is important to know what the power relations within a system are and how they shape the access of the local people to, in this case, local forests. For a system could work and be potentially beneficial for local people, but if power modifies access for the local people they still may not be able to benefit.

This is also what one sees in the definition Ribot and Peluso give to the term ‘access’: “the ability to benefit from things” (Ribot & Peluso, 2003, P.153). They state that having access to something does not just depend on whether a person has formal rights to use it, but it also depends on whether that person has the ability to use it. By bringing the focus to this aspect of access they direct the attention to ‘a wider range of social relationships’. These relationships are important because they can ‘constrain or enable a person to benefit from certain resources without focusing on property relations alone’ (Ribot & Peluso, 2003, p.154). In their research Ribot & Peluso (2003) explore the powers that affect whether someone is able to benefit from certain resources. They call these powers “bundles of powers” and exist of the material, cultural and political-economic strands of the bundle. People can use different bundles to gain access to something or to control who gets access to something. These bundles are dynamic, meaning that they are always changing, depending on someone’s position and power within the social relationships they find themselves in. Also, these bundles function as nodes in bigger webs of power and are again connected by strands. These strands are the means, processes and relations through which people are able to gain, control and maintain access to things. In short, the writers call these aspects “mechanisms” and they describe four different mechanisms they see at work. There are rights-based and illicit mechanisms, which both can be used to gain benefits directly. Other mechanisms, structural and relational, include or reinforce access that is gained directly through

configurations of rights-based or illicit access (Ribot & Peluso, 2003). The writers then give a way to analyze access. First one has to identify the flow of a particular benefit of interest, then one should identify the mechanisms by which different actors gain, control and maintain the benefit and then one has to analyze the power relations that underlie the mechanisms of access that are involved in cases when benefits are derived (Ribot & Peluso, 2003, p. 160-161).

By using this framework of access on the case of REDD+ in Zambia I aim to add to the answer to the question whether and how REDD+ could benefit local people living in the forests. In other words, how will the different bundles of powers be affected by REDD+ and how will this influence the lives of the local people? I want to look at which mechanisms are involved in forest management and which power relations underlie these mechanisms. This is important because to answer the question one does not only have to look at the project itself and the system it's trying to change, but also at the relational situation it has to function in.

4. Forest Policies and Legislation

In this chapter, I aim to lay out the history of forest governance in Zambia. Since there is not much information to be found about this topic, this chapter will not be exhaustive but will rather give an overview of certain important events in forest governance in Zambia, Northern Rhodesia or British colonies in the past. The purpose of this is to see how and why certain forest policies and legislation were developed and how they influenced the countries they were applied in. This puts the programme of REDD+ in a historical perspective and can give important insights in how REDD+ can influence local people in Zambia.

4.1 Policies

As stated in the introduction, forests take up a significant part of Zambia's landmass. To manage these forests the Forestry department of Zambia has gotten the mandate from the national government to do so. They are supported in this by forest policies. Legislation to manage forest was first established by the colonial government in 1949. From then on, the independent Zambian government established the Forest Policy of 1965 and this policy has been revised in 1970 to the Forests Act of 1973. This Act from 1973 formed the framework for centralized forest management in which the government had absolute power over the forests in Zambia and their resources (Ng'andwe et al, 2015; The Forest Act, 1973). However, over time this Act seemed unable to address issues that surfaced at that time, which led to the new Forests Act of 1999. In this act the Zambia Forestry Commission was established and the Joint Forest Management (JFM) was started, which continued in 2006 under different statutory instruments which were derived from the inactive act of 1999 (The Forests Act, 1999). JFM is an initiative that functions as a model for more involvement of local communities in forest management (Ng'andwe et al, 2015). This involvement of local communities in forest management is further described in the Zambia Forest Action Plan (ZFAP) of 1997, in the Forest Policy of 1998 and in the Forest Act of 1999 (FAO, 2008; National Forestry Policy 1998; The Forests Act, 1999). The Forestry Policy of 1998 functioned to change the national institutional and legal framework of forest management with the goal that the forestry sector would be governed by a forest commission (Ng'andwe et al, 2015). In 2015 Zambia established a new Forests Act that builds on the previous act from 1999 (The Forests Act, 2015).

Through these acts and policies, natural forests in Zambia are legally divided into three land classes, namely Trust, Reserve and State lands. Forests that are located on reserve lands are again classified as national or local forests. The president is in full power of declaring any forest area to be a national forest and also claim the land the forests are located on, as long as it is for the purpose of securing forest resources, protecting biodiversity or improving forest management. The state is then allowed to profit from these forests and approve or reject claims from other parties that want to benefit from them. People are not allowed to enter national forests without a permit or license. If they do so this is punishable by a fine of not more than 200.000 penalty units or by imprisonment not more than 2 years or both (The Forests Act, 2015).

Local forests are also appointed by the president, just as he is allowed to acquire the land these forests are located on. These forests are to be used for securing forest resources, protecting ecosystems, the utilization of forest resources at the local level and meeting the social, cultural and economic needs of local communities. The forest director is allowed to, after consulting the local community, assign the control over the forest to a local community or joint forest management committee. Local authorities are also allowed to ask for such control themselves. According to The Forests Act from 2015 people

are not allowed to collect forest resources, graze animals in the forests, use land for cultivation or even enter the forest without a permit or license. If a person does so, he is punishable by the same punishments as mentioned with the national forests. The minister however, can approve of such activities if they do not affect sustainable forest management (The Forests Act, 2015).

For local people to be able to use the forests for their livelihoods they have to apply to the director for recognition as a community forest management group. This has to be with consent of the local chief. To be able to do this they have to live adjacent to or within a local forest or derive their livelihoods from the forest. The group of people that is then appointed as the community forest management group has to apply to the director to enter into a community forestry agreement with the forestry department. When this is approved of the management group will get user rights to the forest. Then they are allowed to collect forest resources for their own use or for community-based industries, cultivate crops on the land and benefit from the forest in other ways that are agreed upon with the director. The management group is then allowed to assign these rights to any other person or group, although to do this they have to apply to the minister first (The Forests Act, 2015). This is how the local people are allowed to maintain their livelihoods while living in or near a forest. If the minister or director want to change or develop forest management plans, they will have to consult with the local community, chief and forest management committee. On the other hand, if the community violates the agreement, the agreement can be annulled by the minister or director. So, in general it can be said that the state maintains the power over the forests in the country (The Forests Act, 2015). Concerning the regulation of forest produce: this shall be conserved for the use and benefit for the local community living in or near the forest, except that trees may be cut and land may be cleared only for the purpose of agricultural and other developments. Produce that is not to be conserved or would be destroyed may be sold under a license. If a person wants to fell, cut, work or remove major forest produce, he has to apply for a license or permit. How much one has to pay for these licenses or permits is to be determined by the minister (The Forests Act, 2015).

This shows that on paper, forest governance is well developed and that local communities are assigned certain rights. In reality this is far more complex and also far more contested. There is a lack of implementation of the policies and legal frameworks, mostly because the Forestry department lacks the capacity to manage the forest properly. Although there are aspirations by the Zambian government to improve forest management, this is not yet happening due to lack of capacity and delays in enacting laws by parliament (Ng'andwe et al, 2015).

Managing forest does not only depend on forest acts and policies. There are also legal frameworks from other sectors that influence forest management such as the Lands Act of 1995 and the draft Lands Policy of 1998, which ascribe rights to land and the forests (The Lands Act, 1995; Ng'andwe et al, 2015). Next to these there is also the Investment Act of 1993, which is a legal framework for investing in sectors like forestry (The Investment Act, 1993). The ZFAP contributes to the preparation of forest policies and programs through an established framework. It aims to make people aware of issues within the forestry sector and provides information on forest policies. The National Forest Policy (NFP) of 1998 aims for sustainable management and use of forest resources. It tries to achieve this by using different approaches, like resource management and development, resource allocation, capacity building and gender equality (National Forestry Policy, 1998; Ng'andwe et al, 2015).

4.2 History

To reach the goals set in the different Forest Acts and different policies, there has been a great difference in forest legislation in Zambia from the past until now. Over the years forest conservation has been a significant agenda point in developing countries, which started early with the colonial powers. Before the start of conservation, the extraction of forest resources happened without strict governance. From that time onwards the British colonial government, who was also in power in Northern Rhodesia, gained great wealth from the extraction of certain woods from the forests and certain crops they would cultivate on forest lands. This was exported to England to be used there. The more goods they could extract from the forests, the more revenue they made (Bryant, 1996).

However, over time this led to a depletion of forest resources. This was a cause for concern for the British and therefore they wanted to bring extraction in line with regeneration. They did this by making forestry 'scientific', which was then all done under the term 'progress'. With their knowledge and science, the colonial power wanted to bring progress to the colonies. They wanted to generate growth in the economy of such countries, which would be for the benefit of the colonizers and colonized alike and science played a significant role in this. The British saw themselves as the bringers of science that would improve the state of a country. Through science they could determine what wood was of best use for what purpose and what lands they could use to grow certain crops. It also helped in mapping out the forests for extensive use. However, the colonial powers saw that the extensive use of the forests needed to be balanced out by the conservation of forests to make sure that they could use the forests for a longer time. So, making wood extraction 'scientific' was central to achieving progress (Bryant, 1996).

By the 1930's there were extensive plans in place that mapped out forests and determined how they should be governed. Where the purpose of mapping of forests and extracting the right kinds of wood was to satisfy the need for timber and generate revenue, the purpose of forest conservation was that this did not lead to forest degradation. For the British knew that if they kept going they would end up with no forests to use. However, forest conservation in these colonial times was a highly selective process. The British only focused on forests that were of value to them, which often led to a conflict concerning what they extracted was the same they tried to conserve (Bryant, 1996).

Progress in forest conservation was measured by several aspects. First, progress was seen as an improvement in conservation. According to the British the best way to improve conservation was to make all forests state-owned. Because of this the colonial powers took control of the forest lands that were of great value for them and were not cleared for agriculture. This led to the situation that there were no such things as forest rights or property rights held by individuals or communities living in or near forests. Here the state was the owner of all forest lands and all the resources that it contained (Bryant, 1996). They saw forest conservation as a process of intensive land management for which the forest lands that were commercially valuable had to be state reserved forests. In other words, the British did not only see conservation as something that should be done by the state, but also as something that justified the spatial extension of state forest control. This is why the area set aside for forest conservation grew during the colonial era in which the forestry department became the main land owner (Bryant, 1996).

This is still the case in many countries that were colonized by the British, for after colonization the system of forest conservation often was taken over by the new governments of the independent countries (Gadgil & Guha, 1993). After they decided that forests were to be reserves controlled by the state, the colonizers started to look for ways to enhance their long-term commercial value. This meant that in the first place they wanted to protect the forest from human and natural hazards. This involved the exclusion of fires from the forest, since they believed that fires were a destruction for the forests

and its resources. It also further involved the restriction or elimination of certain indigenous activities, like cattle grazing, collecting honey, etc. Successfully excluding or restricting these things was seen as progress, although over the years opinions concerning forest conservation started to shift (Bryant, 1996). For example, after the first World War people started to claim that fires did not damage the forests, but that it helped it to survive. Therefore, the fire-protection programmes were mostly wound up at that time. This is also when the colonizers started to see that 'progress' was harder to define than previously thought (Bryant, 1996).

A second way to improve the long-term commercial value of forests was through regeneration, which mainly meant that every other vegetation that hindered the growth of trees had to be removed. Everything in the forests had to be altered in such a way that it favored the growth of certain trees. The more vegetation was removed or altered the more progress there was according to the British colonizers. This also included the creation of timber plantations of which the first were established in the 19th century. The management of these plantations were often done in cooperation with local people who planted and tended to the trees on the plantations. Over the years more and more plantations were established, which sometimes led to conflicts between foresters and shifting cultivators who felt that eventually their way of life would be threatened. However, for the colonizers progress was defined in the acres of land planted with trees. In their eyes the plantations were a way to successfully protect the forests in the colonized country. After the Great Depression the planting programmes were terminated because of cuts in government spending, but still the programme was seen as a great success in managing and conserving forests and therefore generating progress (Bryant, 1996).

An important question to ask here however is for whom this 'progress' was real progress? According to the colonizers they were entrusted with the long-term maintenance of the countries they colonized. They had knowledge and resources that they brought from their home-country and in their opinion this could bring progress to the less fortunate peasants who lived in the countries they colonized (Bryant, 1996). However, the local people who lived there disagreed with this thought. Peasants, shifting cultivators, timber traders and politicians often contested the stewardship role that the British appointed to themselves. In general, there were two ways in which local people tried to resist the colonial forestry. The first way is about activities that were seen as forest crimes by the colonial powers (Bryant, 1996). Local people used everyday forms of resistance. This kind of resistance as portrayed by Scott (1985) is often more hidden and individual, but still poses a challenge for the governing power. During colonial times local people often used these forms of resistance and it posed a significant challenge to the British colonizers. The resistance often arose from the fact that local people were limited in their access to reserved forests. They needed this access to gain timber, wood for fuel, bamboo, and other forest products which they needed to sustain a livelihood. However, because of the forest legislation by the British colonizers they lost access to these resources. Villagers who did not live next to a forest often did not get any access at all and the people who lived next to a reserved forest only got limited access (Bryant, 1996).

Furthermore, forest legislation determined which individuals could get access to the forest, what they could take from the forest and in which time-frame they could do so. Since the local people needed the resources to sustain a livelihood, this led to resistance and illegal activities, like stealing, illegal cattle grazing and cutting of trees, or to the fact that legal activities suddenly became illegal. In some cases, the people could still get some access if they paid fees which allowed them to enter the reserves and get the resources they needed, however in most cases they were completely denied access (Bryant, 1996). When one looks at trade in forest resources during colonial times, one can see that this was largely dominated by the colonial powers. Trade was dominated by large European companies,

while companies from colonized countries only had a small part to play. To accommodate some people from these countries the British established limited self-rule, but for a large part native companies and traders were largely excluded from trade in forest resources (Bryant, 1996). Here it can be seen that 'progress' was not seen as such by the colonized countries, rather it was more in the eye of the colonizers since it mostly benefitted their own colonial rule.

When one looks at this history of forestry and forest conservation in British colonies the question can be asked if it has really changed after countries became independent. Especially since in the current time the developed world is still trying to 'improve' forest governance in developing countries. We see that even today national governments and the international community are still explaining and justifying forestry practices in the same way as the colonial British did (Bryant, 1996). They claim that the act of governing forests and creating policies and legislation to conserve them is simply to save the forests and climate, rather than that it is something political. In aggregate their forest governance looks relatively the same today as it did in colonial times and the resistance of locals towards forestry practices is still present. This situation also reflects the influence the international community still has in developing countries. Through trade agreements and activities of international institutions like the World Bank and United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, the international community continues to influence forest governance in developing countries. Although it is now much more done in different fashions, like in the name of community-based natural resource management instead of conservation by the state, it can be said that the discourse of 'progress' during colonial times is also suited for legitimizing the goals of fighting climate change and pursuing economic development that are posed by the international community today (Bryant, 1996). This is what we see with, for example, certification programs like FSC (Forest Stewardship Council). When one looks at REDD+ in the light of this history one can ask the question of where REDD+ fits in all of this and whether it will be a continuation of the discourse of forest governance as 'progress'.

5. What is REDD+?

As it was stated in the introduction, Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) is a programme developed by the UN that wants to motivate national governments to fight climate change by reducing forest greenhouse gas emissions (UN, 2010). In this chapter I will shortly explain what REDD+ entails. First, it is based on several key guidelines to which it should adhere to (UN, as cited in Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014):

According to the UN REDD+ policies should:

1. Be country-driven
2. Be undertaken in accordance with national development priorities, objectives and circumstances and capabilities and should respect sovereignty
3. Be consistent with Parties' national sustainable development needs and goals
4. Be implemented in the context of sustainable development and reducing poverty
5. Be supported by adequate and predictable financial and technology support, including support for capacity building
6. Be results based
7. Promote sustainable management of forests

REDD+ was developed as a collaborative partnership between the FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization), UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) and UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme) (UN, 2010). The United Nations started with the REDD initiative because they saw that deforestation and forest degradation plays a big role in the production of greenhouse gasses. They came up with an initiative that aims to financially reward national governments relative to the extent of their achieved emissions reductions every amount of forest they manage to protect (The REDD Desk, 2016). This way they hope to motivate national governments to stop deforestation and forest degradation in their countries and therefore slow down the process of climate change (UN, 2010).

At first this was the only objective of the REDD programme, which started with several initiatives after the 2007 Climate Change Conference in Bali. In 2009 during the Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen new concepts were added to the REDD programme, making it the REDD+ programme. The + that was added to the name stands for the addition of the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and the enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries to the original goal of preventing forest degradation and deforestation. With these additions REDD+ takes into account that it can have a positive effect on the conservation of biological diversity and on the livelihoods of people who depend on the forest for their survival (UN, 2010). These additions to the REDD+ programme are an example of the fact that since the initial development in Bali, REDD+ has been adapted continuously (Anderson, 2014). The UN has also established several focus points and activities that REDD+ should focus on. These are activities that (UN, as cited in Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014; The REDD Desk, 2016):

1. Reduce emissions from deforestation
2. Reduce emissions from forest degradation
3. Conserve forest carbon stocks
4. Contribute to sustainable management of forests
5. Enhance forest carbon stocks

These activities, that reflect the main goals of REDD+, should be reflected in the programmes that are developed and measurements that are taken to facilitate REDD+ within a country. In order to participate in the REDD+ programme, a country is requested to do certain things. They have to (UN, as cited in Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014):

1. Develop a national strategy or action plan;
2. Establish a national forest reference emission level;
3. Establish a robust and transparent national forest monitoring system;
4. Establish a system for reporting on how social and environmental safeguards are being addressed and respected.

To make sure that every stakeholder that participates in REDD+ or REDD+ related programmes is able to benefit from the programme and does not experience negative consequences, the UN has established several safeguards to which national governments should adhere to. This is to prevent that only the most powerful stakeholders benefit from the programme. A few of these safeguards are (UN, as cited in Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014):

1. Ensuring actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements;
2. Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty;
3. Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities, by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws;
4. The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular indigenous people and local communities;
5. Ensuring actions are not used for the conversion of natural forests, but instead to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits.

5.1 The Quick-Start Programme

To start the REDD+ programme off, nine countries were appointed to receive initial support. Zambia is one of these countries. They take part in a quick start programme that aims to make the countries ready for REDD+ through a National Joint Programme (NJP). This can be seen as phase 1 of the UN-REDD+ programme (UN, 2010). With this the UN wants to assess whether “carefully structured payment structures and capacity support can create the incentives to ensure lasting, achievable, reliable and measurable emission reductions while maintaining and improving other ecosystem services that forests provide” (UN, 2010, p.10). In other words, it wants to see whether Zambia will be committed to protecting forests and participating in REDD+ when the country receives financial and capacity support from the UN. This is called “REDD+ Readiness”. So, the NJP prepares Zambia for the future when they will be participating in REDD+. The NJP will include the following aspects that they want to establish in Zambia (UN, 2010):

1. A multi-sectoral approach in establishing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.
2. Capacity development to produce and maintain reliable data.

3. Capacity development to access REDD+ funding streams for implementation of National REDD+ activities.
4. Development of appropriate strategies to reduce deforestation and forest degradation in the country.
5. Consolidation of available information on deforestation and forest degradation.

However, the NJP does not fully prepare Zambia for the REDD+ programme. With the aforementioned aspects implemented in Zambia, the country will still not be ready to fully implement the REDD+ programme. This is why next to the Quick-start Programme, Zambia will have to achieve some objectives themselves (UN, 2010):

Zambia has to:

1. Encourage development so that local people are less dependent on the forest for their livelihoods,
2. Strengthen its forest governance frameworks,
3. Become more transparent in its governance,
4. Do appropriate land use planning in the whole country to facilitate REDD+ and
5. Make sure that there is an effective implementation and enforcement of policies concerning the use of natural resources from the forest.

The NJP will aim to achieve the previously stated goals by involving the local communities in learning-by-doing activities. This way the programme wants local people to develop alternative livelihoods. They want them to develop more sustainable agricultural methods and use alternative energy sources. Furthermore, they want to motivate the government of Zambia to revise the policies, strategies and legislation that are applicable in this case (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). These activities will be financed by internal and external donors. However, making Zambia ready for REDD+ and implementing it eventually takes a lot more than only these steps mentioned before. Within the plans for this quick start programme for Zambia the UN admits that a lot has to change within Zambia to make sure that REDD+ can be effectively implemented. Government structures, land tenure systems, law enforcement, market and cultural values of forests, the rights of local communities, benefit sharing and poverty and food production policies all have to be adapted in order to fit the REDD+ programme (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014; UN, 2010).

5.2 The Potential of REDD+

In theory REDD+ can have a lot of benefits for a country like Zambia. It has been found that forest carbon programs, like REDD+, can contribute significantly to the economic situation of local communities by causing household earnings to increase and by giving local people more access to non-timber forest products (Corbera et al, 2009). Local communities have also been able to gain benefits from the programmes without participating in them. Now the hope is that REDD+ could do the same for local communities in countries like Zambia. REDD+ should mainly improve sustainable forest management and give local communities the opportunity to generate income by participating in carbon markets, monitoring and conservation programs and give the local people access to funding (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). In their paper, Anderson & Zerriffi (2014) lay out the potential positive and negative effects that REDD+ could have for local communities, depending on how it is implemented.

they look at how the access to and distribution of forest resources and their access to markets would change when REDD+ is implemented a certain way. How REDD+ will affect the local poorer population depends on several aspects (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014):

1. The Reference levels or baselines that are used to measure changes in forests
2. Whether the country is using a market finance mechanism or donor funding
3. The scope of activities that are included under REDD+ and how a forest is defined
4. The level at which the most risk is borne
5. At which scale REDD+ is implemented
6. Who is involved in evaluation and monitoring and the criteria that are used

5.2.1 Policy and Governance

These aspects in turn influence certain factors within a country and determine whether REDD+ has a positive or negative influence on the local people. The first of these factors is policy and governance. This is an important factor because governance and policies concerning forest management affect who can participate in the projects and decision-making with regards to REDD+ and who is able to gain benefits from it. Strict monitoring by the international community regarding how REDD+ is implemented in combination with the social and environmental safeguards could give REDD+ the opportunity to be beneficial for the local population. This way it could provide incentives and resources for effective decentralization, which in turn could increase the participation of local people in forest governance and give them the opportunity to take part in benefitting from the forest. However, if this does not happen REDD+ could have a negative impact on the lives of the local people. REDD+ is very state oriented and this could contribute to recentralization of forest governance. This in turn could mean that the local communities are further excluded from participating in decision-making with regards to forest resources and participating in REDD+. This and a lack of harmony in national resources policies could prevent them from benefiting from the (forest) resources generated by REDD+. What is necessary is that policies concerning resource management are harmonized. This would maximize the benefits that the local people could get from the forests. It is also necessary to support decentralization by strengthening the institutions at local level. This will ensure that the local people will get opportunities to participate more in forest governance and REDD+ and benefit from it (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014).

This view can be backed up by the research done by Ribot et al (2006) on the question why the decentralization of forest governance often does not work in practice. In this research the writers look at the forest governance reforms in different countries and identify why there often is a significant difference between the claim for policy reform and the real reform that happens in practice. According to them, political dynamics that are involved in reforming forest governance, play the biggest role in the divergence between theory and practice (Ribot et al, 2006). They show through their case studies that although countries claim to decentralize forest governance, there are always certain mechanisms involved that the central government will use to transfer power from the local governments back to them. They talk about two kinds of mechanisms that either restrain the power local governments get with the decentralization or mechanisms that give power to local governments, but not the ones that can be held accountable (Ribot et al, 2006).

In the first case local governments are given certain rights that concern the forests and its resources, but not the rights that help them benefit from them. These rights are often not commercially relevant and thus not very relevant for the local people. Another example the writers give in light of the first mechanism is that national governments often do not give sufficient information about the reforms

that are taking place. This also prevents local people from being able to benefit from these reforms. These examples show that national governments limit the scope of powers they transfer during governance reforms.

In the case of the second kind of mechanisms the writers show that the nature of the local authorities that get to exercise decentralized powers, and their accountability matters in the effectiveness of decentralization. Often these local authorities are not elected and not accountable. The fact that they gain more power, does not mean they have the knowledge to make the right decisions for the local people (Ribot et al, 2006).

These examples confirm that policies and governance play a big role in whether projects like REDD+ that need policy reform, will really work in practice. As we can see, the national government can use the policies and governance in such a way that they will not lose much power in the end. In the case of Zambia, it depends on whether the Zambian central government will use REDD+ to recentralize forest governance or whether it will use REDD+ as the opportunity to make forest governance more beneficial for the environment and Zambian people.

5.2.2 Rights and Ownership

The second relevant factor is rights and ownership over forest lands and resources. The situation concerning rights to forest and forest resources determines whether and how people can benefit from the forests and REDD+. Often in African countries land rights and with that rights to forests are very complex. Local rights are not often legitimized and largely ignored. If REDD+ is monitored in a strict way and safeguards are being applied it could promote the signing of forest management agreements between the state and local communities. This could mean a clarification of tenure and resource rights and an improvement of security of access to forest resources. This way local people would be more secure in their rights and could be able to benefit more from the forests and REDD+. However, on the other hand REDD+ causes an increase in forest value and privatization and centralization of forest control (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014; Phelps et al, 2010). Because REDD+ makes forests more valuable, there is a greater incentive for the central governments to recentralize or don't start decentralization of forest governance. By keeping it centralized the central government will get more benefits by controlling the forests themselves or lease the forests to foreign investors. Decentralizing forest governance to the local level will cause the local governments to benefit more from the forest value and can cause the national governments to miss out on revenue. In light of this, Phelps et al (2010) say that because with REDD+ there is more money at stake, national governments could justify recentralization by portraying themselves as more capable and reliable than local communities at protecting the national interest. This could mean that local people will be more excluded from forest management and decision-making in REDD+ and that their customary rights will be more easily overlooked in favor of the state or private actors. This will fit in previous trends of exclusion of local people from carbon markets and forests and the trends of capture of the benefits by actors with more power and resources (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). What is necessary here is that REDD+ needs to be designed in a way that it maintains access to forests for the local people. REDD+ can be used to address tenure issues and issues with resource rights and to strengthen and support the ability of forest people to enforce their rights (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014).

5.2.3 Benefit Sharing and Compensation

Another factor that is important is the factor of benefit sharing and compensation. This determines who gets which benefits from the forests and REDD+ and what benefits are available. If REDD+ is

implemented in a way that respects the rights of local people it has the potential to change how costs and benefits of forest management are distributed. It is also important for legitimacy, effectiveness and efficiency in REDD+ implementation (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). If REDD+ is strictly monitored and the safeguards correctly implemented, REDD+ has the potential to help improve forest benefit sharing. This means that also the benefits of REDD+ could be equally distributed and local people won't be ignored. However, when executed poorly REDD+ could continue the trend of inequitable distribution of forest benefits. Especially because REDD+ has a very centralized approach. This could cause benefits to also end up centrally and not with the local communities and because the full consequences of REDD+ for the local people may not be fully understood, compensation may also be a problem. What is necessary in this case is that the local people participate in REDD+ governance and decision-making. This way one can make benefit sharing more acceptable to all stakeholders. REDD+ can also again be used to support governance policies and reforms that improve sharing of resources and if combined with other forest management goals, REDD+ could facilitate adequate compensation for local communities (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014).

To make sure that local people participate in REDD+ one can learn from one of the previous Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) projects in Zambia, the Luangwa Integrated Resource Development Project (LIRD). This because community participation forms the core of the CBNRM paradigm (Wainwright & Wehrmeyer, 1998). It shows that projects where local people are fully included, should have a significant positive effect on local livelihoods, but also that local institutions are vulnerable to accountability problems. The LIRD focused on the link between poverty and wildlife conservation. By giving local people money to invest and showing local people that wildlife was an important source of income the locals would feel more responsible for wildlife, which led to investments in wildlife and revenues from it, which were then equally distributed among the locals for the whole community was seen as responsible. This in turn led to wildlife conservation, because of the worth it had for the locals. Important factors in this are transparency and accountability, because without it equal participation would not exist (Child & Dalal-Clayton, 2004). This shows the importance and success of including local people in governance. Making local people care for natural resources and giving them responsibility in governing these resources, makes them feel responsible and willing to protect and invest in it and at the same time they can make money from it. Doing this then with REDD+ could aid in the benefit sharing and shows that local people are more than capable of taking over governance of natural resources and succeed in protecting the resources and benefitting from them in an equal way.

5.2.4 Intermediaries, Corruption and Elite Capture of Benefits

Intermediaries, corruption and elite capture of benefits is another important factor in the governance of forests and REDD+. Forest communities benefit from collaborating with intermediaries that have the know-how and capital concerning carbon markets and monitoring and that have the technologies that allow the local people to participate in a programme like REDD+. On the other hand, there is the fact that local people often have less power, which leads to concerns that weak governance and corruption leads to the capture of benefits by elite actors. This means that there is a danger that the distribution of REDD+ benefits is not done equally and local populations get excluded. Good implementation of REDD+ and its safeguards concerning governance structures and respect for people's rights and international agreements should be a way to ensure intermediaries that are of good quality. It is also a way to support governance reforms that try to reduce corruption and improve the equity in distribution of benefits and resources (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). On the other hand, the national focus of REDD+ could increase the number of intermediaries involved which will indirectly

lead to an increase in poor intermediaries and a reduction in participation of local people in REDD+ governance. Also, if a country already has a high corruption rate it is safe to say that this will also occur in REDD+ benefit sharing. To change this governance reforms must be facilitated. Another point is that because REDD+ is strictly monitored by the international community, countries with a lot of corruption may not want to participate in REDD+ at all. This will lead to more exclusion of local people in benefiting from REDD+ (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). Because of this REDD+ should support government reforms, accountability and transparency and the participation of local people in REDD+ governance. Also, everything should be monitored and evaluated (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014).

5.2.5 Wealth, Resources and Knowledge

Another factor that plays a role in the governance of forests and REDD+ is wealth, resources and knowledge. These three aspects can have a big influence on the ability of local people to participate in REDD+ governance. If REDD+ is implemented well, its safeguards concerning the rights and participation of local people and their rights should support the building of local capacity to participate in REDD+ governance and to access forests and REDD+ benefits. People are now thinking of tools and procedures that should help REDD+ to respect safeguards, to be results-based socially as well as environmentally and avoid negative impacts on local people who are dependent on the forest (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). When the aforementioned safeguards are not being implemented and monitored, participating in and benefiting from REDD+ can become very difficult for many people. People with a lack of capacity related to wealth and knowledge about REDD+ are often not able to participate in REDD+ governance and benefit from it. This because in order for people to fully participate in REDD+ they need to know about it and how it works and they need resources to be able to act in it. To solve this potential problem REDD+ needs to be designed in a way that it is accessible to all local people. next to this it could also provide compensation for the ones that are negatively impacted by it. REDD+ programs need to be monitored in order to ensure equal access to benefits and equal opportunities to participate in REDD+ governance for all local communities involved (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014).

5.2.6 Approaches to REDD+ Implementation

Lastly, what is also important in REDD+ governance is how it is implemented. When a country wants to implement REDD+ in its governance of forests choices have to be made. These choices are important in that it influences the way REDD+ benefits are distributed and how it affects access to forest resources for the stakeholders involved (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). The safeguards of REDD+ concerning the rights and participation of local communities in REDD+ design and the need for REDD+ not to contribute to forest conversion can help to avoid negative effects of REDD+ implementation. With that access to REDD+ and forest resources for local people can be protected. Anderson & Zerriffi (2014) claim however that the way forests and activities under REDD+ are defined could restrict the ability of some local people to get access to REDD+ benefits and could be in favor of private stakeholders. Also, how REDD+ implementation is approached can, in some cases, restrict the flow of REDD+ and forest benefits to local communities. REDD+ needs to be designed in a way that it is pro-poor, otherwise there will be adverse effects that are negative for the people in the local communities (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). In order to prevent this from happening all stakeholders have to have equal influence on the design of REDD+ in their country. This way REDD+ implementation is approached in a way that will also benefit the local people with less power. It is also important that in implementing REDD+, one learns from previous initiatives that also concerned carbon, conservation and community

forestry. This way one can improve equity in the distribution of benefits at the local level (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014).

5.3 Remarks

This analysis from Anderson & Zerriffi shows that REDD+ can have a positive impact on the lives of local people if it is implemented and designed in a certain way that is pro-poor and depends on heavy monitoring of the REDD+ benefit distribution by the international community. It also shows however that a lot needs to happen in a country before REDD+ can be beneficial for all stakeholders in the management of forests. So, whether REDD+ can be relevant to local people depends on a lot of factors, among which are the motivations of the national governments and their capacity and willingness to implement REDD+ in a way that influences their citizens in a positive way. By looking at the different aspects mentioned above in the case of the village of Mwamfushi in Zambia, I want to analyze whether implementing REDD+ will be feasible and beneficial for a town like this. The situation of the forest and the people in Mwamfushi is outlined in the next chapter.

However, seeing all the comments made by Anderson & Zerriffi (2014) one can place a question mark with the points they make. Anderson & Zerriffi (2014) plead for a lot more monitoring and controlling in order to keep the safeguards posed with REDD+. One can argue that this monitoring however, means more involvement and control from the outside and that it will eat up a lot of the REDD+ benefits. A question this raises then is, who will do this monitoring and controlling? And does this reinforce the central nature of forest governance? The significant adaptation that REDD+ requires and the need for intensive monitoring of the project could mean more state involvement and thus not the decentralization that is needed to give local people the opportunity to benefit from the project. For since only the state has the capacity to control one can see similarities to the cases presented by Scott (1998) in which the state is the controlling power forwarding the programmes. To make REDD+ relevant for local people, would mean that local people will be able to benefit from the project. However, with the national approach of REDD+ and the changes it requires important questions need to be asked whether this is the right way to go and whether it does not make REDD+ less relevant for local people.

6. Results

For this research, I looked at the lives of the local people living in Mwamfushi in the Mpika District. Mwamfushi is a relatively large village spread over a significant surface of land. It is located at the edge of a large forest that consists of miombo woodlands and about 11 kilometers from the town of Mpika. To get to Mpika one has to travel these 11 kilometers over a dirt road, which is even less passable when it has rained. The ethnicity of the people living there is Bemba and they are for the most part dependent on the forest for their livelihoods. The information in this chapter was gained by interviewing local people living in Mwamfushi, the headmen of Mwamfushi and the district forestry officers who are responsible for governing the local forests in Mpika district.

6.1 Mwamfushi and the Forest

The forest plays a major role in the lives of the local people in Mwamfushi. It is the place where they get the products from with which they sustain their livelihoods with. From the forest they get: charcoal (whole year), caterpillars (two months), mushrooms (rainy season), wild fruits (certain seasons), herbs for medicine, honey, wood for construction, firewood, other insects (crickets), game (illegal hunting), land for agriculture (through the *chitemene system*) on which they cultivate maize and other crops, and thus respectively also all the crops they cultivate on these lands. To gain these products they often go into the forest in the mornings. They prepare the lands, take care of the crops, look for firewood etc. For a lot of products trees have to be (partly) cut. The products that have the most impact on the forest in terms of deforestation and forest degradation are: charcoal, the *chitemene system*, firewood and wood for construction. For these products a lot of trees are being cut.

Charcoal is responsible for the majority of the cash income of the local people. It is the only way through which people can earn relatively large amounts of money, are able to send their children to school and take care of their families. This is also one of the only products that they can gather any time of the year. Through the interviews I got to know that charcoal from this area is of good quality. Certain tree species grow there that do not grow everywhere in Zambia and which give very good charcoal. This means that people from all over Zambia come to buy charcoal in the Mpika district. Even people from Congo and Tanzania come to buy charcoal from this area. Some local people go to the border to sell their charcoal there, but most charcoal is being sold locally. The people also use charcoal themselves sometimes to prepare food and to make bricks from clay to build their houses.

Another forest product that brings the local people a lot of money are a species of caterpillars. These can mostly be found in the last week of October and the whole month of November. They are being caught from the trees, prepared and sold at the markets in Mpika town. Catching caterpillars can be harmful for the forest when people start to cut the trees to get to them. This is becoming a bigger problem because of the increase in competition in the trading of the caterpillars. The Forestry Department and most locals do not allow this in Mwamfushi but from the forest district officers I got to know that this still can be a big cause for deforestation for some people manage to do it illegally. Also, for this product people come from all over Zambia and abroad to Mpika district to buy them. There are two species here that are especially tasteful and the way the people prepare them here is also in high demand. This makes the caterpillars a significant source of income, although it is only for a short time in the year.

The *chitemene system* is a very big cause for deforestation. This system is used to prepare land for agriculture, by cutting and burning trees and other unwanted plants on the land. This means a whole

area of land is cleared for this. Trees are mostly completely cut except for a few stumps that stay in the land, the rest of it is being burned. Walking in the forest I could see that the areas cleared by *chitemene* are scattered all over the forest. The headmen of Mwamfushi said that after 2/3 years the land is exhausted and people have to start looking for a new area that is then again completely cleared. This is very harmful for the forest. The headmen claimed that it can take 20 years for trees to become half as high as they were when they were cut and another 100/150 years for the forest to completely return to its old form. However, if the land is exhausted to a certain extent and has become acid, the forest may never recover. People get their land from the headmen and in the case of Mwamfushi the headmen in some cases forbid people to cut trees in certain areas for land to protect the forest. The first headman of Mwamfushi told me that there is a decrease in the use of the *chitemene* system, because of legislation and increase in use of fertilizer, but also that it is still used to a certain extent because of poverty and therefore a lack of resources to keep using the same land for a longer period.

At last, the products that are gathered from the forest are used and sold in amounts depending on the needs of the families. These products are poles for construction, firewood, honey, wild fruits and products they make from those fruits. People take what they need themselves to take care of their daily needs and what is left they sell. To sell the products people have to walk or cycle 11 km to the “boma” (Mpika town) over a bad road. A new road is being constructed at the moment in the area, but this does not lead entirely to Mwamfushi and is not finished yet. The road is being built by the Chinese who are staying in a camp nearby. Although the Chinese hire Zambians to do certain aspects of the work, these are not local Zambians. They hire Zambians from Kitwe and Ndola, cities far away from Mwamfushi. Furthermore, working in the forest is very hard work. There are plants that can cut you, animals that can bite you, like snakes, insects that can sting you (wasps, bees) and it is very labor intensive. Especially the women suffer from this because they work on the land and in the bush and have to take care of the household.

6.2 Protecting the forest

In general, there seems to be a lack of initiatives that aim to protect the forest near Mwamfushi. Local people are rarely being taught about forest degradation and deforestation and how to protect the forest. Primary schools do teach something about it but since it is difficult to send children to school few people get really taught about forest conservation. Most teachings happen through parents and grandparents who see the issues with the forest and want their children to do better in protecting the forest than that they are currently doing.

The only collective initiative to protect the forest I saw is the Village Action Group. The village has its own Village Action Group which purpose is to prevent harm being done to the environment. This includes that they try to prevent forest degradation and deforestation from happening. The people that are a part of the Village Action Group are being trained by an initiative from the government and NGOs according to certain positions they hold within the group. What they learn there, they try to teach to the local people as well. They want to make people more aware of the importance of the forest and hope to prevent forest degradation this way (Group discussion 1 & 3, 2017).

While walking through the forest you can see that a large part of the forest has been cut before. The trees are only of middle height except for a few really large trees that are still standing near the village. These trees are there “since the creation of the earth” (Headman 1, 2017). These trees used to be shrines at which local people worshiped their gods. However, because the village is now mostly Christian this is not the case anymore. Now the trees are used to show future generations what a tree could look like if they are not cut. The local people use these trees to teach their children the

importance of the forest and that they should not cut too many trees. They are there as a reminder of what once was and what could be again if the people would take a better care of the forest (Headman 1, 2017). This, among other aspects, shows that in general people are very aware that what they do is harmful for the forest in the long term. A few of them told me they even stopped producing charcoal because they saw the harm it did to the forest and most of them teach their children to never unwantedly cut trees for whatever product. So, they are very aware of what is happening and what is causing it. However, as they say, it is poverty that keeps them coming back to the forest for the products (Villagers, 2017). They want to stop harming the forest, but they simply cannot because they do not have the resources or knowledge to switch to alternative livelihoods. One woman said: Yes, we teach our children to not cut trees unwantedly, but when they see you with an axe the next day, can you really stop them from doing the same (Group Discussion 2)? Also, people from the action group or other people advocating for keeping the forest healthy are in favor of a stop on tree cutting, but at the same time some of them continue doing so themselves because they need the money for their families. Everyone in the interviews state that if they would have other ways of providing for their families, nobody would go back to the forest. They all gladly would turn to alternative methods (Villagers, 2017).

The villagers find it important to protect the forest for a few reasons. As they told during the interviews, they see a lot of unwanted consequences of deforestation. They see the big trees disappear. They feel the air become less “clean”. They see the rain pattern change. These days the rains start later in the year, first they used to start in October, now they start in the end of December. They also see the rains become less. Streams are drying much earlier, they feel the temperature rise and claim that they can feel a change in the air. They have to travel much farther for the products (like mushrooms) now than they used to do. The soil is also becoming less fertile and more acid in some places. The main reasons for the local villagers to protect the forest more are: the changing rain patterns and the clean air. They want the rains back to how it was and the air to become cleaner again (Villagers, 2017).

6.3 Mwamfushi and the State

The relationship between the village and the district forestry office is quite hostile. Officially the local people have to buy permits for cutting trees and producing products from the forest. However, the prices of these permits are too high for them. It is often more than what they get for a bag of charcoal (Group Discussion 3). That is why people are not able to buy permits and this is why more often than not, people have to acquire certain resources illegally. So, when they are caught by the forest officers they are punished by being given a fine or even being arrested. The villagers stated in the interviews that they in most cases could not pay the fine, because it would be more than they would earn by selling a bag of weed or maize. In some cases, the officers take the bike of the perpetrator as a punishment for their illegal production of for example charcoal (Village Meeting 1, 2017).

The district officers almost never come to Mwamfushi to meet with the local people, teach them about deforestation or help them in any way to protect the forest. One of the local people said: they punish the child without telling it why it is punished (Headman 1, 2017). They also told the story about an officer who was almost beaten to death after he tried to approach someone who was producing charcoal illegally. According to them that person had to choose between taking care of his family or living by the law.

This story however has two sides. On the one hand there are the local people who feel the lack of support of the government and on the other hand there is the District Forestry office which is not equipped to enforce the law in any way. Mpika is the biggest district in Zambia and it has only two forestry officers. These officers have to monitor the forests in Mpika on their own since they get no

help from the provincial office. Sometimes they are supported by volunteers who are willing to contribute to healthier forests, but they are always short of resources and staff (Forest Officer 1 & 2, 2017). They do not have a car or even a bicycle to go to the forests and do their job. When they have to go they have to hire a car and a police officer, who they need for protection from people who might get aggressive. They pay this from the budget they get from the government, which is not enough for them to do their work. For example, in the year 2016 the Mpika District Forest office was given a budget of 700K (\$70), which they had to use to protect and monitor the forest (Forestry Officer 2). Often a budget is also not given consistently over the year. They may have to wait 6 months for some funding. The forest officers claim that this is why often when they want to go to a certain area they have to pay from their own money to be able to do so. There used to be forestry rangers who monitored the forests, but these do not exist anymore because of changes in forest governance from the government. The Forest officers are also aware that most people are acting illegally in the forest. Out of all the companies and local people who use resources from the forest and sell them, only three companies had applied for a permit to cut trees. Although they know about the illegal activities they claim that they can do little to stop it.

One thing that makes enforcement of the law more difficult is the duality of the law in Zambia. Under the law the land is owned by the president who then allocate the land to local chiefs, who can distribute it among the local people. In Mwamfushi the main distribution of the land among the people happens via the headmen who is appointed by the chief to oversee this process. This because the chief lives to far from Mwamfushi to be overseeing this himself. Under the law this land is being kept by the local people and it is their ownership as long as the local leaders want. However, the resources on the land are not included in that ownership. The resources on the land, like trees, animals, water, etc. still belongs to the state, which makes it difficult to determine who can make use of the resources and how much they can use them. This makes it also more difficult to protect the forest and stop people from cutting trees. For when an officer comes to a chief stating that illegal things are happening in the forest, the chiefs will claim that the land is theirs and therefore they are allowed to use what is on the land. This is a source of great conflict between the local community and the forest officers. Nevertheless, the officers all claim that the relationship between them and the local chiefs is a good relationship.

Another thing is that there is little or no cooperation between the different departments that are responsible for the governance of natural resources. There are often great differences in how the law is applied and what is allowed. For example, the forestry officers in Mpika may allow someone to cut trees in a certain area, while the officers responsible for wildlife in that area do not. These differences in enforcement of the law makes it difficult to govern the forest and to hand out permits. It is also a difficult point for the local people who may be breaking the law, while having a permit from the forestry department (Forest Officer 1 &2, 2017).

Another point of contention at the moment is the discussion around forest fires. To clear the land local people want to burn certain areas in the bush. They want to do this in September/October since the chiefs are convinced this will get them more caterpillars and other benefits. However, since the temperatures are then very high, there are high risks of forest fires burning out of control and destroying large areas. The forest officers also claimed that 'their science' showed that it is in general better to do the fires another time, in June/July. This is why the government wants them to do the fires earlier in those months. However, the local people do not want to do this because they claim that the later fires are better for the land and their crops and it gives them more benefits in general. The government claims that this is not true and that science points towards the fact that the late fires are better for production. At the moment, this is a big discussion between local communities and government offices.

All things considered, the local people are very distrustful of their government. The members of the village often said that: “the international community wants best for us, but our own government are only there for themselves” (Village meeting, 2017). During the interviews NGOs and organizations were positively viewed by the local people, where the government got a lot of criticism. Government officials were rarely referenced or referenced in a very negative way. In asking them what they would need, they would often ask for NGOs or foreign investors to give them opportunities. The help of the government was often not referred to in the first place, but only when asked about.

6.4 Mwamfushi and REDD+

During the interviews, I got to know that the local people from Mwamfushi know about climate change in some shape or form. On the one hand they know the word, but on the other hand almost nobody knows exactly the mechanics behind it. More often than not they do not know what carbon is, or they do know what it is, just not what it does. They are fully aware of the consequences of climate change however. In general, they seem to be aware that the trees play a big role in cleaning the air and that because of the cutting of the trees the climate, which they often refer to in terms of rains and temperature, is changing. They know what happens when they do certain things, they just don't know how it exactly happens. They point to the sky saying that certain processes and systems happen there that control the rains and temperature (Villagers, 2017).

The local people know more about climate change than they know about REDD+. In Mwamfushi nobody had ever heard of REDD+. The villagers did not know what it was and what it entails (Interviews). Only the former forestry officer did know what it is for he tried to prepare people living in other villages for the REDD+ programme. They started teaching in some areas in Mpika about it, but the REDD+ projects never came and the local people were disappointed. After this they stopped teaching villages about REDD+ (Forest Officer 1, 2017). The current forest officer had never heard of REDD+ and did not know what it entails. Both forest officers said that a lot of the projects in preparation for REDD+ went to communities in the Eastern province and according to them this was because a lot of the government officials in charge were from those communities. They made sure that the benefits that might come from REDD+ would first and foremost end up with their communities (Forest Officer 1 & 2, 2017).

When I told the local people of Mwamfushi about REDD+ most people found it a very good idea and told me they would welcome it with open arms. They really want someone to teach them alternative strategies to provide for their children and to give them the resources to be able to change to these alternative ways of living. They see that REDD+ could help them in this, but they also do have reservations regarding REDD+. The fact that the money will have to be distributed by the national government receives the most critique. They claim that if this would happen the money would never reach them. They have had other experiences with promises from the government to give them resources and money, but in those cases very little or no money ever reached the local community. A quote from one of the interviews shows the concern with a programme like REDD+ and also illustrates the bad relationship with the government: “those government officers build their own big houses from this money, it never reaches here”.

Another concern about this is that the money and resources will only reach the communities from which certain members are involved in the project and in the government. The officers will make sure that the benefits will first and foremost reach their communities (Village Meeting 1; Group discussions). The local villagers claim that it would be better for an NGO to approach everyone individually. These NGO's would have to ask them what they want and what they need and then give

it to them personally. Division into groups would also be possible, but then there is fear for conflict within those groups about the division of the benefits. The women even stated that the money should be distributed to them since some of the men did not care about the well-being of their families and would spend the money otherwise. By giving the money to the women it would be more likely that it would end up within the family.

To prevent forest degradation and deforestation from happening the local people name several alternatives strategies that they would like to do instead of gaining their resources from the forest. They would like to be taught about animal rearing, fish farming, carpentry and conservation agriculture. For this they would need education and the resources (like the seeds, animals and fertilizer). They name education as the most important factor in being able to change to these alternative methods. In general, the local people are very much willing to change. Especially the women complained that the work in the forest is too demanding and that if they were taught otherwise they would change their livelihoods without a doubt. This something that came forth from almost all interviews; people are very willing to change. They would rather do different things than working in the forest every day.

7. Discussion

In the previous chapters I have presented different aspects in relation to forest governance in Zambia. I have looked at the current state of forest governance in Zambia, what does it look like and what are the different power relations that shape it? I also looked at how these aspects shaped the access for people to the forests and their resources. Next, I showed what REDD+ is supposed to be and how it can possibly influence a country like Zambia. In the results chapter I showed the information I found through interviews with local people from Mwamfushi and their position regarding REDD+. In this chapter, I will discuss what I found through these chapters and answer the main research question on whether and how REDD+ can be relevant for local people, like the people living in Mwamfushi. I will do this by looking at the six aspects posed by Anderson & Zerriffi (2014) in Mwamfushi, through the lenses of the different theories I explained in chapter three.

7.1 Policy and Governance

When we look at the state of policy and governance that concerns forests in Zambia we see a few things that can determine whether REDD+ can become beneficial for local people in villages like Mwamfushi. For REDD+ to become beneficial for local people living in villages like Mwamfushi the national government has to be willing and able to implement it in a way that makes this possible. For as Anderson states: “outcomes from REDD+ for both carbon storage and local livelihoods and the ability of the poor to participate in REDD+ design and implementation will depend on the existence and quality of structures to devolve funds and control and ownership of forest management to the community level” (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014, p.33). This makes policy and governance one of the most important aspects in the implementation of REDD+. For REDD+ to work in Zambia, the government will have to ensure local participation in the REDD+ programme and they will have to decentralize forest governance even more. However, when one looks at the situation concerning forest governance in Zambia right now, one can see that a lot has to change concerning policy and governance to achieve this.

Anderson & Zerriffi (2014) state that for REDD+ to be beneficial for local people in the first place the different policies concerning natural resource management have to be aligned. This because different policies concerning natural resource management can influence the way local people can live in the forests. The example is that on the one hand, there can be a legislation of forest governance that should give locals the opportunity to benefit from forest resources, while on the other hand governance regarding wildlife could be stating otherwise, making it more difficult for locals to benefit from the forest.

This exact problem could also occur within Zambia, because here the different policies concerning natural resource management are not aligned at all. As I explained in chapter 4, there are a lot of different policies that have an effect on forest governance (Forest Acts, Land Acts, Wildlife Acts, etc. What can be seen in the previous chapter through the eyes of the two district forestry officers who are responsible for the forests in Mpika district is that this issue very much exists in the Mpika district. They state that there is not enough cooperation between the different departments that are responsible for natural resources, such as the forests and wildlife departments. Forestry officers 1 and 2 state in the interview that when the forestry office would approve of someone cutting trees in a certain area, this could be opposed by the Department responsible for wildlife. This makes it unclear for the people which rule they were supposed to follow and makes it almost impossible to really benefit from the decentralization of the forest governance in Zambia. According to forestry officer 2

this lack of cooperation between the departments made protecting the forests more difficult for them, for it could also be the other way around, that because of wildlife policies, forests that were supposed to be protected by the forestry office were harmed, because people were not allowed to get their resources from certain wildlife areas. This shows that in Zambia there is a need for more cooperation and realignment of the different departments that influence the use of forest resources, before REDD+ can become beneficial and effective. The departments of wildlife, energy and water, agriculture, etc. will have to adapt their policies so that it aligns with the objectives of the REDD+ programme. Otherwise the objectives of REDD+ are less likely to be realized and local people won't be able to benefit from it.

Another aspect that will be affected by policies and governance concerning forests is the participation of local forest people in international conversations about the implementation of REDD+. If they would not be involved in these conversations by their governments it will be less likely that they will benefit from the programme eventually. This could also become a problem in Zambia, in that local people seem to be largely ignored by the government or even the district offices. This can be seen in that the local people I have talked to did not even know what REDD+ is. This means that they have not been involved in any conversation concerning REDD+, not about its implementation or even about the programme itself, even when the quick-start programme should have prepared the country already for the implementation of it. There has been no dissemination of information or exchange of ideas about REDD+ by the forestry department or national government or any sign of local involvement in the implementation of REDD+. For REDD+ to have a positive impact on local people in Zambia the government and its forestry department will have to give more information to the locals and listen to their ideas about REDD+. This will give the local people the opportunity to participate in the discussion and influence the eventual implementation of the programme so that it will respect their rights. This is where the theory of access (Ribot & Peluso, 2003) can be seen. The local people are not able to benefit from REDD+, because they are simply not informed about it and have little knowledge on how it works. The distribution of information shapes their ability to benefit from the access they have in theory.

What is also important in this is democratic decentralization of mainly the forestry governance. This is necessary for it will bring the power of decision-making to representative local governments, which could provide the local people with the opportunity to participate in decision-making in the REDD+ programme. Although it does not guarantee the success of REDD+ it is a very important factor in reaching the goals REDD+ has set out (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). Implementing REDD+ via the national governments could negatively impact the way local people can benefit from the programme, for it has been proven that in general local people are having great difficulties in influencing governance of any sorts beyond the local level. Decentralizing forest governance and related policy areas could give the locals more opportunities and resources to influence the way REDD+ is implemented and thus influence the way they could benefit from it. However, as Ribot et al (2006) show, decentralization of forest governance does not always work, because of the way it is implemented by the national government. This can also be seen in Zambia.

In Zambia, decentralization has officially happened. In theory forest governance is decentralized and the district Forestry offices have the responsibility to take care of the forests. However, in practice there are no resources for the district officers which they can govern the forest with. What I gathered through the interviews I did with the district forestry officers and local people is that in the first place the district forestry officers have little to no resources which they could govern the forest with. As a consequence, they claim that there is little they can do. Their job is to give out permits for getting and selling forest resources and uphold the local people to this, but because the permits cost too much

money for the local people there are only a few companies that buy permits, the local people get the resources illegally. The officers are not able to patrol the forests and control what is happening, because they have no car or little money. There is furthermore little interaction between locals and officers and the relationship is very strained. So, one can see that there is a significant disconnect between what is on paper and what is happening in reality. Here one can see the second mechanism at work that Ribot et al (2006) talk about. Forest governance is decentralized, but not to actors that are able to perform the duties that are necessary. This is why the decentralization of the forest governance in Zambia does not work in practice.

The locals complain in the interviews about the lack of involvement of the forestry office in their attempts to protect the forest and that they are not involved by the officers in protecting the forest at all. This shows that although there is decentralization in theory, there is not much benefit of it in practice. One because although the power of governing the forest is decentralized to the district level, the local offices are not strong enough to carry their task out without further support of the national government. The national government is still very locally involved in that they determine what is allowed and what is not and in that the district forestry officers still have to answer to the officers positioned in the provincial forestry offices, who have to approve of what is happening. This also means that there is a lack of accountability. The local forestry officers are not very involved in the forest management and therefore cannot be held accountable.

The second reason that there are little benefits from decentralization is that although the power is now more locally situated, it is still far from the local people. Mpika is a very big district, which makes the distant between the forestry offices and the local people very significant. Without any resources the officers are not able to include the local people into any decision-making processes about forest governance, which could be seen in Mwamfushi village. Furthermore, the fact that even the chief of the area lives 100 kilometers away does not improve the opportunities of participating in and benefiting from a programme like REDD+. This gap between the different levels of governance is also shown in the information I found in Mwamfushi.

There is an even larger gap between the international community, where the project was designed, and the local people, who it should eventually benefit and the implementation of the programme via the national government. In 2010 Zambia together with the UN started a quick start initiative for REDD+. The goal here was to prepare stakeholders and institution for implementation of REDD+. This programme ended in 2013. Here in Mpika I have seen barely anything that suggest any preparation for implementation of REDD+. The only persons I have met that know about REDD+ are the former district forestry officer of Mpika, who is now stationed in Isoke district, and a volunteer sometimes working for the office. Besides those people no one I spoke to knew what REDD+ was. Even the current district forestry officer, who was in Mpika a week when I interviewed him, did not know what REDD+ is. The only REDD+ related projects in Zambia at this moment or that have been here were largely in the Eastern province or a few in other areas. It may be the case that government officials at provincial and national level are more aware of REDD+, but this has to be further researched. I can see however that at district level, in the largest district of Zambia, barely anything has been done regarding REDD+. The former officer had taught some communities about it some years ago but stopped doing it because REDD+ never came to be and people never saw any of the projects.

It seems that if the international government wants to have the programme implemented through the national government of Zambia, this still has a long way to go, since it does not reach the local people at all at the moment. There needs to be a solution on how to close the gap between the plan at the international level and the local level, where the benefits should end up. So, for REDD+ to become beneficial for local people like the ones living in Mwamfushi, forestry governance has to become more

decentralized and not only power has to shift to the local offices, but also the resources. The gap between the different levels of government has to be made smaller, not only in terms of distance in kilometers, but also in terms of the development of policies in theory and the implementation of them in practice. Forestry governance in Zambia will have to undergo significant restructuring and the national governments will have to invest in it more than they do right now. This confirms the statement of Anderson & Zerriffi (2014) that “successful implementation of REDD+ will likely require a combination of decentralized and centralized forest governance approaches to be effective” (p.44). decision-making and development has to be more decentralized, but the national government has to provide the resources so that this can happen in an effective way. Concerning REDD+ itself there will have to be more dissemination of information and local people will have to be involved in decision-making on how to implement the programme.

Looking at this information one can see the theory of Scott (1998) in it. There is such a significant gap between the level of development and the level of implementation that the intentions do not seem to manifest themselves on the ground. One can see here that society is often more complicated than what is depicted in these programmes that aim to change society. REDD+ is a programme that is difficult to implement, because society is much more complicated than it seems and implementing it requires significant changes that are not always possible to achieve.

7.2 Rights and Ownership

The aspect of rights and ownership concerning forest resources and forest lands is very important in the success of REDD+ and when we look at the case of Zambia and the local village of Mwamfushi we see that some things have to change in order for REDD+ to become beneficial for local forest people. the fact that there is still much conflict about rights to lands and resources and that these are very complex, makes it a key issue and challenge in the implementation of REDD+. This is also where the aspect of access as posed by Ribot & Peluso (2003) comes in. For REDD+ to be beneficial for local people, they have to have access to the benefits REDD+ delivers. In the first place, unclear and contested rights lead to conflicts over benefits and in the second place, when these benefits are there the locals still have to be able to benefit from them. Often power differences then lead to the claims on benefits from more powerful actors and restricted access for local forest people. This could also be a significant problem in Zambia. Already there are conflicts about what in the forest belongs to whom and who is allowed to benefit from it. Since the lands are in fact of the local people, but the resources on it belong to the local government it is very difficult to say who would be allowed to benefit from the REDD+ programme. Already there is much conflict in Zambia about who owns the trees and other resources on the land and who is allowed to benefit from them. Locals are of the opinion that they are allowed to freely benefit from the forests’ resources, because the land in theirs, while in according to the law all forest resources are owned by the government and who want to use and/or sell the resources has to gain permission from the government. When talking about this conflict one can easily replace the word ‘resources’ with ‘REDD+ benefits’ and see that this can become a significant issue in the implementation and results of REDD+. In this case power plays a big role in whether the local people will be able to benefit from REDD+. It is easy to see that when REDD+ will bring forth certain benefits the national government will claim these benefits, because the resources they leave untouched in the forest are theirs. So, in these terms the benefits Zambia earns through REDD+ will also be legally theirs. The locals then will claim that because the land is theirs, the resources on it are theirs and therefore they have the right to benefit from REDD+. The rights to forest lands could also become an issue when the national government determines to distribute them differently. For example, they could lease the lands to (foreign) investors and make private forest lands so that benefits are easier to capture for the national government and other powerful actors. This will reduce access

to forests and forest resources for local people and will also reduce their ability to benefit from REDD+. Although it is not completely clear whether REDD+ will cause these things to happen it is clear that the concern about this aspect is legitimate.

This is where not only 'access' is an issue, but also the 'ability to benefit from this access' as posed by Ribot & Peluso (2003) is important, because even if the local people would get legal access to the benefits from REDD+, they still would have to be able to benefit from those benefits. Most importantly, they have to be able to enforce the rights they have to certain resources and benefits. Because there is much unclear about the rights local people in Zambia have regarding forest resources it may be difficult for them to get access to the benefits REDD+ can provide. In this case they fear that the government will be too powerful and it will use its power to benefit from REDD+ itself. Also, local chiefs will prove to be more powerful and use their 'bundles of power' to claim benefits for themselves rather than for the community.

Having social relationships will also prove to be beneficial, for the one with more connections to important and powerful people will have the ability to benefit from REDD+ more. This could also be seen in the stories told by the people from Mwamfushi and the forestry officers. Most REDD+ programmes that did start in Zambia started in the Eastern Province where many communities had family members in powerful positions. This allowed them to get access to REDD+ projects and benefit from them. This shows indeed that for REDD+ to be beneficial for all local people it has to be clear who has access to what, legally speaking and then safeguards have to be upheld to make sure that everyone is able to materialize the access they have.

7.3 Benefit sharing and Compensation

One aspect that will play a big role in whether local forest people in Zambia will be able to benefit from REDD+ and in whether it can become relevant for them is the aspect of benefit sharing and compensation. This aspect is important because the way benefit sharing is structured determines who can capture the benefits from the REDD+ programme and what benefits will be eventually available. It is important that these benefits are distributed fairly to respect and protect the rights of local forest people and it is important for the legitimacy, effectiveness and efficiency in REDD+ implementation (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). REDD+ has a very national approach in that its payments will be made to national governments, which could result in problems concerning access to and distribution of those payments. That is why it is important that benefit sharing is designed in such a way that the payments and other benefits are equally accessible for local forest people and that the distribution of REDD+ and forest resources at the local level will be done equally as well. It is also important that that benefit sharing is not only designed this way, but that it is also implemented in practice the way it was designed. For the biggest challenge seems to be the implementation of equitable benefit sharing mechanisms and the monitoring of them in practice.

In theory REDD+ has the ability to improve sharing of forest benefits among stakeholders that are involved. However, this largely depends on the governance structure it is implemented in. How will REDD+ affect benefit-sharing arrangements through existing forest governance structures? Since the local forest people will bear a significant amount of the cost it is important that REDD+ compensation is determined in a way that that they can capture adequate benefits from the programme. This also depends on the governance structures and the upholding of the REDD+ safeguards (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). The local people will have to be compensated for the cost they make by foregoing livelihood strategies that depend on forest resources (opportunity costs). The issue here is that compensation that is made based on opportunity costs could underestimate the true costs the local

people really make. There are many factors involved in the livelihoods the local people currently have and in the changes they would have to make for REDD+ purposes, that could be easily ignored by someone who does not have the experience of living this way. There are economic, political, social and ecological factors that are indirectly bound to this way of life that could be easily forgotten when someone calculates the opportunity costs of the local people that have to change the way they live (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014).

In Zambia, this will probably play a significant role in determining whether REDD+ will be relevant for local people in a positive way. The fact that the payments of REDD+ are distributed to the national government means that benefit sharing structures and safeguards need to be in place and well monitored in order to make sure that the local forest people do not become the bearers of the costs without receiving any compensation for the livelihood strategies they leave behind. What could give the local people extra revenue is a change in livelihood strategies by teaching them alternative ways to provide for their families without harming the forest. Since one of the objectives of REDD+ is to try and give the local people that this could be very relevant for them. They are also willing to change to those alternative livelihoods and stop working in and getting their products from the forest, so this could help REDD+ projects in promoting new livelihood strategies. What needs to be taken into account is what kind of alternative livelihoods fit within the context the local people live in. These alternative strategies should not be connected to the forest so that it does not have negative consequences on it, but on the other hand it would be better for the local people if they could adapt alternative strategies that fit within their context, their tradition and surroundings. There should be put a lot of thought into the alternative livelihoods that are proposed to the local people. right now the products that they get account for all the income that they get to take care of their families. There is also still a large demand in those products from all over the country and even abroad. The money they earn by selling those products is very important for the local people and the products themselves are still of great importance for people all over Zambia. These are products like charcoal and caterpillars. Charcoal is still very much needed because of the load shedding that sometimes can last a few days. In those times people need charcoal to cook and run their household. Caterpillars are a delicatessen. People from all over Zambia want to eat the caterpillars from Mpika. To prevent this from harming the forest, people need an alternative or alternative ways to harvest the caterpillars without harming the forest. This is why alternative livelihood practices will need a lot of attention. It has to fit within the context and be able to be a substitute for the practices they are doing now in terms of revenue. They will have to be developed together with the local people. This way the local people can be compensated for the activities they stop doing in favor of REDD+. These things could be combined with incentives to conserve biodiversity and other ecosystem services to generate additional revenues as well.

7.4 Intermediaries, Corruption and Elite Capture of Benefits

Because REDD+ is designed at the national level, there is a great need for intermediaries, like governments, NGO's, community organizations, etc., that have the necessary capital, expertise about carbon markets and carbon monitoring and technology to allow the local people to participate in international carbon markets. They can also help to lower transaction costs associated with working with smallholders which will be important in facilitating forest peoples' access to REDD+ benefits. However, because of this need for intermediaries, power and control over payments and resources could become an issue in benefit distribution in the REDD+ programme (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). There is great concern that the intermediaries play a negative role in determining who is able to benefit and what the benefits are. The biggest concern is that weak governance structures, corruption and

embezzlement of REDD+ funds and payments could cause REDD+ benefits to be claimed by powerful intermediaries and elites. This will exclude marginal groups like local forest people and prevent equitable distribution of the benefits, because the forest people tend to have less power. The people with the most power in the chain between the national level and local level could possibly capture more than an equal share of REDD+ benefits. They can use their 'bundles of power' (Ribot & Peluso, 2003) to gain more and better access to REDD+ benefits and influence the ability to benefit from access of others. This easily shows that the fear of elite capture of benefits is real.

Therefore, to be successful, REDD+ will need to design and implement benefit sharing arrangements that strive for equal distribution of those benefits. It will also need policies and monitoring to prevent corruption and make the processes more transparent and accountable (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). This will of course be very difficult to achieve, since a lot of countries who struggle with this, have been struggling with it for a very long time and will also struggle with it with regards to the REDD+ programme. When there is corruption and lack of transparency, REDD+ will have great difficulty in benefitting the poor local forest people for mainly two reasons. One, REDD+ donors and investors are less likely to invest in the programme in poorer countries where this is a problem. With this they will certainly prevent local people from benefitting from REDD+. Two, on the other hand the poorer countries, in which political elites benefit greatly from revenues gained by exploiting certain resources, will be less willing to participate in the REDD+ programme because of international scrutiny and pressure to change governance structures and become less corrupt. This would also negatively impact the opportunities for local forest people to get access to the benefits REDD+ may bring to the country (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). It is thought that to prevent this from happening, local people need to participate in the REDD+ process and good benefit-sharing mechanisms will have to be developed. This is more likely to improve equity and prevent REDD+ from having a negative effect on land and resource rights and the livelihoods of the local people. This is also what REDD+ tries to avoid by employing the safeguards developed for the well-being of local forest people.

These fears of unequal distribution of costs and benefits and corruption and elite capture of benefits is already there in Zambia, because of experiences in the past. The fact that the money and other benefits have to be distributed via the national government is seen as a big problem by almost every local villager I have interviewed. They have experiences with previous promises that have been made but never reached them in the end. The local people were convinced that if the payments are going to be done to the national government, they will never receive the money and resources that come from the REDD+ programme. They explained that this will end up in the pockets of government officials or it will only end up with the local communities with family members in the government. It seems that for REDD+ to be really relevant in practice a large amount of attention will have to be paid to the benefit distribution. Who is going to distribute the money and who do they distribute it to? The local people told me that they would prefer that NGOs or other independent organizations would do the distribution. They do not trust their own government in that regard. When asked about things such as conservation projects they always spoke about the actors of NGOs as actors who they would like to get involved. Government officials were not often named in the answers or strongly critiqued.

It is also important to look at who REDD+ distributes the benefits to. Who receives it? Do you give it to the chiefs? The headmen? Groups? Or individuals? The local people seemed to prefer the latter option. From their experience anything else could be a cause for conflict within the village and a risk of them not getting the benefits they were promised. So, for REDD+ to become relevant and beneficial for local forest people in Zambia there have to be strict policies and monitoring that will reduce corruption and unequal distribution of benefits and it would be better if the money and resources would be distributed more locally, because this would lessen the amount of 'stations' the benefits have to go

through and make it more difficult for more people to get an unequal share of them. However, one can ask the question whether policies and monitoring will stop corruption and elite capture from happening in a country where a lot of people benefit from things like that. Especially when the country is being scrutinized by the international community it will be less likely that it will implement REDD+ at all.

7.5 Wealth, resources and Knowledge

Wealth, resources and knowledge play a significant role in the capacity of different local forest people to participate in REDD+ activities, participate in REDD+ governance, and access REDD+ benefits and forest resources (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). The ability to benefit from things like the REDD+ programme is shaped by the skills, education and negotiating ability someone who attempts to participate in REDD+ has (Ribot & Peluso, 2003). Knowledge and skills will give people the ability to think and act for themselves and gain a good position within the REDD+ process because they know what they are talking about, they can determine what they want regarding the project and if they have the necessary skills they can act as within the REDD+ programme to gain benefits for themselves the way they want to. The problem in this case however, is that the local forest people that are dependent on the forest for their livelihoods are often poor with little education and skills that could give them the ability to act in relation to the REDD+ programme. Often the local people already know little about current forest management rules and structures, which already restricts them when they have to talk about REDD+. This causes them to be less able to gain access to REDD+ benefits (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). In other words, it effects their ability to benefit (Ribot & Peluso, 2003).

To give local forest people the opportunity and abilities that are needed to participate in REDD+ they will need sufficient authority within their area and information about the project, which allows them to decide for themselves whether and how they want to participate in REDD+, under what terms and what they would like to gain from it. It will also allow them to participate in decision-making and implementation with respect to all aspects of REDD+, including monitoring and revenue sharing (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). However, this is a very difficult thing to achieve since the knowledge and awareness about REDD+ and what it entails is still very limited with local forest people. More often than not, they do not even know it exists. The local people also rarely have the skills that are needed to be involved in the REDD+ programme because of a lack of education. All these aspects make it difficult for them to gain access to and ability to benefit from REDD+ benefits. Experiences show that it is more difficult for the poor local people to benefit from projects and programs, simply because they have a reduced capacity to gain access to benefits and negotiations (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). This means that they cannot stand up for themselves and that they are more likely to be ignored in the REDD+ processes, which will negatively impact their chance to benefit from it. Even if they are able to participate it is shown in previous experiences that the poor encounter severe difficulties in fully participating in practice because of high transaction and investment costs. Because the poor are then less able to participate in and benefit from programmes like REDD+, they will not experience much positive effects from them. It is shown and feared that this will cause the gap between rich and poor to become even bigger, because the richer people are able to participate and gather revenues from the projects. This is why it is feared that REDD+ also will exacerbate the gaps between rich and poor in participating countries.

To prevent this from happening in Zambia, local forest people have to be involved in decision-making processes concerning REDD+. To make sure they are able to participate they will have to be able to gain access to the processes and knowledge and skills about everything the programme entails. This requires education and information dissemination. Right now, this is not happening in villages like

Mwamfushi. From the information I gained through the interviews can be seen that it will not necessarily be very difficult to motivate the local people to get involved in REDD+. The local people are willing to protect the forest and see that it is very necessary to do so. They claim that they are very willing to change everything they can in order to protect the forest 'for their children', as long as they are taught alternatives with which they can sustain a livelihood. In other words, REDD+ should have no problem in convincing them to change their way of living as long as the alternatives they suggest are approved by the local people. Furthermore, the local people know about the consequences of climate change. They see it happening in front of them, although no one can fully explain the mechanics behind it. Official terms like carbon are not very familiar to them. They have heard of the word climate change, but few of them really know how it works. They do know that the cutting of the trees brings forth the consequences that they see happening, like changing rain patterns and shifting of the seasons. In other words, REDD+ can be relevant for the local people in that they know what is happening. They do need more education about climate change, but at least projects can approach them with the system of REDD+ knowing that they will understand what it tries to do. Additional education is necessary however in that it can help them better understand the project and give them necessary skills to participate in it. They need to know that there is a new way for them to protect the forest, how it works and be given the opportunity to participate in it.

7.6 Approaches to REDD+ Implementation

For REDD+ to be successful in Zambia and relevant for the local people there, certain decisions have to be made. First, definition of forests and eligibility of activities under REDD+ have to be in such a way that no one will be excluded from participating in REDD+. This because how a forest is defined by either REDD+ or the national government can influence which forests are protected and what people are allowed to benefit from the programme. The potential for REDD+ definitions to negatively affect forest people will vary considerably with how national governments plan to implement REDD+ and with national contexts and baseline calculations. Negative impacts could be at partly avoided if REDD+ safeguards regarding the rights of forest people are upheld and if full and effective participation of all stakeholders are well implemented (Anderson & Zerriffi, 2014). So, in Zambia one should be careful on how to define forests and local forest people. participation of local people in the construction of these definitions is very important to improve their access to REDD+ processes and benefits. Second, REDD+ design and forest management choices can have a big impact on how REDD+ will work in a country. So, the country in question should carefully choose its way to approach forest management. How Zambia will approach this will determine eventually how costs and benefits are distributed and what they look like. Third, what is also important is in what ways the benefits are distributed in a country. So, Zambia has to decide on how they are going to distribute the benefits that are generated by REDD+. Are they just going to distribute the money or are they going to employ alternative benefit distribution mechanisms like employment opportunities, community funds or local infrastructure development? REDD+ could also provide indirect benefits to forest people via contributions to development at the national level. What Zambia chooses to do determines who will benefit most from the benefits and who has access to them. So, Zambia has to look at distribution mechanisms that will benefit all local people, not just a few. What is furthermore most important is that REDD+ has to be implemented in a pro-poor way. This would make sure that REDD+ will not harm poor local people, but that it will help them and give them opportunities to develop.

These are decisions that have to be addressed by the Zambian government and stakeholders involved when they are implementing REDD+ in the country. If these are ignored REDD+ cannot be beneficial for local people, because dangers of exclusion and unequal distribution of benefits will occur.

7.7 The Consequences

What one can conclude when analyzing all the things that have to happen for REDD+ to become locally relevant and beneficial for the local people in Zambia is that a lot has to happen and significant changes have to be made. Knowing what has to change and the amount of control and strict policies it requires, one can ask whether REDD+ is a way to help local people to protect their forests without bearing all the costs or if it is a way to completely modify an existing system of forest governance in order to get more control over society or is it both things? If it is both things: will it work or is it the next big programme that will fail and harm more people than aid them? Since REDD+ requires significant changes in the governance structures and systems one can say that it can be seen as a way to modify the system of forest governance in Zambia. When we look at the theory of James Scott about seeing like a state, one can say that REDD+ meets a lot of the requirements Scott sees in previous projects that attempted to change societies but failed. However, it can also be argued that REDD+ really can be beneficial for local forest people and protect the forest in favor of the environment. To really see what the local relevance of REDD+ for local people can be I want to look at whether REDD+ has the potential to become a success and will not fail like many projects before. To analyze this I will look at the four points posed by Scott (1998): 1) There has to be an administrative ordering of nature and society, 2) There has to be an uncritical, un-skeptical and optimistic view on the ability of science and technology or as Scott calls it: a high-modernist ideology, 3) there has to be an authoritarian state that has the will and authority to implement these high-modernist designs and 4) there has to be a civil society that lacks the capacity to resist these plans.

When I look at the first point Scott mentions in his theory and then look at the situation of REDD+ in Zambia I can see administrative ordering of nature and society to a certain extent. For REDD+ to work a lot of policies have to be adapted, forests have to be classified as forests are defined by REDD+, people living in and around the forest are classified as local forest people or indigenous people (what classifies is a person a local forest person or indigenous?) and different authorities have to be given a specific role and established to control the processes of REDD+ and monitor whether the safeguards are being respected in the country. This seems to a certain extent like the ordering of nature and society. Concerning REDD+ this ordering and structure is necessary in theory for it to succeed and be equally beneficial for all stakeholders involved. However, one can ask the question, is this ordering and structuring not a simplification of reality and is the case of forest governance in Zambia, or in any country, not too complicated for it to be so ordered? The chances of encountering more and more problems when REDD+ is eventually fully implemented are significant in my view, because there are so many different people living in different villages and communities and there are so many different forests and governance departments involved in governing these forests that it might be too simplistic to expect every actor and every aspect to fall in line with the objectives of REDD+. In reality people cannot be ordered and even nature becomes very difficult to structure. Because it is necessary that every aspect turns in favor of REDD+ for it to work this will be extremely difficult if things cannot be fully ordered and controlled. Even when everything is ordered in relation to REDD+, many aspects will turn out to be uncontrollable. It can be seen in Zambia that this is very difficult to achieve when one looks at the quick-start programme. This was supposed to prepare the country for the implementation of REDD+ and for this it also proposed a lot of changes in Zambian governance and life of local people. The fact that I only spoke to two people who knew about REDD+, shows that its goals have not been reached and that structuring a country to a new purpose is extremely difficult if not impossible if one just proposes a lot of restructuring and ordering.

The second point posed by Scott about the view on science and technology can also be seen in the case of REDD+. The purpose of REDD+ to stop climate change by stopping deforestation and forest degradation is completely based on science and what needs to happen to achieve this goal is also based on it. In the beginning the programme was so focused on this science that eventually the points concerning the well-being of local people had to be added. Still this approach simplifies reality too much. As it is shown in this paper there is much more to protecting forests in Zambia than to just get people to stop cutting trees. Social aspects play a big role in this and it cannot be predicted or solved by science and technology. Looking at the case through a purely scientific view simplifies it too much and will cause problems to occur when one tries to fully implement REDD+ in Zambia.

The third point about the authoritarian state is more up for debate. In general, I think that the Zambian government is able and willing to implement a programme like REDD+ if it benefits them and in such a way that benefits them most. In this case REDD+ has the ability to be very beneficial for them if it is implemented the way they want to. Meaning in a way so they can optimally benefit from it. However, because REDD+ will come under significant scrutiny of the international community it can also be argued that the Zambian government has more benefits in leaving it the way it is now, benefit from certain REDD+ related projects, but not implementing it full, because that would mean they would have to equally share benefits and put a lot of effort in restructuring the country. However, one could also argue that the control of the international community only reaches so far and that the Zambian government to a certain extent can always do what it wants. Taking this into account I think that the government has the authority and will to implement REDD+ in Zambia as long as they see that they can benefit from it without bearing too much of the costs.

The last point posed by Scott can also be seen in Zambia in that there is no civil society that is willing or able to stand up to the government. Authority plays a big role in Zambia. When you are a person of authority, no one speaks against you, simply because that is not done. Causing conflict in Zambia is seen as a very negative thing and is not approved of by almost everyone I spoke to. Only two young, educated people I spoke to approved of speaking against authority figures if they did something 'bad'. They also told me that the last time a group of people stood up against the government they were punished very quick and they just gave up. But this was a very unique incident.

When looking at these points and the whole picture of REDD+ in Zambia one can argue that it is doomed to fail, just like the other projects that Scott (1998) mentions in his paper. The situation in reality is so much more complicated than the UN makes it seem in several papers about REDD+ (2010). They pose a list of things that have to happen and how they have to happen according to them, but these are not things that can change over the course of a few years, as I have seen in Zambia. Here it can be seen that REDD+ is a programme that is developed at a much higher level than at the level it has to be implemented and just like many other policies there is a big gap between development in theory and implementation in practice. If the programme will keep on simplifying things like they do now they will never get a connection with the local level or even the national level, making the REDD+ programme the next project to fail without reaching its goals and benefiting local people. For the programme to succeed it needs to be developed and implemented on a more local level with involvement of local people who know about the local situation and what is needed to reach the goals that are set. Otherwise it remains like it is now, namely that only a few know about REDD+ and that there is not much implementation going on at all.

8. Conclusion

In conclusion, it can be said that REDD+ in theory has the ability to be relevant for local people in Zambia. Local forest people in Zambia indeed encounter significant problems regarding deforestation and forest degradation, benefit sharing and participation in forest governance and if implemented in the right way REDD+ could provide for improvement in those areas. However, it needs to be taken into account that for REDD+ to become a success and relevant for local people a lot has to change in Zambia. One can see a big gap between policies and requirements on paper and the reality on the ground. The effort that is needed to bridge this gap and build a programme that is relevant on the local level seems almost too great. Governance structures will have to be adapted so that REDD+ can be implemented and monitored. Local people will need to be more involved in forest governance and the development and implementation of REDD+ projects. They will need to be educated on climate change and how REDD+ works so that they can involve themselves in REDD+ processes. Safe-guards will need to be strictly monitored so that corruption and elite benefit capture are stopped and benefits are equally shared among the stakeholders. And there needs to be clarity about rights concerning forest lands and forest resources. For these things to succeed a lot has to happen. It requires significant restructuring of governance and society and the well-being of the local people needs to be taken into account at all times. For REDD+ can only be locally relevant if local people are able to equally benefit from it. If they are being involved in decision-making and development concerning REDD+ and if they get the access to benefits and if they have the ability to benefit from that access equally to other stakeholders involved. Power imbalance and the distribution of information are some of the aspects that can influence the ability of locals to benefit from the access to REDD+. Eventually REDD+ can be beneficial and relevant for the locals if it leads to a more sustainable future for them and their families. Ultimately the REDD+ programme as a whole has to work and not become like other programs that tried to modify systems and society in the colonial world and modern world, but eventually failed to do so and harmed society in the end. However, it is not difficult to see REDD+ becoming such a programme as well.

9. References

- Anderson, E., & Zerriffi, H. (2014). The effects of REDD+ on forest people in Africa: access, distribution, and participation in governance.
- Arnold, D. (2012). Disease, Resistance, and India's Ecological Frontier. In Rangarajan, M. & Sivaramakrishnan, K. (Red.), *India's environmental history; Colonialism, Modernity and the Nation*, 143-168.
- Bryant, R. L. (1996). Romancing colonial forestry: The discourse of forestry as progress' in British Burma. *Geographical Journal*, 169-178.
- Child, B., & Dalal-Clayton, B. (2004). Transforming approaches to CBNRM: learning from the Luangwa experience in Zambia. In McShane, T.O., & Wells, M.P. (Red.), *Getting biodiversity projects to work: Towards more effective conservation and development*, 256-89.
- Corbera, E., Soberanis, C. G., & Brown, K. (2009). Institutional dimensions of Payments for Ecosystem Services: An analysis of Mexico's carbon forestry programme. *Ecological economics*, 68(3), 743-761.
- FAO. (2008). Zambia; nfp Update. Consulted on January 11, 2018. <http://www.fao.org/forestry/14908-0c2d4bdac841345afbf77bdca2bb49ba0.pdf>
- Freeman, R. (2012). Folk Models of the Forest Environment in Highland Malabar. In Rangarajan, M. & Sivaramakrishnan, K. (Red.), *India's environmental history; Colonialism, Modernity and the Nation*, 169-196.
- Gadgil, M., & Guha, R. (1993). *This fissured land: an ecological history of India*. Univ of California Press.
- Moore, H., & Vaughan, M. (1987). Cutting down trees: women, nutrition and agricultural change in the Northern Province of Zambia, 1920-1986. *African Affairs*, 86(345), 523-540.
- National Forestry Policy. (1998). Consulted on January 11, 2018. http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&Itemid=134&view=document&alias=320-national-forest-policy-1998-320&category_slug=policies-and-legislations-432
- Ng'andwe, P., Mwitwa, J., & Muimba-Kankolongo, A. (2015). *Forest Policy, Economics, and Markets in Zambia*. Academic Press.
- Phelps, J., Webb, E. L., & Agrawal, A. (2010). Does REDD+ threaten to recentralize forest governance?. *Science*, 328(5976), 312-313.
- Ribot, J. C., Agrawal, A., & Larson, A. M. (2006). Recentralizing while decentralizing: how national governments reappropriate forest resources. *World development*, 34(11), 1864-1886.
- Ribot, J. C. & Peluso, N. L. (2003). A theory of access. *Rural sociology*, 68(2), 153-181.
- Richards, A. I. (1995). *Land, labour and diet in Northern Rhodesia: an economic study of the Bemba tribe*. LIT Verlag Münster.
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press.
- The Forests Act. (1973). Consulted on January 11, 2018. https://theredddesk.org/sites/default/files/forest_act_1973.pdf

The Forests Act. (1999). Consulted on January 11, 2018.
<https://landportal.org/library/resources/forest-act-1999-zambia>

The Forests Act. (2015). Consulted on January 11, 2018.
<http://www.parliament.gov.zm/sites/default/files/documents/acts/The%20Forest%20Act%202015.pdf>

The Investment Act. (1993). Consulted on January 11, 2018.
<http://www.parliament.gov.zm/sites/default/files/documents/acts/Investment%20Act.pdf>

The Lands Act. (1995). Consulted on January 11, 2018.
<http://www.fao.org/faolex/results/details/en/?details=LEX-FAOC009900>

The REDD Desk. (2016). What is REDD+? Consulted on September 1, 2017.
<http://theredddesk.org/what-redd>

UN. (2010). UN-REDD Programme; Zambia Quick Start Initiative. Consulted on September 1, 2017.
https://theredddesk.org/sites/default/files/zambia_un-redd_njp_23_august_2010_final_4_1.pdf

Wainwright, C., & Wehrmeyer, W. (1998). Success in integrating conservation and development? A study from Zambia. *World development*, 26(6), 933-944.