FSC and CCBA: An exploratory analysis of legitimacy under REDD+

MSc Thesis

Forest and Nature Conservation Policy Group

Coraina de la Plaza

June 2012

WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY

FSC and CCBA: An exploratory analysis of legitimacy under REDD+

Coraina de la Plaza

Reg. No 861031173080

Email: coraina.delaplaza@wur.nl

Thesis Supervisor: Dr. I.J. Visseren-Hamakers

Forest and Nature Conservation Policy Group, FNP-80436

Wageningen University, The Netherlands

WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It has already been a long time since I first realized that the “fight” to preserve and conserve our environment and ecosystems needed some “extra-hands”. I decided then to study environmental sciences in my home country, Spain. I have always been quite interested in the policy as well, but I did not really have the opportunity to combine this field with the environmental one during my bachelor studies. In Wageningen University, I finally was able to put both the environmental and political “worlds” together and this thesis is the most recent evidence of this accomplishment. However, I could not have gone so far without my family. I deeply want to thank them, especially to my father **Jose Ángel** and my mother **Alicia**. They have supported me from the very beginning of my academic studies and they gave me the opportunity to go on with my studies abroad, collaborating to the accomplishment of this thesis in their own way. Thank you for everything.

I want to thank to my friend **Ines Muñoz** for her encouraging words, giving me her opinions and for sharing with me many long days of work in Forum and at home. It is always better and easier to work well-accompanied. I am also thankful to **Simon Fischer** for supporting me and listen to my ideas and “complains”.

I would like to thank to my supervisor **Dr. Ingrid Visseren-Hamakers** for her constant guidance during my research process. I enjoyed the discussions and feedbacks which were really useful for me to learn and put this thesis “on the right track”. I also really appreciate all her “buts” and her straightforward way to present her ideas and opinions. It has been really enlightening for me to count with her as my thesis supervisor.

I am also thankful to all the interviewed experts who provided very valuable inputs for this thesis and also enlighten me with their experiences and views. Thanks to **Alfredo Rodriguez, Álvaro Vallejo**, **Braulio Andrade**, **Christopher Thies**, **Elvira Gómez**, **Gerald Steindlegger**, **Hugo Che Piu**, **Jorge Torres**, **Mario Chacón**, **Renzo Barrón**, **Roberto Persivale**, **Rubén Paitan**, **Silvia Gómez**, **Stefan Salvador**, **Tatiana Lapeyre**, **Teddi Peñaherrera** and **Violeta Colan**.

Coraina de la Plaza

June, 2012

SUMMARY

During the last decades, a lot of effort has been put into different policies, mechanisms and tools aimed at mitigating climate change, and the preservation and conservation of ecosystems and natural resources. However, these issues are still “hot topics” in the international and national political agenda´s, remaining, to a great extent, unresolved. REDD+ is a relatively new mechanism whose inception has taken place within the international political community. REDD+ basically aims to mitigate climate change by avoiding deforestation and forest degradation through the collaboration between developed and developing countries. Although REDD+ is still under development, “older tools” such as voluntary certification schemes, can (potentially) have consequences for the attainment of REDD+ goals. From the mentioned “older tools”, I focus on the FSC and CCBA voluntary certification schemes, the main research objective being **to explore the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+.** In order to explore this role, I have established three different levels of analysis: global, national and local, with the national and local levels focused on one of the REDD+ partner countries, Peru. The main research objective has led to the formulation of the following research questions:

i. What is the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level, and at the national and local levels in Peru?

iii. What is the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level, and at the national and local levels in Peru?

The study is guided by the global environmental theory and pays special attention to questions of legitimacy, more specifically, output and input legitimacy. In other words, the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ is explored from the global environmental governance perspective and this “role” is operationalized in terms of output and input legitimacy. Both dimensions of legitimacy are qualitatively measured through the respective use of effectiveness (output and outcome) and participation. Moreover, the data to answer the research questions were collected through desk research and in-depth phone interviews. For the research, the websites of different organizations corresponding to the international, national and local levels were researched in order to find relevant documents regarding the research objective. Eighteen in-depth phone interviews were carried out with experts and practitioners corresponding to the defined levels of analysis as well.

Based on the results, the main conclusions are that FSC and CCBA voluntary certification schemes are regarded at the three levels of analysis, as tools that can (potentially) help to attain some REDD+ goals and this topic is increasingly being discussed and documented by different actors and organizatopns. FSC and CCBA are specially mentioned in relation to REDD+ safeguards as (potential) useful tools that can prevent or help to partially cover some REDD+ weakness. Although REDD+ is still “young”, especially at the national and local levels in Peru, some positive experiences have already been reported in relation to the use of these certifications in REDD+ pilot projects. In spite that the effectiveness of FSC and CCBA under

REDD+ are still low according to the indicators established in this study, the positive experiences on the ground plus a general positive opinion among experts and practicioners make of FSC and CCBA two private forms of governance which can potentially play a more relevant role in the next months or years, increasing their levels of effectiveness. Regarding the participation, both organizations are actively involved in side-events of UNFCCC meetings at the global level. However, for the national and local levels just CCBA has been involved in REDD+ processes and activities. The participation of FSC and CCBA in REDD+ processes and activities is relevant due to the learning and dissemation components of participation. Through participation FSC and CCBA can reach and raise awareness in different REDD+ related actors about the rola that these certification scheme can play under REDD+. Moreover, a relationship between participation and effectivennes *within* levels of analysis is suggested. A potential relationship between participation, effectiveness of the FSC and CCBA in the REDD+ muilti-level governance context is also discussed, concluding that the role of participation seems to be more relevant for output and input legitimacy from a top-down perspective while the role of effectiveness might be more evident from a bottom-up approach.

Keywords: *REDD+, FSC, CCBA, Peru, legitimacy, effectiveness, participation, global environmental governance, forest.*

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ARR	Afforestation, Restoration & Reforestation
AWG-LTC	Ad-Hoc Working Group on Long Term Cooperative Action
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCBA	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance
CCBS	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CI	Conservation International
COP	Conference of the Parties
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FCWG	FSC Forest Carbon Working Group
FIP	Forest Investment Program
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
IFM	Improvement of Forest Management
GHG	Greenhouse gas
MA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
MINAM	Ministerio de Ambiente de Perú (Peruvian ministry of environment)
MRV	Monitoring, Reporting & Verification
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PEFC	Programme for Endorsement of Forest Certification
REDD+	Reducing emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
R-PIN	Readiness Plan Idea Note
R-PP	Readiness Preparation Proposal
SCS	Scientific Certification Systems
Mt	Metric ton
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
UN	United Nations
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development

UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UN-REDD	United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
WTO	World Trade Organization
WWF	World Wide Fund for nature

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Climate change, and policies and actions aimed to mitigate this global phenomenon have been some of the most debated topics on the international agenda during the last decades (Adger et al., 2001). The causes of climate change are located, among others, at the global level and hence international co-operation is needed to avoid its negative consequences through, for instance, mitigation and adaptation activities (Somorin et al, 2011). On the other hand, the role that forests play in climate change has also been a key issue in both international and national political agendas as well as a recurrent study subject for scientific research. Awareness about the importance of preserving forests and carrying out sustainable management practices have increased over the years, particularly since the recognition of the wide range of services that forests provide. In the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA), which was an effort of 1300 scientists to evaluate the consequences that changes in ecosystems can have for human well-being, four categories of ecosystem services were established: regulating, provisioning, supporting and cultural services (Fisher et al., 2009; MA, 2005). Forests can offer a large variety of services and making use of the MA (2005) classification they can be grouped as follows: 1) Regulating services, such as carbon dioxide fixation and regulation of water flows, 2) Provisioning services, such as timber and non-timber products, 3) Supporting services, such as soil formation, and 4) Cultural services, such as the opportunity to carry out recreational activities (Meynard et al., 2007). Forests are of great relevance for human welfare and depletion and degradation of forests and thereby of their associated services, consitutes a major source of concern due to the negative effects that these processes can have on environment, society and the economy (Franquis & Infante, 2003). The link or connection between forests and climate change is mainly related to the first category of services, regulatory services, and more specifically, to the fixation and release of carbon dioxide. Release or emissions of CO_2 to the atmosphere occurs when, among other things, forests depletion or degradation take place (van der Werf et al., 2009). CO_2 emissions are of particular concern because this greenhouse gas (GHG) is the one that contributes in a highest degree to global warming and hence to climate change (Meinshausen et al., 2009). Forests act as carbon stocks and when deforestation or forest degradation take place, carbon is released into the atmosphere, increasing CO_2 concentration levels (Palmer & Engel, 2009). In fact, the two largest anthropogenic CO_2 emission sources are fossil fuel combustion and deforestation (van der Werf et al., 2009). According to van der Werf (2009), CO_2 emissions from deforestation and forest degradation constituted, by 2008, 12% of the carbon global releases. It is important to note that this estimation refers just to emissions of anthropogenic origin (van der Werf et al., 2009). Moreover, the main anthropogenic sources of carbon emissions related to the degradation and depletion of forest depletion are: 1) Forest fires, 2) Decrease of forests and other woody biomass stocks, 3) Abandonment of managed areas and forests, and 4) Grass-lands conversion to, for instance, agricultural lands (Palmer & Engel, 2009).

Concern about how to slow down or stop forests depletion and degradation as well as how to mitigate climate change has led to many negotiations and much collaboration not only between national governments, but also among other actors such as NGOs, representatives of local communities and private companies, which has resulted in the development of different environmental initiatives, mechanisms and instruments. This concern has also led to the development of an international arena where negotiations about new policies take place, and where the interests and concerns of different actors regarding environmental issues are discussed. One of the most famous examples of international negotiation arena are the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) meetings. The UNFCCC is a treaty which was open to sign during the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992 (UNFCCC, 2012a). This treaty basically established the need for cooperation among countries to avoid an increase in the average global temperature and to cope with the negative impacts of climate change (UNFCCC, 2012a). The well-known Kyoto Protocol, which in general terms is a binding agreement for industrialized countries to stabilize GHG emissions (UNFCCC, 2012b), is one of the instruments that have been negotiated under the UNFCCC. At the international level, there have been other negotiations beyond those held in the UNFCCC meetings which have constituted the ground for the development of other environmental instruments such as many of the different existing voluntary certification schemes. This research project focuses on three of these environmental international political instruments or tools: on the one hand it focuses on the REDD+ mechanism, and on the other hand, it focuses on the Forest Stewardship Council certification scheme and on the Climate, Community & Conservation Alliance standard. Here I give a brief overview of REDD+, FSC and CCBA, but a more complete description can be found in Chapter 2.

REDD+ refers to the Reduction of Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation *plus* the conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (UNFCCC, 2009). REDD+ is a mechanism aimed at the mitigation of climate change and although it was introduced as a discussion item in the UNFCCC agenda at the COP-11 in 2005 for the first time (it was introduced as RED) (UNFCCC, 2012d), REDD+ has not been completely developed and defined yet (Corbera & Schroeder, 2011). REDD+ basically consists of the creation of economic incentives by developed countries in order to increase the interest of a wide range of actors (from the local to the international level) from developing countries to preserve and maintain their trees standing rather than to allow deforestation and forest degradation (Lederer, 2011; Melick, 2010). Although the payment mechanisms and (all) the sources of the funds are not clear yet, what is certain is that economic compensations will be made according to the level of attainment of REDD+ objectives (Sunderlin & Atmadja, 2009). Moreover, the development of REDD+ national strategies by each country seems to be the most appropriate approach to ensure the success of REDD+ (Phelps et al., 2010b). The development of national strategies implies, among other things, that national governments will have to put a lot of effort into controlling corruption and coordinating policies in order to develop and enable the success of REDD+ (Corbera & Schroeder, 2011). In addition to the national efforts, there are international initiatives whose objective is to assist developing countries to get ready for REDD+. The United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (UN-REDD) launched in 2008, is one example of international initiative aimed to support the

national efforts and thereby make the development and implementation of REDD+ programmes easier for developing countries (UN-REDD, 2012a).

FSC and CCBA are organizations which have developed their own voluntary certification standards. FSC was the first organization which developed a voluntary forest certification scheme in 1993 (Rametsteiner & Simula, 2003). The main goal of the FSC scheme is to promote the improvement of the forest management practices (Elliott & Schlaepfer, 2001a; Taylor, 2005a). This certification also constitutes a mean which, through the use of a label, let consumers know that the wood products that they are buying come from well-managed forests (FSC, 2012a). The FSC certification scheme is concerned with forest sustainable management issues and therefore it also pays attention to social and economic aspects (Naka et al., 2000; Taylor, 2005b). The CCBA was founded in 2003 (Wood, 2011) and this organization launched the CCBA Standard (CCBS) in 2005 (CCBA, 2005). The CCBS is mainly aimed at the identification and evaluation of land-based carbon projects which can contribute to the mitigation of climate change as well as generate other environmental and social benefits (CCBA, 2012a). Therefore, although there are differences between FSC and CCBA main goals, both voluntary certification schemes can be understood as market-based tools which act as indirect economic incentives and, in general terms, seek to promote environmental improvements, taking into account social and economic aspects as well.

1.2. Problem statement

Although attempts to mitigate climate change have been made through different policies, tools, etc. (e.g. Kyoto Protocol), the fact is that nowadays this phenomenon is still a central concern within many fields such as ecology (e.g. Walther et al., 2002), economics (e.g. Stern, 2007) and political sciences (e.g. Giddens, 2008). REDD+ can be understood as another relatively new attempt to mitigate climate change, in this case, by reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (Busch et al., 2011). However, despite the fact that REDD+ can still be considered as “young”, there are older tools, initiatives and policies that can (potentially) have positive or negative consequences for REDD+ processes and outcomes, and thereby for its success or failure. Voluntary certification schemes or standards constitute one of such tools. Voluntary certification schemes can promote, for instance, the conservation of forests and the improvement of forest management practices which can help to reduce CO_2 emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. In other words, certification goals can (potentially) help to achieve REDD+ objectives. In those places where it can be proven that, for instance, carbon benefits are attained due to the improvement of forest management practices, REDD+ funds could be used to support voluntary certification schemes (Nasi et al., 2011). This means that instead of looking at REDD+ and voluntary certifications as two different tools, they can be seen as two means where one could complement and reinforce the other. Despite the fact that some aspects of REDD+ are still being negotiated within the international political sphere, there are already some REDD+ pilot experiences on the ground (Phelps et al., 2010a). Therefore, it is important to research the (potential) complementarity between voluntary certification schemes and REDD+ at this early stage, when changes or new actions to further enable the success of REDD+ are more likely to take place.

This research project explores the role that two voluntary certification schemes can (potentially) play under REDD+ for three different levels of analysis. More specifically, it explores the role of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+ at the global level, and at the national and local levels in Peru. For the global level I will focus on the UNFCCC meetings and events. Peru is one of the the UN-REDD partner countries and many REDD+ pilot projects have already been developed. In addition, a few of these pilot projects are FSC and/or CCBA certified. These facts make of Peru an appropriate country to carry out the research at the national and local levels.

1.3. Research objectives & Research questions

Drawing on the problem statement, the main research objective of this thesis is **to explore the role that the FSC and the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level, and at the national and local levels in Peru.** The main objective has been divided into the following sub-objectives and their respective specific research questions:

Sub-Objective 1. To explore the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global, and at the national and local levels in Peru.

i. What is the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level, and at the national and local levels in Peru?

Sub-Objective 2. To explore the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level, and at the national and local levels in Peru.

ii. What is the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level, and at the national and local levels in Peru?

It is important to note that I make use of the word *potential* due to mentioned "youth" of REDD+ (See Chapter 4 for a further explanation of this issue)

1.4. Relevance of the research

On the one hand, the (potential) positive and negative consequences of the FSC scheme, CCB standard and REDD+ on forests, economy and society, the numerous negotiations among the different actors involved in the development of these instruments and some of the most controversial issues that surround them, have been extensively documented by many authors (e.g. Blom et al., 2010; Corbera & Schroeder, 2011; Hajek et al., 2011; Humphreys, 2005; Naka et al., 2000; Nasi et al., 2011; Peskett et al., 2007; Porras, 1992; Rametsteiner & Simula, 2003; Skutsch & Trines, 2008; Taylor, 2005a). On the other hand, despite the fact that some scholars have already addressed the possible benefits of using voluntary certification schemes under REDD+ (e.g. Merger et al., 2011; Nasi et al., 2011), not much has been yet written about this topic within the academic field.

As it was previously mentioned, older environmental tools such as voluntary certification schemes can (potentially) have consequences or influence the success or failure of REDD+. Therefore, knowing how the FSC scheme and CCB standard might reinforce and complement REDD+, the possible negative and positive consequences, the influence that FSC and CCBA

could exercise under REDD+, to what extent this is already happening, and expanding this idea to other tools (e.g. biodiversity conservation tools which can bring along conservation benefits for forests and other existing different voluntary certification schemes which can complement REDD+ as well), can help to the success of REDD+ and ultimately have positive consequences for the mitigation of climate change. Since the main goals of different environmental tools vary, it seems recommendable to individually study these existing tools. This is why two specific voluntary certification schemes have been chosen instead of adopting a more general approach. Therefore and linked to the main research objective, the relevance of this research is related to the generation of knowledge about the possible positive or negative effects and consequences that the FSC scheme and CCB standard can (potentially) have on the attainment of REDD+ objectives.

1.5. Report Outline

In Chapter 2, the background of the research is presented. First I introduce REDD+, its origin under the international negotiations, and how REDD+ is being shaped in Peru at the national and local levels. Afterwards, I describe the main characteristics and goals of the FSC, CCBA and the certifications that these organizations have developed as well as a brief overview of the presence of these voluntary certification schemes in Peru.

In Chapter 3, I elaborate on the theoretical concepts that have been used as framework for this research project. I first discuss the global (environmental) governance theory and the related concept of non-state actors. Moreover, I introduce the concept of legitimacy and discuss some of its different meanings and connotations. I further elaborate on a two-folded definition of legitimacy, output and input legitimacy. At last, I focus on effectiveness as a relevant aspect for output legitimacy and on participation for input legitimacy.

Chapter 4 consists on the conceptual framework and here the pivotal concepts for the research are operationalized. Drawing on the theoretical framework presented in Chapter 3, REDD+, FSC and CCBA are framed under global environmental governance. Morevoer, the research questions are further operationalized in terms of output and input legitimacy. Then, I describe how output and input legitimacy are qualitatively measured through effectiveness and participation. At last, I explain how REDD+ is understood in the context of this research project as well as the differences between *regional* and *local*.

In Chapter 5, I elaborate on the methodology that has been used in the research process. First, the research design is explained. Morevover, I describe the research methods. At last, I elaborate on the data analysis.

In Chapter 6 and 7 I present the results of the research. On the one hand, Chapter 6 consists of the results obtained for the FSC. After the discussion of the results, some additional findings about the FSC and a summary of the results can be found. The results for the CCBA are described in Chapter 7. At the end of this chapter a summary of the results for the CCBA can be found as well.

Chapter 8 is structured in three main blocks. The first block contains a summary of the results for both the FSC and CCBA. In the second block I present the discussion of the results regarding

some of the theoretical concepts presented in Chapter 3. In the third and last block, I reflect on the theoretical and conceptual approaches used for the research as well as on the methodology.

Chapter 9 is the last chapter and is divided in two main parts. The first part consists of the conclusions of the research. The second part contains some recommendations for further research in relation to the topic of this thesis.

CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH BACKGROUND

In this chapter I elaborate on the background of the research and it is structured in three main parts. In the first part I introduce REDD+ and the origin of this mechanism under the international negotiations. I briefly describe the development of REDD+ in Peru at the national and local levels as well. In the second part, I elaborate on the origin and main objectives of the FSC voluntary certification scheme and shortly describe it within the Peruvian national context. The third part contains information about the origin and objectives of the CCBA and the CCB standard. At last, the background of the CCBA in Peru is briefly introduced.

2.1. What is REDD+?

The acronym RED means **R**educing **E**missions from **D**eforestation and is the "predecessor" of REDD and REDD+. REDD referred to **R**educing **E**missions from **D**eforestation and forest **D**egradation. However, the scope of REDD was extended (Pistorious et al., 2010) due to the increasing interest of scientists, observers and UNFCCC parties, among others, on the possible co-benefits that REDD could generate (Busch et al., 2011). These facts triggered within the international sphere the appearance of what is known today as REDD+. Yet, the meaning and definition of REDD+ is still a controversial topic. The term REDD+ is increasingly used to refer to the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation ***plus*** the acknowledgement of the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and ehacement of forest carbon stocks in developing coutnries (UNFCCC, 2009). Despite the fact that currently this is the general or most common understanding of REDD+, a clear and complete definition of this mechanism is still lacking (Edwards et al., 2010) and negotiations are on-going. For instance, some authors also address or recognize the importance of including the enhancement of communities' livelihood in the scope of REDD+ (e.g. Miles &Dickson, 2010; Lawlor et al., 2010). The relevance of the engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities in REDD+ activites has also been pointed out by the UNFCCC (UNFCCC, 2009). Moreover, REDD+ basically consists on the creation of economic incentives by developed countries aimed to increase the interest of a wide range of actors (from the local to the international level) from developing countries to carry out sustainable forest management practices rather than allowing deforestation or forest degradation processes (Lederer, 2011; Melick, 2010). Some of the characteristics that make of REDD+ something different compared to other earlier initiatives aimed to mitigate climate change (e.g. Kyoto Protocol) is that forests are perceived as something that must be protected, the potential large sums of money involved and the fact that the payments will be made in accordance with the achieved results (Sunderlin & Atmadja, 2009). There is still considerable uncertainty about how to ensure REDD+ effectiveness (Hajek at al., 2011), but it will probably be implemented as national programs and therefore its success will partially depend on the ability of national governments to create incentives at the local level to change some of the ongoing unsustainable forest management practices (Hayes & Persha, 2010). National governments will also need to put a

lot effort into controlling corruption and on the coordination of policies in order to achieve REDD+ objectives (Corbera & Schroeder, 2011).

As with other older mechanisms aimed at the mitigation of climate change (e.g. Kyoto Protocol), REDD+ is also subject of critiques and a debated topic. Some of the current more contentious issues that surround the development and implementation of REDD+ are: 1) How to measure the initial levels of stored carbon and how to monitor the changes in those levels in order to establish payments that are consistent with the achieved objectives, 2) How payments will be made, 3) The different possibilities of how to implement REDD+ programs at the national level, and 4) The participation, integration and coordination of the multiple stakeholders involved in REDD+ programmes and pilot projects, especially of those groups that might be potentially vulnerable such as local communites and indigenous people (Peskett & Brockhaus, 2009). Another of the contentious issues surrounding REDD+ is the possible generation of co-benefits by this mechanism. It has been commonly presumed that a successful reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation would generate some co-benefits (Pistorious et al., 2010) such as enhancement of biodiversity conservation and/or local communities´ livelihoods. While this can be true for some cases (Busch et al., 2011), it has also been pointed out and proven through some pilots projects (e.g. in Papua New Guinea) that REDD+ does not always generate co-benefits, but can instead be a source of potential risk for environment and society (Pistorious et al., 2010). Due to the identification and recognition of the (potential) risks associated with REDD+, decisions regarding pilot projects and policies development should include *safeguards.* These safeguards are meant to avoid negative effects or undesirable consequences such as inter-ecosystem leakages (e.g. conversion of non-forest peatlands), biodiversity loss (Pistorious et al., 2010) or deterioration of local communities' livelihoods caused by the development of REDD+ activities. Under the UNFCCC official negotiations some agreements about the need to establish safeguards have already been reached (Saunders & Reeve, 2010). In fact, there has been agreement upon seven types of REDD+ activities for which safeguards should be promoted and supported such as *"actions to reduce displacement of emissions"* and *"the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular, indigenous peoples and local communities"* (UNFCCC, 2010, p.26-27). However, these safeguards are quite broad and national goverments have to interpret and decided how to implement them.

Despite the fact that REDD+ is still not completely defined and developed at the international level, currently more than 40 countries are already designing their national REDD+strategies and many REDD+ pilot projects have already been carried out (Lederer, 2011). However, some of the first results coming from REDD+ pilot projects are not very encouraging; for instance, in the case of Papua New Guinea, corruption and pressure on indigenous groups to abandon their lands have been reported (Lederer, 2011). From a more positive perspective, such cases can be used to point out the issues that require greater attention to ensure the effectiveness of REDD+. Some of the learned lessons from this pioneer project in Papua New Guinea are that REDD+ has to be implemented following transparency principles and that the support of the local communities and forests owners is essential to make this mechanism work (Melick, 2010).

2.1.1. The origin of REDD+ in the international sphere

What is today REDD+, was once RED and it arose within the context of the failure of the majority of policies, both domestic and international, that attempted to stop or ameliorate deforestation, forest degradation and mitigate climate change (Sunderlin & Atmadja, 2009). The origin of REDD+ can be tracked back to the 11th Conference of the Parties (COP-11) of the UNFCCC held in Montreal, in 2005[1]. The need to consider in the international agenda the establishment of new instruments aimed at the reduction of emissions from deforestation was addressed for the first time by the Coalition for Rainforest Nations which was led by Papua New Guinea and Costa Rica (REDD services, 2011). Since COP-11 the interest and participation of the UNFCCC parties in the development of REDD has considerably increased over the years (Skutsch & Trines, 2008). Moreover, some advances regarding REDD were made at COP-13 held in Bali in 2007. The highlight of this conference was the creation of the Bali Action Plan. The Bali Action Plan included the formation of the ad hoc Working Group on Long Term Cooperative Action (AWG-LTC) which has mediated in the negotiations between the parties involved in REDD+ (Blom et al., 2010; UNFCCC, 2007). In the Bali Action Plan it was recognized the importance of the conservation of carbon forest stocks and it was addressed the need to further considerate the role of conservation, sustainable management practices and enhacement of forest carbon stocks in activities related to the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (UNFCCC, 2007). The generation of co-benefits in developing countries through the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation was recognized as well in the Bali Action Plan (UNFCCC, 2007). Moreover, at COP-15 held in Copenhagen 2009, it was acknowledged "*the importance of reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocksin developing countries"* (UNFCCC, 2009, p.11).Therefore, this can be considered as the point where REDD officially tuned into REDD+. Moreover, at COP- 15, it was also recognized the need of a full and effective engagement of indigenous people and local communities in REDD+ activites such as monitoring and reporting activities, and biodiversity was explicitly defined as a co-benefit (UNFCCC, 2009). Finally, during the last negotiations at COP-17 in Durban, issues about the safeguards and finances became more concrete. The need to adopt the best practices regarding environmental and social safeguards was addressed (UNFCCC, 2011). Decisions about the reference levels that have to be used in order to accurately measure reductions in emissions, and about monitoring and reporting activities, were also made during these negotiations (Dooley & Horner, 2012; UNFCCC, 2011). However, there are still matters that have to be further discussed during the next meetings such as the full consideration of the positive and negative consequences of activities aimed at the mitigation of climate change or which are the financial sources that can be considered as appropriate for REDD+ activities (Dooley & Horner, 2012; UNFCCC, 2011).

Next to the negotiations that have shaped REDD+ in the international sphere under the UNFCCC meetings, there are other international initiatives that have been important for its development. For instance, in 2008, the UN-REDD program was created as a partnership

[1] *It isimportant to note the forest were already mention as relevant greenhouse gas sinks and reservoirs in the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992*

between FAO, UNDP and UNEP (Johns et al., 2008) and it aims to support the development of national REDD+ strategies (Johns et al., 2008; Rosendal & Andresen, 2011). Another important initiative which was funded by the World Bank and became operational in 2008 (FCPF, 2012b), is the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF). The FCPF is a global partnership which basically helps countries to get ready for REDD+ (FCPF, 2012c). The FCPF created a framework that is used by countries to develop reference scenarios, design monitoring systems, adopt and set REDD+ national strategies (FCPF, 2012c). In other words, the FCPF helps to build capacity in developing countries and provides performance-based incentives at the national level and for pilot programs regarding REDD+ (Johns et al., 2008). Therefore, the UN-REDD program and FCPF have the same main goal, to support national efforts. Moreover, the Forest Investment Program (FIP) is part of one of the financing instruments of the Climate Investment Funds[2] and whose administrative organization and trustte is the World Bank as well. The FIP mainly aims at the mobilization of funds for activities focused on the reduction of deforestation, forest degradation and promotion of sustainable management practices (Climate Investment Funds, 2012a). These activities should lead to the protection of carbon sinks (only terrestrial sinks are considered) and reduction of emissions. In other words, the FIP funds are oriented towards REDD+ projects and activities.

As it was previously mentioned, advances in the international negotiations have been made and international initiatives to support the development and implementation of REDD+ have emerged. However there is still a lot of remaining uncertainty surrounding this mechanism (Karsenty, 2008; Streck, 2010). The international negotiations are slow and there are usually critiques even on those issues where some degree of agreement has been reached (Dooley & Horner, 2012). Yet, REDD+ is "happening" at the national and local levels through the development of REDD+ national progammes and REDD+ pilot projects in several developing countries such as Peru (Hajek et al., 2011; Streck, 2010).

2.1.2. REDD+ in the Peruvian context

Peru is the third largest country in South America, with an area of approximately 1.285.215 km² (Indexmundi, 2011). Peru is located on the Western part of South America and has a total of 5 neighboring countries: Ecuador and Colombia in the North, Brazil in the East, Bolivia in the Southeast and Chile in the South, being in the West the Pacific Ocean. Peru is a highly multiethnic country and by 2011, it had a population of approximately 29 million from which the largest part lived in urban areas, being the main cities allocated by the coast (Indexmundi, 2011). Moreover, although the economy has considerably grown during the last years, Peru falls under the category of developing countries and agriculture, mining and fishing constitute three important sectors of its economy (Indexmundi, 2011). Regarding the political sphere, Peru is a constitutional republic divided in 25 regions with their own regional government and 1 province, being Lima the capital (Vega, 2009). Some of the most recent and significant political events in Peru started in 1990 when Alberto Fujimori won the elections (Vich, 2004). From 1990 until 2000, Alberto Fujimori was the president in Peru, and this period is denominated in many sources as a dictatorial one. In 2000, Alberto Fujimori was re-elected

[2] *The Climate Investment Funds are two financing instruments (Clean Technology Fund & Strategic Climate Fund) which support changes towards low-carbon and climate resilient development and are based on Multilateral Development Banks (Climate Investment Funds, 2012b)*

under a polemic and questioned elections (Vich, 2004). The opposition of the rest of political parties, different civil organizations as well as evidences of bribery made the president to abandon the country shortly after the elections (Vich, 2004). After these events, elections have taken place 3 more times: in 2001, 2006 and the most recent elections in July 2011, being Ollanta Humala the current Peruvian president.

Peru contains a great variety of landscapes ranging from the high Andes to the low coastal areas in the West. Peru has many different ecosystems and is one of 10 countries with the highest levels of biodiversity worldwide and many large forest areas (Brack, 2000). For instance, by 2011 Peru had approximately 67 million hectares of forests and an estimation of 8.831 million tonnes of carbon stocked in the living forest biomass (FAO, 2011). Such a high number of hectares makes of Peru one of the countries with the largest forest area in Latin America (Organización para Estudios Tropicales, 2011) and hence an appropriate scenario to develop and implement REDD+. Peru also constitutes a suitable ground for REDD+ due to the existing deforestation and forest degradation threats. The threats are mainly caused by high rates of migration from the Andes to the Amazon and the consequent increase of pressure on the land, by a low capacity to control illegal activities and by the development of some policies which partially favor changes in land-uses (Organización para Estudios Tropicales, 2011). These facts, among others, triggered the appearance of interest in REDD+ as a tool to slow down and control deforestation and forest degradation processes as well as to bring along other possible benefits to this country.

Peru is one of the partner countries under the UN-REDD programme but it is not receiving direct support for its national program yet (UN-REDD, 2012b). This country also participates in the FIP, which is expected to deliver about US$50 million for REDD+ activities (Piu & Garcia, 2011), and the FCPF. In fact, it can be considered that the involvement of Peru in REDD+ started with the submission of the Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN) to the FCPF in June, 2008 (FCPF, 2012a).The main purposes of this document are to provide an overview of the country interests in the FCPF program, and an overview of some REDD+ related issues such as the main causes of deforestation or the land-use patterns (FCPF, 2012a). Furthermore, the Declaration of Tarapoto was a key step in the decision to adopt REDD+ in Peru (Hajek et al., 2011). It was a collective agreement which was signed in October 2008 by different groups of actors such as NGOs and governmental actors (Declaracion de Tarapoto, 2008; Hajek et al., 2011). This declaration recognizes the negative effects of climate change, it states that 47% of the GHG emissions in Peru are caused by deforestation and it recognizes REDD as a real opportunity to contribute to the conservation and sustainable management of the Peruvian forests (Declaracion de Tarapoto, 2008; Hajek et al., 2011). Another important event in the Peruvian REDD+ history was the first submission of the draft of the Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) in April of 2010 (FCPF, 2012a). This document has to be elaborated by any country seeking to participate in the UN-REDD program and its main purpose is to help to a given country to get ready for REDD+ (Organización para Estudios Tropicales, 2011). The first draft was submitted on 2010 and there is now an updated version from March 2011 (FCPF, 2012a).

Peru is one of the countries that support the nested approach as the appropriate national strategy to develop REDD+ (Zambrano-Barragán & Cordero, 2008). The nested approach is a bottom-up “method” that basically consists of adopting a flexible strategy in which a

combination between the national and sub-national approaches would make the implementation of REDD+ easier (Zambrano-Barragán & Cordero, 2008). In the nested approach the counting and designation of credits from the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation takes place at both the national and sub-national level (Pedroni et al., 2009). One of the short-term consequences of supporting the nested approach for Peru has been the fast proliferation of a considerable number of pilot projects while the national REDD+ strategy has not been completely defined and established yet (Llanos & Feather, 2011). This could be seen as a positive fact. For instance in the Declaration of Tarapoto in 2008, it was declared the relevance of developing local pilot projects by different types of actors in order to contribute to the future development of the REDD+ national strategy (Declaracion de Tarapoto, 2008).

Regarding the negotiations surrounding REDD+ at the national level, Mesa[3] REDD Peru can be considered as the natural space for those private and public organizations interested in participating in REDD+ discussions (Grupo REDD Peru, 2012a). Mesa REDD Peru had its first meeting in 2008 and currently more than 40 member organizations participate in the assemblies (Grupo REDD Peru, 2012b). Moreover, Mesa REDD Peru is further divided in four sub-groups in order to focus the discussions on more specific topics. These four groups are the communication, legal, financial and technical group (Grupo REDD Peru, 2012a). Therefore, Mesa REDD Peru can be seen as the valid national cross-sectoral working space where mainly NGOs, but also research institutes and governmental institutions work together to develop REDD+ (Grupo REDD Peru, 2012b; Hajek et al., 2011). It is important to note the relevance of Mesa REDD at the national level to understand why a part of the research for this level of analysis focuses on this group. Moreover, although it is not always clear in the documents, Grupo REDD Peru can be understood as the virtual platform where mainly the members of Mesa REDD Peru share information. More specifically, Grupo REDD Peru has three main objectives: 1) The creation of a platform to share all kinds of information related to REDD, 2) The analysis of information coming from pilot projects, methodologies, etc., in order to discuss different possibilities for strategies, rules or approaches, and 3) The creation of a national agenda and policies about issues related to REDD (Grupo REDD Peru, 2012c).

2.1.3. REDD+ at the regional level in Peru

As it was mentioned before, Peru supports and is adopting a nested approach to develop its REDD+ national programme. This fact has promoted, among other things, the appearance of regional Mesa REDD in 6 out of the 25 regions in which Peru is divided. The Mesas REDD are located in the regions of Cusco, Loreto, Madre de Dios, Piura, San Martin and Ucayali (Piu & Garcia, 2011). However, I further elaborate just on the region of Madre de Dios region for two main reasons: 1) This region it is one of two most active regions regarding REDD+ activities (the other region is San Martin), and 2) From all the Peruvian regions where there are ongoing REDD+ pilot projects, Madre de Dios is by far the one with the largest number of projects (Piu & Garcia, 2011) of which a few of them are FSC and/or CCBA certified.

[3] *Mesa is the Spanish word for "table". However, since the name of this group appears in all the documents as "Mesa REDD", I make use of the Spanish word throughout the research in order to make it more transparent and easier to further research.*

Regarding the involvement of this region in REDD+, the regional Mesa REDD in Madre de Dios was created by the regional government in December 2009 and its members are mainly governmental actors and NGOs (Grupo REDD Peru, 2012d). The regional Mesa REDD in Madre de Dios has the same main objectives as the national Mesa REDD: to create a platform to discuss, share information and further develop and implement REDD+ but at the regional level. On the other hand, regarding REDD+ pilot projects, Peru is nowadays one of the countries with the largest number of REDD+ pilot projects together with Brazil and Indonesia (Petkova et al., 2011). By June 2011 Madre de Dios held 10 projects within its boundaries and shared with neighboring regions 4 more projects (Piu & Garcia, 2011). This makes a total of 14 projects out of the 35 REDD+ pilot projects being developed in Peru. From the pilot projects taking place in this region, 3 of them are certified by the CCBA and 2 are both CCBA and FSC certified (In Annex 6 a table with all REDD+ pilot projects in this region, area and (if any) the type certification used in the projects can be found).

***Figure 1**. Map of Peru and its regions including Madre de Dios (Source: http://www.hispagen.org/america/peru.asp).*

However, the great proliferation of REDD+ pilot projects without a national REDD+ strategy clearly defined can also bring along some negative consequences. There are numerous REDD+ pilot projects under development in Peru and in those regions (e.g. Madre de Dios) where REDD+ projects are especially abundant there might some overlap among them (Llanos & Feather, 2011). For instance, Llanos & Feather (2011) mention the fact that a local community, known as the "Infierno" community, is involved in two different REDD+ projects. They also address that the area of two different REDD+ projects taking place in this region slightly overlap. This is most likely caused by the geographical proximity among projects and the quick appearance of so many initiatives in a short period of time without a defined national REDD+ framework. Moreover, the cases in which REDD+ projects overlap, double carbon counting of the carbon credits could take place (Llanos & Feather, 2011). As a consequence of the proximity among projects and the partial overlapping, it might be difficult to recognize the specific contribution of each project to the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation as well. This fact can increase the risk of selling the same carbon credits more than one time (Llanos & Feather, 2011). Another added problem is that the methodology used to measure the carbon stocked differ among many of the pilot projects. It has even been reported that the same organization has used different methodologies for two different REDD+ projects. These

methodological differences can also bring problems regarding carbon accounting and estimation processes (Llanos & Feather, 2011).

2.1.4. REDD+ from the perspective of experts and practitioners

During this research project, in-depth interviews with experts and practitioners belonging to the different levels of analysis were carried out (See Chapter 5 for a further explanation about methodology). The interviews contained some ice-breaking questions regarding the interviewees´opinion about REDD+ which, although they are not directly reated to the research questions (See Chapter 1), have provided valuable inputs. By introducing their opinions in this chapter, I intend to complement the previosly presented information and provide new insighs into what the REDD+ mechanism is, and how it is understood by experts and practitioners at the global level as well as in Peru.

On the one hand, regarding the interviews carried out for the global level, it can be inferred that REDD+ is perceived as a mechanism that can (potentially) have positive consequences, not only for the mitigation of climate change, but also for other issues such as biodiversity conservation and communities' livelihood enhancement. The fact that REDD+ has the potential to mobilized large amounts of money or funds, which could help to the implementation of sustainable forest managements practices, is also mentioned as something positive. Moreover, it is addressed how this mechanism has already been successful engaging a large number of actors and hence raising awareness about the need to carry out forest sustainable management practices.

> *"REDD+, besides the fact that it needs to contribute to the climate change agenda, it has the potential to significantly contribute to other global processes and targets. I would name here the CBD target for example, so anything related to biodiversity. But also, as it was more recently mentioned in Durban, the contribution to reduce poverty or to increase livelihood of forest dwellers…I think REDD+ has already been able to significantly raise global awareness on the issues of good forest management. In this regard REDD+ has been really successful already. REDD+ has the potential to raise significant funds and to implement responsible forest management practices around the world. I said it has the potential because so far it did not and it needs to be scaled up significantly"* (Gerald Steindlegger, WWF International, Manager of the Global Forest Programme, January 20th, 2012).

> *"In general, REDD+ is a very heavily loaded term. For me in the first place REDD+ is just a discussion topic under the UNFCCC and up until now no final decision on the design or set up of REDD+ has been taken...If REDD+ goes wrong, then it not only will not contribute to a significant reduction of emissions but it might even make forest protection more difficult and expel traditional forest dwellers or destabilized their livelihoods"* (Christopher Ties, Greenpeace International Forest campaign policy and strategy coordinator, January 16th, 2012).

> *"I think REDD+ offers really good opportunities…It has the right intentions and it has a huge potential in terms of providing sufficient finances to value the many services that*

forests provide and to recognize that they are more worth it standing that cut…Where I see problems with REDD+ is in maybe the lack of clear commitment and accountability of countries because is all in the country level at the end… and without a proper verification or MRV system there are chances of improper claims or inaccurate statements..."(Stefan Salvador, FSC Policy Manager, January 27th , 2012).

Therefore, there are different perspectives about REDD+. Although, in general terms, REDD+ is regarded as a mechanism that can potentially contribute to the mitigation of climate change as well as to other processes such as biodiversity conservation, some critics or concerns are also expressed. For instance, it is mentioned the fact that currently REDD+ covers too many issues, the risks for forest dwellers if REDD+ fails, and a possible lack of commitment or accountability of some countries. From these opinions it can also be inferred that there is a general perception about the great need to further work and develop REDD+ in order to ensure a positive and significant contribution to the mitigation of climate change.

On the other hand, regarding the views and opinions of the experts and practitioners corresponding to the national and local levels, it seems that, in general terms, there is a positive attitude towards REDD+. This mechanism is seen by many experts and practitioners in Peru as an opportunity to decrease deforestation and forest degradation. It is also mentioned how REDD+ might also help to strengthen the governance of the country, collect and order important information that is currently lacking regarding forests, and bring along biodiversity and social co-benefits.

"I believe that REDD+ is a mechanism that can allow to obtain finances to protect certain areas in Peru…I also believe that with this mechanism, communities which are living within protected natural areas can get benefits and this fact will ultimately help to reduce the negative impacts in natural areas" (Ruben Paitán, SERNANP, REDD+ expert, January 31st, 2012).

"REDD+ is a good opportunity to create synergies among countries and to look at the earth as a single entity instead of as a subdivision of countries which their own political and economic autonomy" (Braulio Andrade, Conservation International Peru, Field work coordinator, February 1st, 2012).

"I think REDD+ is an interesting idea" (Alfredo Rodriguez, WWF Peru, Global Forest Trade and Network Coordinator, February 2nd, 2012).

"For us, as a country, REDD+ is an opportunity that will allow us to generate some necessary information. We do not have updated information on deforestation, timber volumes, carbon stocks and a monitoring system for forests and our governance is still a little weak. So REDD+ is an opportunity to get funds to strengthen the governance, generate and organize the information in order to be able to make the proper decisions on forests and thereby reduce emissions" (Elvira Gomez, MINAM REDD+ expert, January 12th, 2012).

"I think it is a very interesting and good idea and if it is developed in the right way it can bring along all kind of benefits such as the reduction of emissions, organize the

forest sector information, increase the institutional capacity and human resources or support the development of countries and local communities through the obtained funds" (Mario Chacón, Coservation International, Training manager in the Science and Knowledge division, January 26th, 2012).

"I think that REDD+ will actually take place, not only at the project level but also at the national level. I think that it will help to reduce emissions from deforestation but I am not so sure about the emissions coming from degradation because we have not even managed some technical issues yet" (Hugo Che Piu, Director of DAR, January 18th, 2012).

"In general terms, I think it is a challenge for the communities and many organizations to participate and develop this mechanism. It is a challenge because with REDD+ we get committed to closely look at the problem of deforestation…" (Violeta Colan, Rainforest Alliance Peru, Coordinator of the Andean region, February 3rd, 2012).

However, concerns and critics about REDD+ were also expressed by experts and practitioners in Peru.

"I also think that in Peru and mainly in the jungle areas, REDD+ have generated many false expectations mainly due to the lack of information" (Ruben Paitán, SERNAN, REDD+ expert, January 31st, 2012).

"There are still many things to define and things that are not clear enough yet. For some groups such as indigenous groups, REDD+ is seen as a possible threat for their autonomy and development" (Braulio Andrade, Conservation International Peru, Field work coordinator, February 1st, 2012).

"I see that some problems might arise because is another tool created in the northern hemisphere to be applied in the southern hemisphere…In the southern hemisphere very small groups have the knowledge, tools, experiences and opportunities to understand this idea. Then there are local or indigenous communities and some forestry companies who know nothing about this or about what is going on, and many organizations and entrepreneurs, who have certain advantages due to their knowledge, make them propositions to sign contracts to start REDD + projects" (Alfredo Rodriguez, WWF Peru, Global Forest Trade and Network Coordinator, February 2nd, 2012).

"At the beginning was a little less complex because it was only designed to reduce deforestation but more ideas has been added such as forest carbon stocks enhancement. So now REDD+ seems a bit too complicated" (Mario Chacón, Conservation International, Training manager in the Science and Knowledge division, Janury 26th, 2012).

"I do not think that the level of contribution to the reduction of emission will be large. I honestly have some doubts about the scale of REDD+ contribution in this regard...." (Hugo Che Piu, Director of DAR, Januray 18th, 2012)

> *"In order to develop REDD+….some support from other countries have to take place because what it happens many times is that the countries that have the forests which have to be protected do not have the capacity to organize everything. For instance, monitoring processes are very expensive…"* (Tatiana Lapeyre, Co-founder and advisor of Ecodevelopment group, January 8th, 2012).

Therefore, the concerns are mainly related to the potential risks for the local and indigenous communities due to, among other things, their lack of knowledge about REDD+ and its related topics and how some organizations could take advantage of this fact. It was also mentioned, for instance, the existing lack of definition and clarity that still exists about some REDD+ aspects, how this mechanism has become more complicated over the years due to an extension of its scope, and doubts about the real contribution of REDD+ to the reduction of global emissions.

2.2. The Forest Stewardship Council

Although we can track the labeling of wood products back to the year 1637 in France, this process has changed through time, and it was in the 1990s when labeling arose as we understand it today under the name of forest certification (Elliott & Schlaepfer, 2001a). Forest certification schemes emerged as a result of a proactive participation of civil society and business actors in response to a wide spread concern that arose in the late 1980s and increased during the 1990s about deforestation, forest degradation and biodiversity loss taking place especially in tropical forests (Bartley, 2003; Rametsteiner & Simula, 2003), and as an attempt to improve forest management practices. This attempt of collaboration from society ran parallel to the international negotiations which were perceived as a failure of the participating states to reach binding agreements regarding forest issues (Gulbrandsen, 2004; Merger et al., 2011).

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) took place in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. This conference was proposed by the United Nations General Assembly in 1989 and led to a multitude of multilateral negotiations and a lot of diplomatic activity (Humphreys, 2005). Although the UNCED, also known as The Earth Summit, was supposed to focus on both environment and development, most of the negotiations took place around environmental issues (Porras, 1992). One of the goals that it was hoped to achieve was a legally binding instrument on forests (Humphreys, 2005). However, due to the different interests of the participants and the short-term perspective of many states, the negotiations failed (Porras, 1992). Northern developed countries wanted forests to be seen as a common good. This idea was rejected by the G77 and China, which claimed that national states should hold their authority regarding forests issues. Moreover, NGOs and indigenous groups argued that the best approach to protect forests was ensuring land tenure rights and access to forest resources for those local communities whose welfare depends on the conservation of forests (Humphreys, 2005). The final outcomes of the Rio negotiations regarding forests were the "Forest Principles", which is a non-binding statement, and Chapter 11 of Agenda 21 named "Combating Deforestation" (Humphreys, 2005). Another important event that took place at

the Río conference was that the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD), which is a legally binding agreement, was opened to sign. The main objectives of the CBD are the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use and management of its components and a fair distribution of the benefits gained from the use of genetic resources (Jacquemont & Caparrós, 2002). Therefore, the CBD can be seen as an agreement that promotes sustainable management of forests as these are part of global biodiversity (Higgins, 1998). Moreover, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was adopted at the Río conference as well, and it promotes international efforts to mitigate climate change (UNFCCC, 2012a), addressing the importance of promoting sustainable management, the conservation and enhancement of sinks reservoirs such as forests (UNFCCC, 1992). However, in spite of some of the positive outcomes of the Río conference such as the CBD agreement or the creation of the UNFCCC, the general perception was that the negotiations focused on forest issues were a failure. Within this context forest certification emerged as an alternative tool to promote forest sustainable management practices. The first forest certification scheme was established by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) in 1993 and since then, this marked-based tool has rapidly spread around the world (Rametsteiner & Simula, 2003). The origin of the FSC can be tracked back to 1990 when a meeting between groups of timber users, traders and representatives of environmental and human-rights organizations took place in the U.S.A to develop a system that would allow to identify wood products coming from well-managed forests. Three years later, in 1993, the FSC was officially founded in an assembly that was attended by 130 participants from 26 countries in Toronto, Canada (FSC, 2012c). In 1994 the FSC Principles and Criteria were approved (FSC, 2012c). By 1998, 10 million of hectares were FSC certified and just five years later, by 2003, this number had increased up to 40 million of hectares (FSC, 2012c). Currently, the FSC has, approximately, 40 regional offices and networks partners in more than 50 countries (FSC, 2012d), and by May 2012 there were 80 countries with FSC certified forests (FSC, 2012d) which accounted for more than 150 million of hectares (FSC, 2012g).

As it can be inferred from the previous data, the FSC has gained many supporters in a relatively short period of time and it has been consolidated as a considerable alternative to international politics regarding forest management issues (Pattberg, 2005). In fact, FSC is still considered as the most rigorous forest certification scheme (Taylor, 2005b). Partially as a result of the FSC success, there is now a wide range of voluntary certification schemes that work at the international and national levels. Some of them have the improvement of forest management practices as their main objective (forest certifications) such as the Programme for Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC)[4], while other certifications have different main goals, such as the Climate, Community and Biodiversity (CCB), CCB REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (CCB REDD+ S&E) or Plan Vivo Standards (Merger et al., 2011).

2.2.1. The FSC certification

Forest certification is a market-based tool that acts as an indirect economic incentive and which promotes the improvement of forest management practices (Elliott & Schlaepfer,

[4] *Although the PEFC resembles FSC regarding its main goal, the former certification was developed in the late 90s to mainly facilite certification in Europe and it differs from the FSC, among other things, in its assessment criteria and governance structure (PEFC, 2011)*

2001b; Taylor, 2005a). In order to obtain a forest certificate, (usually) a third independent party has to accredit and ensure that forest management practices are sustainable according to a preset set of standards (Elliott & Schlaepfer, 2001b). The FSC also has this accreditation system (Taylor, 2005b). It is also important to mention that sustainable management practices do not only refer to environmental and ecological standards but also to social and economic (Naka et al., 2000). In fact, the FSC certification put great emphasis on the social and economic aspects (Taylor, 2005b). Another characteristic of (most) forest certification schemes is that due to the different conditions of forests, the standards have to be adjusted in some situations to the specific environmental and social realities of each area, as well as take into account the national context where these forest areas are embedded (Rametsteiner & Simula, 2003). Regarding the particular case of the FSC, the Principles and Criteria (P&C) state that compliance is mandatory (FSC, 1994). However, it also alludes to the possibility of being flexible if that will help to comply with them (FSC, 1994). In other words, "*FSC global standards provide a framework for more specific standards for distinct regions, countries or ecosystems*" (Taylor, 2005b, p.135).

Moreover, although the general perception is that certified forests help to decrease degradation and stop unsustainable management practices (Nasi et al., 2011), there have been some critics regarding the effectiveness of this tool in relation to its initial objectives (Rametsteiner & Simula, 2003). For instance, tropical forests were the main goal of forest certification. However, by May 2011, when 375 million of forests hectares were certified around the world (not only by the FSC but also by other certifications such as the PEFC) less than 2% of these hectares belonged to tropical forests (FAO, 2011). In the specific case of the FSC, the most recent data show that by May 2012 just 12.02% of the FSC certified forests were tropical and subtropical, being the rest boreal and temperate (FSC, 2012g). This means that just 18.12 million of hectares out of the total global FSC certified area belongs to tropical and subtropical forest (FSC, 2012g). In accordance with these data, Europe and North America are the regions that respectively have the largest FSC certified areas (FSC, 2012b). Furthermore, forest certification is more common on forest areas that are recovering and less common on forests that are under high levels of pressure (Pattberg, 2005). In addition, it has been pointed out the fact that many local communities face serious difficulties to access certification (Taylor, 2005b). This fact is related in many occasions to the high costs associated to certification processes (Humphries & Kainer, 2006). The FSC is now trying to lower the certification costs with the goal of allowing the access to certification to local and indigenous communities, small-scale and/or low-intensity managed forests (Taylor, 2005b). It has also been pointed out that due to the great proliferation of forest certification schemes during the last years, private companies have nowadays the option to choose which scheme fits best their interests, which does not always have to be (improvement of) sustainable forest management practices (Pattberg, 2005). However, other authors like Gulbrandsen (2004) argue there is yet insufficient empirical data to state whether forest certification is effective in promoting sustainable forest management or not.

2.2.2. The FSC in the Peruvian context

Currently, the FSC has official and permanent representation in Peru through one of its regional offices (FSC, 2012b). This office was established in 2010 but the FSC was present in

this country before through the validation of many initiatives. In fact, the first FSC certified initiatives can be tracked back to 2006 (FSC, 2012e). The number of FSC certified hectares in the Peruvian forests is still rather limited in comparison with the total forest area of the country. For instance, by May 2011, Peru had a total of 618.821 hectares which were FSC certified out of approximately 68 million of hectares of forest (FAO, 2011; FSC, 2012b). However, this number has increased during the last year and by May 2012, 746.275 hectares of forest were FSC certified in Peru out of the approximately 11 million hectares in Latin America and Caribbean region (FSC, 2012g)

2.3. The Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance

The Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance can be described as a partnership among non-governmental organizations that consists of NGOs, coorporations and research institutions which work together since 2003. The members are NGOs (e.g. CARE, The Nature Conservancy group), the advising institutions consist of the research institutes (e.g. CIFOR) and they received funds from philanthropic organizations and corporations (e.g. Hyundai) (CCBA, 2011e; Wood, 2011). The CCBA´s main objective is the search for solutions to land management problems. For that matter the CCBA developed a set of standards which can identify and evaluate land-based carbon projects that contribute to the mitigation of climate change. The first edition of the CCB standards (CCBS) was launched in May 2005. The CCBS consists of 23 criteria but it is mandatory to comply just with 15 of them in order to get certified. The remaining 8 criteria are optional and they are named by the CCBA as “point scoring” criteria (CCBA, 2005). Projects that fulfill the “point scoring” criteria can obtain the Silver or Golden level of the CCBA certification (CCBA, 2005; Eliasch Review, 2008). Moreover, this set of standards was tested on the ground in some countries such as Tanzania, Scotland and Bolivia (CCBA, 2012b). After these experiences, a process for the improvement of the CCBS was open and a second edition of the standards was released on December 2008 during the UNFCCC COP-14 in Poznan. The CCBA standard can be seen as one of the numerous voluntary certification schemes that emerged, among other things, due to the initial FSC scheme success. CCBA has also been quite successful considering its relatively short life-time and by June 2012, there were 21 projects under the process of validation and 49 projects were already validated worldwide (CCBA, 2012c).

As a consequence of the CCBA main objective, the CCBS is usually found in projects that include or are related to the improvement of forest management (IFM), afforestation, restoration, reforestation (ARR) or reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) (Wood, 2011). Carbon projects that choose to be CCBA certified have to generate a reduction in the GHG concentration (Estrada, 2011). However, project developers do not obtain any reduction certificate from the CCBA (Estrada, 2011). Moreover, besides the generation of climate benefits, this set of standards also aims to the identification of projects that promote the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable development (CCBA, 2012:a). In fact, CCBS is currently considered by some authors as the leading standard to ensure social and environmental benefits in forest carbon projects (e.g. Estrada, 2011). The CCBA also uses an independent third-party certification system which increases the credibility of its standard. Moreover, according to the CCBA (2012d), the CCBS can be beneficial for three different

groups of users, 1) Projects developers such as NGOs or communities, 2) Investors who might find CCBA certified projects more attractive, and 3) Governments who can find CCBS useful to help to a national sustainable development.

Furthermore, there are often many critics and controversy surrounding carbon projects (Wood, 2011) and a lot of effort is nowadays put on the preservation of the integrity of projects which aim to reduce emissions and can hence be involved in carbon markets (Richard & Panfil, 2011). The CCBA is currently considered as one of the existing voluntary certification schemes that can prevent projects from being subject of critiques and controversy which are usually related to social and environmental issues (e.g. scandals related to local communities) (Wood, 2011). Therefore, buyers are more and more interested in projects that have these potential sources of risk covered (Richard & Panfil, 2011). In fact, the CCBS have been already successful in this aspect because there is lately a great interest among byers on CCBA certified projects within the voluntary market (Harvey et al., 2010).

At last, another activity that the CCBA is currently facilitating in association with CARE International is the development of the REDD+SES standards. This set of standards is being designed and developed to match government-led REDD+ national strategies or programs. The REDD+SES are supposed to act as safeguards as well as generate social and environmental benefits (Proforest, 2010).

2.3.1. CCBA in the Peruvian context

The CCBA is one of the international organizations that play the role of market intermediary and service provision in Peru (Hajek et al., 2011). Unlike the FSC, the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance has no permanent representation in Peru. However, the CCBS is known in Peru since 2004. Peru was one of the countries where the draft of the CCBA standards was tested on the ground, more specifically, it was tested in the Selva Central Climate Action Project in Peru (CCBA, 2012b; CCBA, 2012c). Moreover, after the release of the final CCB standards version, the first project validated in Peru by the CCBA took place in Madre de Dios in 2009 (CCBA, 2012c) and is known as the Madre de Dios Amazon REDD Project (See Annex 5).

CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter I present the theoretical framework of the research. First, I introduce the concept of global environmental governance which can be understood as the theoretical context in which other concepts are embedded and discussed. After this, I elaborate on non-state stators and legitimacy. At last, legitimacy is further discussed in terms of output and input legitimacy, paying special attention to effectiveness and participation. The theoretical framework serves as a basis for the conceptual framework (See next chapter 4) where these theoretical concepts are operationalized for this research project.

3.1. Global environmental governance

The use of the term "*governance*" is currently quite popular among scholars and practitioners within the political field. However, this is an old concept that has changed and evolved during the last decades (Weiss, 2000), having different meanings and connotations over time. Rhodes already mentioned in 1996 (p. 652) that the *"term governance is popular but quite imprecise"* and he addressed that although this term was often used as synonym of government, governance was starting to connote "*new process of governing; or a changed condition of the ordered rule; or the new method by which society is governed"* (Rhode, 1996, p.652). Weiss (2000) also argues that the concept of governance has evolved from a term which was commonly used to refer to traditional state forms and their features, to a term that is more and more often used to refer to the national governmental activities as well as the activities, processes or structures of other types of actors. Moreover, at the global level the concept of governance started to change and evolve within the academic sphere when scholars from the 1980s and 1990s realized that the traditional meaning of governance failed to encompass many of the actors and activities involved in the international political processes at that time (Weiss, 2000). Traditional meanings of governance did not embrace, for instance, the increasing number and influence of non-state actors (Weiss, 2000) within the different political spheres. As a consequence of the "evolution" of the concept governance, currently, it is still possible to find this term in the literature related to state-actors steering processes, but also related to non-state actors forms of steering. For instance, Betsill & Bulkeley (2004, p.473) conceptualized governance as a *"cascade in which agreements forged by nation-states at the international level are passed down to be implanted through domestic processes within those states";* but they also mention some of the critics made to this more traditional understanding of the concept. On the other hand, there are also authors that recognize and include the role of both state and non-state actors steering processes, under the concept of governance. For instance, Bierman & Pattberg (2008) used this term to refer to the new forms of regulation that are different from traditional state forms and in which there are new actors involved that exercise self-regulation in some degree, but where public governmental actors still remain visible. Moreover, during the last years, different definitions and connotations of governance have taken place not only among academics but also between some international organizations. For instance, and as Weiss (2000) notes, the UNDP define governance "*as the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all*

levels. It comprises mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences", while the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) states that governance "*denotes the use of political authority and exercise of control in a society in relation to the management of its resources for social and economic development. This broad definition encompasses the role of public authorities in establishing the environment in which economic operators function and in determining the distribution of benefits as well as the nature of the relationship between the ruler and the ruled"* (Weiss, 2000, p.797).

According to Biermann & Pattberg (2008), *"Global governance"* refers, in general terms, to new forms of regulation different from the traditional state form but when they cross the boundaries of the national level. Moreover, the term "*Global environmental governance*" is also related to these new forms of regulation regarding environmental matters. However, the definition or connotations of global environmental governance have been also immersed in debate and controversy related to, among other things, the nature and characteristics of the actors that steer the processes within the global political (environmental) field and related to the question of "who" these actors are. Paterson et al. (2003) argue that the different meanings and connotations are not a consequence of diverse interpretations of something that has been agreed before, but rather a consequence of the different meanings that each of the words that compound the term can have (Paterson et al., 2003). Different meanings for governance have already been discussed above. Moreover, the word *"global*" and *"environmental"* can be, themselves, a subject of debate. For instance, while global can be simply understood as *"a synonym for international"* (Paterson et al., 2003, p.4), there are other definitions of this concept which conceptualized global as *"a distinct phase of capitalist development, or a spatial reorganization of politics involving a in the relevance of the territory"* (Paterson et al., 2003, p.4).

Regardless of the origin or the causes for the disagreement among scholars, the fact is that there are different understandings about what global environmental governance means and denotes. However, after an analysis of the conceptualization of global environmental governance, Paterson et al. (2003) concluded, among other things, that despite the differences that can be found in the literature about this term, most of them share one thing: they address a shift in authority and recognize not only the traditional governance arrangements but also new forms of governance. Moreover, Paterson et al. (2003, p.8) defined global environmental governance as a "*political process involving struggles over who has the authority and legitimacy to propose rules, guiding the practices of states, TNCs*[5]*, social movements and individuals, and who will benefit and lose out through the adoption of particular rules and their implementation*". Arts (2006) also notes the multiple meanings of global governance among scholars and establishes and analytical system that distinguish between: 1) "Old governance" which refers to state steering process, 2) "New governance" refers to new modes of governance, going from public-private networks to private self-regulation, 3) "All" governance refers to co-ordination mechanisms to provide for public goods between public, being these mechanism public, private or mixed, and 4) "Normative" governance which refers to programs

[5] *By TNCs, Paterson et al. (2003) refer to transnational corporations*

to renew public or private management and includes good governance, NMP[6] and corporate governance (Arts ,2006, p.2). Moreover, Pattberg (2005) in an attempt to make the idea or concept of global governance clearer, established four analytical elements which are: *1) Non-state actors, 2) Analyses multiple spatial and functional levels of politics, 3) It is concerned with new mechanisms of producing and maintaining global public goods, and 4) Highlights the establishment of new spheres of authority beyond the nation-state* (Pattberg, 2005, p. 177). However, although many scholars have attempted to define global (environmental) governance, as Paterson et al. (2003, p. 8) noted, it *"will remain a contested and sometimes controversial concept*".

3.1.1. Non-state actors in global environmental governance

Nowadays, non-state actors play an important role within the global (environmental) governance context. The participation and political power wielded by non-state actors have considerably increased in the last few decades (Pattberg, 2005), and has led to a new political arena where the role of the state is weaker. This fact can be inferred in the previous discussion and definitions of global governance where changes in nature and characteristics of actors participating in the international political arena are addressed. Although this retreat from the state does not apply to all the fields, it has been observed, for instance, within the environmental political one (Arts, 2006). The decrease of the power wielded by the state regarding environmental issues means that policy-making processes and authority are now in many occasions shared with other actors (Cashore, 2002). Likewise, the search for solutions to environmental problems it is not just a duty of national governments anymore but is rather spread among different sectors or groups of non-state actors as well (Pattberg, 2005). Due to the prominent role of non-state actors in global environmental governance, it is important to identify the members of this varied group. According to Arts (2006, p. 4), in the literature five different groups of non-state actors are usually distinguished: 1) Intergovernmental organizations, 2) International non-governmental organizations, 3) Corporate interest groups and Transnational Corporations, 4) Epistemic communities, and 5) A remainingr category that for instance includes professional organizations (e.g. consultancy groups that offer advice about certain issues or groups of professionals which regulate and set the entry conditions for a given profession). However, it is important to mention that intergovernmental organizations are not understood by all authors as a "pure" group of non-state actors. For instance, Volgy et al. (2008, p.5) conceptualized intergovernmental organizations *"as mechanisms of cooperation between states".* These authors also argue that although they do not deny the presence and relevant role of non-state actors, intergovernmental organizations *"require that decision-making and oversight must reside overwhelmingly among states"* (Volgy et al., 2008, p.5). Arts (2006, p. 4) also mentions how not all scholars would classify intergovernmental organizations as a group of non-state actors since they might be seen as *"an ensemble of states".* Regardless of this debate about whether intergovernmental organizations can be considered as a group of non-state actors or not, two well-known examples of intergovernmental organizations are the United Nations (UN) or the World Trade Organization (WTO). The second group of non-state actors includes, according to Arts (2006, p. 4), those "*international non-profit, non-violent pressure groups that pursue certain goals and that seek to influence outcomes in international*

[6] *New public management*

politics" such as The Nature Conservancy Group. Moreover, corporate interest groups are also non-profit and non-violent organizations but they can be distinguished from the previous group looking at their ideology and functionality (Arts, 2006) which are more related to business. Transnational corporations are defined by Arts (2006, p. 4) as *"large-scale, profit-making, commercial organizations with offices and/or production units in many countries around the world"* such as Repsol. At last, epistemic communities has been defined by Haas (2004, p. 2) as "*organized transnational scientific networks*".

Moreover, in many occasions the lack of willingness and limited capacity of governments to cope with environmental problems has made of these groups of non-state actors a key group to offset these deficits (Visseren-Hamakers & Glasbergen, 2007). According to Bäckstrand (2006) these deficits can be divided into governance, implementation and participation. Non-state actors and their new rule systems are sometimes able to offer alternatives to solve or mitigate environmental problems and hence fill these gaps or deficits in politics (Bäckstrand, 2006; Visseren-Hamakers & Glasbergen, 2007). These facts have led in some occasions to the private regulation of issues that were once a completely competence of the state (Visseren-Hamakers & Glasbergen, 2007). In addition, non-state actors do not always act individually when it comes to achieve their objectives. In fact, it is common the appearance of alliances and partnerships between different groups or institutions when their goals are similar or the same. A well-known partnership that constitutes a form of forest private governance and is one of the key elements of this research project is the FSC (Pattberg, 2005). Due to all the facts mentioned above, it may seem that states have now a secondary role in comparison to non-state actors. However, this is not the case and states still hold power and exercise great influence within global environmental governance. The extent to which governments still hold power and the extent to which non-state actors have taken over the control regarding environmental issues is a question that still remains unanswered (Dellas et al., 2011). Moreover, partnerships involved in environmental issues are not only based on private authority or private regimes but also on a mix of public and private actors (Bäckstrand, 2006). According to Visseren-Hamakers & Glasbergen (2007) these partnerships can take the shape of four different institutional forms: 1) Business initiatives, 2) Civil society initiatives, 3) Private intersectoral partnerships, and 4) Public-private intersectoral partnerships.

The influence and participation in environmental politics of non-state actors and the different established partnerships (private or a mix of private and public regimes), have opened new lines of research among scholars. The changes posed by these new forms of governance within the international political arena have had an important consequence and is that traditional systems to for instance, control power and accountability, are now less effective or even obsolete (Van Kersbergen & Van Waarden, 2004). Since non-state actors hold different degrees of power within the political field and there have always been risks associated to power such as corruption and abuse, there is a need to develop, among other things, systems to control the exercise of power and prevent abuses and arbitrariness by these actors (Van Kersbergen & Van Waarden, 2004). Therefore, concepts such as legitimacy, effectiveness, accountability, participation, architecture or agency, acquire great importance and new connotations within these relatively new scenarios. There is a need to rethink about some of these concepts and make them compatible with the new structures that can be found within contemporary global environmental governance (Bäckstrand, 2006). It is also necessary to map

who these actors are, and their mechanisms and system rules in order to evaluate the options for an effective and fair global environmental governance architecture (Pattberg & Stripple, 2008). From all the mentioned concepts that require being "re-molded" to match the new forms of governance taking place under global environmental governance, I will further elaborate on legitimacy. I focus on legitimacy because, as discussed below, it has been defined as an important aspect for the functioning and success of different forms of governance, policies, tools and mechanisms produced by different groups of actors

3.2. Legitimacy

The concept of legitimacy has always been central to political science. However, there is no agreement about its meaning and sources (Gilley, 2006). The meaning of legitimacy and its implications may vary depending on the context or the nature of the entity that is studied or analyzed. Due to the traditional forms of governance, legitimacy has historically been seen as a state duty (Biermann et al., 2010), and it is a concept that has been traditionally associated to democracy. More specifically, democracy has been defined, among other things such as public participation and expertise, as a basis for legitimacy (Bodansky, 1999). Regarding traditional or state legitimacy, two of the definitions that can be found in the literature are those proposed by Corbera & Schroeder (2011, p. 94), and Gilley (2006, p. 500). The former authors state that legitimacy "*derives through the accountability of governments to their constituencies as well as through wider public scrutiny and acceptance of decisions and actions*" and the latter author argues that "*a state is more legitimate the more that it is treated by its citizens as rightfully holding and exercising political power*". Moreover, legitimacy has also been explicitly related to *authority* by many scholars. For instance, Biermann & Gupta (2011) defined the acceptance and justification of authority as two main elements of legitimacy. Bodansky (1999, p. 601) uses the term legitimacy to refer to *"the justification of authority"*. This author also addresses that legitimacy can have a sociological and a normative dimension. The sociological dimension refers to popular attitudes about authority and he points out that *"authority has popular legitimacy if the subjects to whom it is addressed accept it as justified"* (Bodansky, 1999, p. 601). On the other hand, the normative dimension refers to *"whether a claim of authority is well founded, whether it is justified in some objective sense"* (Bodansky, 1999, p. 601). Bodansky (1999) also argues that although within the literature the sociological and normative dimensions are linked in some occasions, these dimensions are practically and conceptually different (Bodansky, 1999). The first dimension is an empirical one mainly based on popular attitudes that has been the focus for social scientists while the second is an evaluative dimension to which political theorists and philosophers have put more attention (Bodansky, 1999). This author also addresses the effort that many social scientists and philosophers have put on developing different theories of legitimacy and he grouped them under three categories that are related to authority as well: 1) Source-based, 2) Procedural, and 3) Substantive legitimacy. Source-based takes place when the authority is legitimized by its origin. Procedural is when an authority is considered as legitimate because it involves procedures that are regarded as fair. At last, substantive legitimacy is when authority is legitimate by its success in producing a desired outcome (Bodansky, 1999, p. 612). Moreover, Dowling & Pteffer (1975) addressed that (organizational) legitimacy not only relies on the process of legitimatization but also on actions that can affect relevant values and norms. Values and norms can change over time and hence constitute a source of pressure for (organizational)

legitimacy (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975). Furthermore, the concept of legitimacy has also been approached from two different perspectives: descriptive or sociological and prescriptive. The descriptive approach is *"concerned with how rules and institutions correspond to the culturally and historically contingent belief systems in particular political communities"* while on the other hand, the prescriptive approach *"set out general criteria against which the right to rule can be appraised"* (Lövbrand et al., 2009, p. 76) .

Besides of the theoretical debates around legitimacy, the different conceptualizations, sources of legitimacy or approaches that has been discussed to bring more insight into this concept, the fact is that legitimacy has now to be analyzed within new contexts as a result of the different realities posed by new forms of governance within the political field (Biermann et al., 2010). Bodansky (1999) already mentioned that problems regarding legitimacy could potentially arise within the international environmental field. Although he focused on international law, he addressed that problems such as climate change and biodiversity loss were likely to aggravate in the coming years and how this could lead to a need to develop stronger international institutions to response to these problems. The development of new institutions aimed to cope with environmental problems would carry more challenges for the already controversial concept of legitimacy. This challenge is nowadays a reality and looking at the great variety of actors that participate or are involved in different degrees in the international environmental political field, legitimacy becomes a central concept. Consequently, it is necessary to rethink legitimacy and adapt it or make it consistent with the new political realities (Bäckstrand, 2006) taking place under global environmental governance.

When it comes to the description or analysis of the concept legitimacy within other contexts such as in global environmental governance, there are also different definitions and conceptualizations of this term. For instance Bernstein & Cashore (2007, p. 348) define political legitimacy as "*the acceptance of shared rule by a community as appropriate and justified"*. Following the same line of reasoning Corbera & Schroeder (2011, p. 94) state that legitimacy "*concerns the way in which rules and outcomes are negotiated, administered and accepted by stakeholders, including a fair distribution of decision-making power*". Moreover, Biermann & Gupta (2011) make a distinction between internal and external legitimacy. Internal legitimacy refers to *"the acceptance of norms by participants in an institution"* while external legitimacy refers to the same process regarding non-members or non-participants. (Biermann & Gupta, 2011, p.1858). One famous contribution to the study of legitimacy is the two-dimensional or two-folded definition that Scharpf made in 1997, differentiating between *output* and *input* legitimacy. This two-dimensional definition is currently used by many scholars involved in the study of legitimacy issues under global governance (e.g. Bäckstrand, 2006; Biermann & Gupta, 2011; Lederer, 2011; Lövbrand et al., 2009; Van Kersbergen & Van Waarden, 2004). On one hand, *output legitimacy* has been defined as *"the ability of rule-makers to produce outcomes that achieve collective goals and solve problems"* (Lövbrand et al., 2009, p.77), as a dimension that *"revolves around effectiveness or problem solving capacity of the governance system"* (Bäckstrand, 2006, p. 292) or to refer *"to the acceptance of rules because of their (perceived) ability to solve problems"* (Biermann & Gupta, 2011, p. 1858). On the other hand*, input legitimacy* has been described as the *"democratic quality of the rule-making process"* (Lövbrand et al., 2009, p.77), as a dimension that *"concerns whether the process conforms to procedural demands, such as representation of relevant stakeholders,*

transparency and accountability" (Bäckstrand, 2006, p. 292) or to refer *"to the procedural characteristics of rule-setting process"* (Biermann & Gupta, 2011, p. 1858). These definitions are different regarding their terminology but all address (explicitly or inexplicitly) the relevance of *effectiveness* and/or *solving-problem capacity* for output legitimacy and the importance of *procedural demands or characteristics* of a process for input legitimacy. I put emphasis on this fact because *effectiveness* and *participation* will constitute the core elements of the conceptual framework and hence these concepts will be further discussed within this chapter. It is also important to mention that although output and input legitimacy are seen as different dimensions, there is an ongoing debate among scholars about a possible relation between them. It is under discussion whether output and input legitimacy depend on each other and if there are trade-offs between them (Lederer, 2011). Bäckstrand (2006b, p.473-474), addresses that *"high output legitimacy in terms of effective collective problem-solving capacity can, on some accounts, compensate for low input legitimacy. Likewise, a lack of effective regulatory capacity prompts the need for greater input legitimacy in terms of transparent and accountable decision making process".* Lövbrand et al. (2009) also describe tensions and trade-offs between output and input legitimacy in their study of the CDM market. However, although some attempts to clarify this possible relationship between output and input dimensions of legitimacy have been made, there are no conclusive or enough findings yet to draw definitive conclusions.

Legitimacy is also relevant because its absence can compromise the functioning and success of any form of governance. This is especially important for groups of non-state actors because unlike governments, their legitimacy is not based on popular democracy (it was mentioned before how democracy has historically be seen a core element of legitimacy). Therefore, the justification and acceptance of authority by the actors involved in groups of non-state actors and by the public can determine their success and their permanence in the political sphere over the years. Cashore (2002) states that the viability and success of a new form of governance posed by non-state actors is highly dependent on their legitimacy and argues that external audiences have power to give or take away the legitimacy of an entity. Therefore, it is likely that any kind of organization (not only those groups whose members are non-governmental actors) will try to ensure their legitimacy over time through different kind of actions (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975). Moreover, a deficit or gap of legitimacy in the international environmental political arena has been addressed. Lövbrand et al. (2009, p.77) argue that for the input dimension this gap comes from the *"mismatch between decision-making circles in international arenas and the global publics affected by their decisions";* in other words, citizens are not directly connected to goblal governance arrangements and the lack of pre-existing rules about, for instance, accountability and authority issues can lead to this "mismatch" between the international arena and those affected by the decisions made in this arena. Regarding output legitimacy *"the lack of substantive outcome represents the output dimension of the legitimacy gap in global environmental governance".* As a counterpoint, some authors have argued that the appearance of groups of non-state actors and the consequent dispersion of power could be a way to reduce the lack of legitimacy identified in the political international arena (Lövbrand et al., 2009). However, other scholars remain skeptical about this fact (Lövbrand et al., 2009).

3.2.1. Output legitimacy and Effectiveness

As it was mentioned before, most of the definitions of output legitimacy proposed by different authors, explicitly or inexplicitly, address the relevance of effectiveness for this concept. Effectiveness has been mainly used in the international relations literature by academics trying to analysed and compare the effectiveness of different regimes (Biermann & Bauer, 2005). Due to the strong relation between output legitimacy and effectiveness, it might be difficult, in some occasions, to establish as distinction among them. However, drawing on Biermann & Gupta (2011) and Rosendal & Anderson (2011), effectiveness can be understood as *"institutional performance"* regarding the results, while output legitimacy *"is concerned with the perception of the results among a broader range of stakeholders"* (Rosendal & Andresen, 2011, p. 1909). Moreover, different conceptualizations and dimensions have been defined and analysed for effectiveness by different authors but, in general terms, an institution, policy or measure can be considered effective when it ameliorates or solves the problems that motivated its creation in the first place (Gulbrandsen, 2005). However, it is hard to assess effectiveness in a straightforward way because the isolation of the causal effects might constitute an almost impossible task (Gulbrandsen 2005).

It has been argued that effectiveness can be influenced by the type of problem and the problem-solving ability or capacity (Skjaerseth & Wettestad, 2002) of the considered entity, tool or even an individual person. This statement relies, in general terms, on the fact that regarding the type of problem it can be easier or not to cope with it and on the different degrees in the capacity to solve a problem of a given entity (Skjaerseth & Wettestad, 2002, p.106). On one hand, regarding the type of problem, Kalfagianni & Pattberg (2011) in their study of the effectiveness of transnational rule-setting organizations, describe how the characteristics of a problem can help to partially explain effectiveness. These authors mention five characteristic of the structure of problem that can influence effectiveness: 1)The nature of the problem that is being addressed which refers to *"the scale of its temporal and spatial effects within a geophysical system",* 2) The salience of problems for political actors which is the *"importance that actors attach to particular issues"*, 3) The level of awareness in society, 4) The establishment of knowledge associated with the causes and consequences of the problem and 5) The prior existence of public regulation which is described as relevant part of the problem structure because *"public regulation can sometimes create synergy with non-state rule thus increasing the latter's effectiveness in dealing with certain issues"* (Kalfagianni & Pattberg, 2011, p.8-9). On the other hand, the degree of capacity or ability to solve a problem can be related to what it has been named by some authors as institutional effectiveness. For instance, Bäckstrand (2006) in her study of the multi-stakeholder partnerships for sustainable development, also operationalizes output legitimacy in terms of effectiveness and she addresses how (at least in this case) effectiveness can be assessed looking at two dimensions: 1) The extent to which desired outcomes are reached, and 2) To what degree a partnership network has an appropriate *institutional design* to reach the desired outcomes. Drawing on Bäckstrand, Lövbrand at al. (2009, p.79) analyzed *institutional effectiveness* by looking at *"the extent to which the governance arrangement has established mechanisms for goal achievement and evaluation".* Moreover, Szulecki et al. (2011) in their attempt to explain the variation in the effectiveness of transnational energy partnerships, also argue that the internal

structure of the partnership, mainly the decisions-making mechanisms, management structures and the character of the actors involved, are elements that play an important role and should be considered when looking at variations in effectiveness. They address that *"legal and institutional design as well as the internal organizational structure of a partnership"* matters regarding effectiveness (Szulecki et al., 2011, p. 716).

Besides of the elements or dimensions that can be studied for the assessment of effectiveness, this concept has been operationalized by many authors in terms of output, outcome and impact. Although variations in the terminology can be found in the literature, the distinction between output, outcome and impact has been commonly used within the policy analysis field and it has been applied in many occasions to study the effectiveness of international regimes (Biermann & Bauer, 2005). Some examples of authors that have study effectiveness through output, outcome and impact are: Szulecki et al. (2011) in their study of the effectiveness of transnational energy partnerships, Lederer (2011) is his comparison of two carbon governance instruments (CDM and REDD+), Beisheim & Dingwerth (2008) in their analysis of private transnational agreements and Biermann & Bauer (2005) in their study of international bureaucracies. As it was mentioned before, in order to make output, outcome and impact consistent with the context of the research, differences in the terminology used to define them can be found in the literature. However, as the following examples show, the essence of output, outcome and impact is the same for many authors. For instance, Szulecki et al. (2011, p. 716), refer to output as the *"actual activities such as issuing regulations, producing reports, conducting research or organizations meetings"*; outcome as *"changes in behaviour"* and impact as *"the actual improvement in the problem areas in the form of tangible changes in economic, social or environmental parameters*". Drawing on Young, Beisheim & Dingwerth (2008) describe output as the generation of papers and workshops; outcome refers to the compliance to the rules set by a private governance scheme and impact refers to problem that have been partially or completely solved as a result of the scheme. Finally, Biermann & Bauer (2005, p. 18) define output as *"the actual activity of the bureaucracy"*; outcome as *"the observable changes in the behaviour of actors targeted by the bureaucracies' output (including unintended consequences)"* and impact as *"the changes in economic, social or ecological parameters that result from the change in actors' behaviour".*

Moreover, other scholars have mentioned a possible relation between output, outcome and impact. For instance, Skjaerseth & Wettestad (2002) addressed a lack of attention to outcome and the special importance of this dimension to link output and impact and therefore assess effectiveness. They also point out that first output has to be produced in order to induce outcomes and how despite the fact that outcome might be seen as a necessary condition, behavioral changes are not sufficient to achieve effectiveness in the context of regimes (Skjaerseth & Wettestad, 2002). Regarding the relation between output, outcome and impact, Lederer (2011) also argues that it is not enough if a policy instrument is just applied (output), but in order to be effective, it also has to reach the pre-determined targets inducing to compliance (outcome) and solve the problems that motivated the creation of a given instrument (impact). Finally, Dellas et al. (2011) open new lines of research suggesting that it would be interesting to apply effectiveness and the dimensions of output, outcome and impact to other theoretical concepts such as agency, in order to assess the way in which actors exercised agency and the effectiveness of actors prescribing behavior.

Furthermore, some authors have addressed a lack of effectiveness in environmental international policies and two key strategies or propositions have been made in order to increase the effectiveness within this field. One of them consists of the adaptation of the level and spatial scales of governance to the scale and level of the environmental problems. The second proposition is to increase the involvement of non-state actors through participation in environmental decision-making processes (Newig & Fritsch, 2009b). Gulbrandsen (2005, p. 128) also argues that *"participation is a precondition for effectiveness".* This second strategy and Gulbrandsen´s (2005) statement could be interpreted as a link between output and input legitimacy (See previous section). In order to better understand input legitimacy, the role that it plays within this research and its (possible) relation with output legitimacy, this concept is further discussed in the next section.

3.2.2. Input legitimacy and Participation

As it was mentioned before, input legitimacy refers to "*procedural demands, such as representation of relevant stakeholder, transparency and accountability"* (Bäckstrand, 2006, p. 292) in a given process or, in other words, *"to the democratic quality of rule-making process"* (Lövbrand et al., 2009, p.77). Skogstad (2003, p.322) also argues that input legitimacy strategies *"rely on the rhetoric of participation and of consensus".* This author, within the context of his research about EU regulatory governing, addresses how through participation, a "democratization" of a given policy takes place and hence the outcomes of that policy might be better accepted by the public, having positive consequence for its legitimacy. As it can be inferred from these definitions or conceptualizations of input legitimacy, participation is regarded as an important element to satisfy the procedural demands of a process enhancing its democratization and hence legitimatization. Other elements such as transparency and accountability are also highlighted as important for input legitimacy. However, since in the next chapter input legitimacy will be operationalized through participation, I focus this discussion just on this element.

As for effectiveness, there is not a definitive meaning of participation and definitions can vary in order to make them consistent with the context of a given research project. For instance, Newig & Fritsch (2009b, p.209), in their attempt to shed some light into the potential improvement of environmental governance through the involvement of citizen, conceptualized participation as *"all forms of influence on the design of collectively binding agreements by persons and organizations that are not routinely in charge of these tasks"*. Lövbrand et al. (2009, p.78-79) defined participation as the *"inclusion of affected actors, directly or indirectly, in the justification, making and implementation of standards".* Their research focused on the legitimacy gap in global environmental governance and by standards they are referring to output and input legitimacy which are used to assess the performance of the CDM. Bulkeley & Mol (2003, p.151) address that participation *"is not just a matter of representing people, but of the ideas and values which they carry with them".* In line with this statement Lövbrand et al. (2009) also point out that it is important to look if the concerns and views of the participants are incorporated and considered during processes; in other words, they emphasized the importance of responsiveness for participation. Beisheim & Dingwerth (2008) also address how "just participation" is not enough to guarantee that a process is democratic and they describe three dimensions of participation that should be considered in

order to ensure the democratization of a process. These three dimensions are: 1) Inclusiveness, which means that "*all stakeholder interests should be effectively represented"*, 2) Fairness, which refers to the fact that *"all stakeholders should be able to participate in the process either on an equal basis or on the basis of morally justified graduated participation rights",* and 3) Representativeness, which means that *"participants must be sincere and legitimate representatives of their constituencies"* (Beisheim & Dingwerth, 2008, p.13). Moreover, other authors such us Schroeder (2010) have developed different systems to address or measure participation. Although this author refers to the *involvement* in policy-making as way to measure agency[7], this can also be understood as participation. In fact, the system developed by this author is based on a document which contains a spectrum of public participation and was elaborated by the International Association of Public Participation[8]. Schroeder (2010, p.322) states that involvement can take place, among other ways, *"by being informed of facts and outcomes"*, *"being involved as a junior partner and ensured that views and concerned are reflected in the outcomes"*, and *"being empowered and conferred decision-making authority"*. For instance, the second type of involvement defined by this author (being involved as a junior partner and ensured that views and concerned are reflected in the outcomes) is highly related with the previously mentioned dimension of participation, responsiveness.

Besides the different definitions, conceptualizations and dimensions, participation "itself" has been a controversial topic within international (environmental) politics. During the 1960s, demands for an enhancement of participation in political issues started to be raised (Newig & Fritsch, 2009a) and these claims have increased over the years, being exacerbated by the appearance and relevance of the role of non-state actors in the international political sphere within the lastdecades. In fact, a large part of the international (environmental) political research pays special attention to the role and participation of different groups of non-state actors (Auer, 2000). Although some critiques and concerns have been expressed regarding the enhancement of participation of non-state actors in (environmental) political process, there is an increasing consensus about the need to increase public participation in environmental decision-making processes (Bulkeley & Mol, 2003). This fact has been expressed, for instance, in institutionalized rules such as the Århus Convention[9] or some EU directives[10] (Newig & Fritsch, 2009b). The benefits, or even need, to include a broader range of actors and stakeholders in (environmental) decision-making process has also been pointed out by many scholars. For instance, Rosendal & Andresen (2011, p. 1910) state that "*a comprehensive, integrative approach with strong stakeholder participation may have greater long term success".* Bodansky (1999) argues that participation can help to give a sense of ownership to

[7] *In words of Schroeder (2010, p. 322) agency "may arise from the purposeful steering by constituents either directly by making steering decisions or indirectly by influencing the decisions of other actors"*

[8] *The International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) seeks the promotion and improvement of public participation worldwide in relation to individuals, goverments, institutions and other entities which can affect public interests*

[9] *The Århus Convention focused on the interaction between public and private authorities and is concerned with the gratings of public rights regarding the access to information, public participation and access to justice, in governmental decision-making processes at different levels of governance.*

[10] *An example is the Water Framework Directive (Directive 2000/60/EC) (Newig & Fritsch,2009:a)*

the stakeholders involved in a given process contributing to its legitimacy. Following the same line of reasoning, Newig & Fritsch (2009b) argue that an improvement in policy implementation might be expected through an increase in participation. Gulbrandsen (2005, p. 128) goes one step further and suggests that *"participation is a precondition for effectiveness".*

On the one hand, it has been argued that there is a lack of democracy and legitimacy within global governance (Nanz & Steffek, 2004) and how through an enhancement of the participation of non-state actors, this gap could be (partially) closed in different ways (e.g. Beisheim & Dingwerth, 2008; Lövbrand, 2009; Newig & Fritsch, 2009b). Through participation, non-state actors can for instance, produce and gather important information, carry out dissemination and advocacy functions, and facilitate environmental inter-state negotiations (Auer, 200). Moreover, Bulkeley & Mol (2003) after studying participation in environmental governance, summarized in four points arguments in favor of more participatory processes within this field. They argue that 1) An enhancement of participation of actors different from the traditional state actors can help to close the gap between the environmental problems that have already been scientifically-defined and the experiences, values and practices of actors who might be not only the cause but also the solution for these problems, 2) Participation can help to reach more appropriate problem-definitions and lead to a broader support because it helps to clarify different interest and views regarding a given problem, 3) The enhancement of the quality and support of an environmental decision-making process can be a consequence of the learning component that participation has for the participants, and 4) Participation might also lead to an improvement of the quality of decision-making process because it may increase the democratic content, the commitment among actors and prevent implementation problems. On the other hand, critics or concerns about an enhancement of participation in (environmental) governance have been also expressed. For instance, some scholars have addressed that such enhancement may has negative consequence for effectiveness (Newig & Fritsch, 2009b). Other authors have wondered if participation actually improves policy outcomes and in what circumstances or to what extent the outcomes are improved (Newig & Fritsch, 2009b). Moreover, it is also common to find in the literature dealing with participation and input legitimacy, the question of "*who*" should be enable to participate (Bodansky, 1999) and in what stage of the decision-making process should the participation of a given group of actors be facilitated (Bulkeley & Mol, 2003). Concerns about the way to institutionalized and organized participation as well as how to prevent confusion and avoid "*paralyzing policy making"* have also been expressed (Bulkeley & Mol, 2003, p.151). The controversy about participation goes even further when other structural and political features are taking into account. The norms of participation, characteristics of the participatory processes and stakeholder participation practices that "rule" in a specific context (Schroeder, 2010) are essential elements that should be considered, mainly when making comparisons among different decision-making processes. Bodansky (1999) pointed out that the scale of governance can also play an important role regarding the possibilities of (citizen) participation, being scale of governance and participation negatively correlated; in other words, when the scale governance increases, citizen participation might decrease. Newig & Fritsch (2009a) also explored the relation between multiple levels of governance and participation regarding the quality of environmental outputs and the improvement of compliance and implementation. They concluded that although further research is needed

"participation can contribute to deliver effective, legitimate and efficient environmental policies in a multilevel context" (Newig & Fritsch, 2009a, p.210).

From all the exposed above, it can be inferred that participation is currently a central concept in politics due to, among other things, the fact that global environmental governance decisions are in most of the cases beyond the reach of many stakeholders which are ultimately affected by these decisions, which could lead to effectiveness and legitimacy problems. Despite the fact that there are some critiques, enhancement of participation of non-state actors can be seen as way to voice the views and concerns of new groups of stakeholders and make political outcomes more legitimate and effective. However, the conditions for participation, the extent to which participation actually (if) improves political outcomes, effectiveness or under what circumstances such improvements take place, are still being debated and the need for further research about this and other related issues has been manifested by most scholars.

CHAPTER 4: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter the theoretical framework (See Chapter 3) is operationalized for the research project. I first explain how REDD+, FSC and CCBA are framed under global environmental governance. Moreover, I discuss why I use legitimacy to explore the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+. At last, the operationalization of output legitimacy through effectiveness and of input legitimacy in terms of participation is described. In addition, I explain how the concept of REDD+ is used in the research and I establish the differences between regional and local. Although the two latter issues are not related to the theoretical framework, it is important to explain the conceptualization of REDD+ as well as the differences between regional and local within this research project in order to avoid misunderstandings in the following chapters.

4.1. REDD+, FSC and CCBA in global environmental governance

In this section, I first argue why REDD+ can be seen as a "hybrid mechanism" which is consequence of several of the current processes taking place under global environmental governance. Moreover, FSC and CCBA are discussed together as private forms of governance that can be seen as two groups of non-state actors involved in global environmental governance. I make use of the four elements of global governance stated by Pattberg (2005) as a tool to reinforce and organize my arguments. Finally, it is important to remember that global environmental governance is used as a theoretical frame for REDD+, FSC and CCBA under which other theoretical concepts are further operationalized and used to attain the main research objective of the research, which is **to explore the role that the FSC and the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level and at the national and local levels in Peru** (See Chapter 1).

4.1.1. REDD+ in global environmental governance

As it was mentioned in the theoretical framework, global environmental governance refers, in general terms, to the co-existence of state and non-state steering processes due to a partial retreat of the state and an increasing participation of non-state actors regarding international environmental issues. However, while currently the influence of non-state actors is relevant, the role of national governments should not be underestimated. REDD+ can be considered as a mechanism that within the international sphere is being negotiated and developed by different national governments. However, non-state actors also play a relevant role in REDD+. Although this role might not be so evident at the international level, it is important for the development and implementation of this mechanism at other levels of governance. For instance, as it was mentioned for the case of Peru (See Chapter 2), the development of the national REDD+ programme is being coordinated by the MINAM[11] and Mesa REDD; in other words, by national state actors as well as by non-state actors. In Peru, the development of REDD+ pilot projects at the local level is also being carried out by non-state actors in most of

[11] *Peruvian Ministry of Environment*

the cases. Moreover, as Corbera & Schroeder note (2011, p.90), "*REDD+ is a governance process with multiple actors, interests and activities, involving several sources of informal power and authority (UN bodies, multilateral organizations, governments but also community and indigenous organizations), which all influence each other and may or may not coincide in their interests and vision regarding how such strategy of forest and climate governance should actually look in the future".* On the other hand, REDD+ is a mechanism by which developing countries will be compensated for reducing emissions and where markets will also play an important role regarding the perception of payments (Phelps et al., 2010). Therefore, markets can be considered as another non-state element which plays a role in REDD+ and will influence its functioning. REDD+ can hence be seen as a "hybrid political mechanism" in which public but also private forms of governance need to cooperate in order to make it work on the ground and achieve a significant reduction in CO_2 emissions. The characterization of REDD+ as a "hybrid mechanism"consequence of several global environmental governance processes, is discussed making use of Pattberg´s (2005) elements for global governance. I argue that REDD+ complies, in different degrees, with all of them:

***1) Non-state actors*:** This type of actors is involved in different degrees in the development or implementation of REDD+, mainly at the local and national governance levels. Despite the fact that the at the international level governmental actors play a preponderant role, REDD+ should not be seen as a mechanism that only relies on this type of actors. The previous definition of Corbera & Schroeder (2011) of REDD+ also supports this idea since they enumerate both, state and non-state actors in relation to REDD+ processes. Moreover, at the international level, NGOs (e.g. Rainforest, indigenous communites representatives) are involved in the UN-REDD programme and FCPF (e.g. The Nature Conservancy group). As it was mentioned before (See Chapter 2), both UN-REDD programme and the FCPF offer support for the development of REDD+ national strategies. In addition, the presence of non-state actors in REDD+ processes at the national and local levels in the Peruvian context, also supports this argument (See Chapter 2).

***2) Analyses multiple spatial and functional levels of politics**:* The very idea of REDD+ implies multiple spatial and functional levels of governance and hence politics. REDD+ is being developed in different countries and at different levels of governance, going from the international sphere mainly under the UNFCCC negotiations, to the local level through the implementation of REDD+ pilot projects. Related to this element, Corbera & Schroeder (2011, p. 90) mention that REDD+ *"exemplifies how a scientifically informed policy idea permeates through multiple spheres of decision-making and organization, creates contested interests and claims, and translates into multiple implementation actions running ahead of policy processes and state-driven decisions".*

3) It is concerned with new mechanisms of producing and maintaining global public good: REDD+ is concerned with the maintenance of global public goods[12]. REDD+ main objective is to reduce CO_2 emissions in order to mitigate climate change and their associated negative consequences through the avoidance of deforestation and forest degradation. Sustainable

[12] *Climate change and forests are understood as different types of global public goods by Kaul et al. (1999) in the UNDP report on global public goods*

management practices are also included in the scope of this mechanism and therefore, REDD+ can be considered as concerned with the maintenance of more than one public good such as climate and forests.

***4) Highlights the establishment of new spheres of authority beyond the nation-state*:** REDD+ might not directly highlight the establishment of new spheres of authority beyond the nation-state but as it was mentioned before, it seems that the "sharing" of authority accompanies the development and implementation of this mechanism. It has already been discussed that there are international initiatves involved in the development of REDD+ in which non-state actors participate, and the fact that the role on these types of actors seems to be more prominent, at least in the case of Peru, at the national and local levels. Therefore, it can be argued that the development of REDD+ implies spheres of authority which differ from the traditional nation-state form.

4.1.2. FSC and CCBA in global environmental governance

On the other hand, it can be argued that FSC and CCBA voluntary certification schemes are two of the currently present new forms of governance in the environmental international arena, more specifically, private forms of governance. FSC and CCBA are here discussed together due to the similarities between the nature and characteristics of these organizations (See Chapter 2), following again the elements stated by Pattberg (2005):

1) ***Non-state actors:*** The FSC is a non-governmental, not for-profit organization (FSC, 2012c) and CCBA can be defined as an alliance among NGOs, research institutions and corporations (CCBA, 2012e), being both organizations partnerships. These organizations are also in charge of setting their out rule systems. Therefore, looking at these definitions, it becomes clear that the FSC and CCBA can be considered as two groups of non-state actors. Moreover, the characterization of FSC and CCBA as non-state actors can also be found in the academic literature, mainly in the case of the FSC (e.g. Cashore, 2002; Gulbrandsen, 2005; Pattberg, 2005).

2) Analyses multiple spatial and functional levels of politics: The problems that FSC and CCBA address and try to mitigate through their respective certification schemes can be found at multiple spatial and functional levels. For instance, unsustainable management of forests or biodiversity loss can take place in a given area but the consequences of these processes can be found, in some occasions, at other levels instead of just in the spatial root of the problem (e.g. unsustainable forests practices lead to higher emissions of $C0_2$ affecting climate change which is a global phenomenon). Moreover, FSC and CCBA are defined as international organizations (CCBA, 2012e; FSC, 2012c). Yet, in order to achieve their goals (See Chapter 2) FSC and CCBA are present at the national level in different countries and the certification schemes developed by these organizations are mainly applied to different projects taking place at the local level. Therefore, it can be argue that FSC and CCBA are related to multiple spatial and functional levels of politics.

3) It is concerned with new mechanisms of producing and maintaining global public goods: Although their main objectives are different (See Chapter 2), both FSC and CCBA, are concerned with the maintenance of global public goods. While the FSC put more emphasis on

the promotion of sustainable forest management practices, the CCBA is more oriented to the generation of climate, biodiversity and society benefits. Therefore, they are, in general terms, concerned with the maintenance of forests (FSC), climate and biodiversity (CCBA) which are considered as global public goods.

***4) Highlights the establishment of new spheres of authority beyond the nation-state*:** The FSC has already been recognized as a relevant alternative to traditional forms of international forestry policy-making processes (e.g. Cashore et al., 2003; Pattberg, 2005; Taylor, 2005b). On the other hand, CCBA standard has been consolidated during the last years as a reliable tool to address climate, biodiversity and community issues (Wood, 2011). Therefore, FSC and CCBA can be seen as new private forms of governance that, in different degrees, constitute new spheres of authority beyond the nation-state regarding their respective fields of expertise.

4.2. Legitimacy of FSC and CCBA under REDD+

In order to explore the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+, legitimacy is divided into output and input legitimacy which are respectively operationalized through effectiveness and participation. REDD+, as a mechanism created under several current global environmental processes, can be subject of critics regarding its legitimacy and this fact might jeopardize the success of this mechanism as well. Therefore, to explore the (if any) output and input legitimacy of some groups of non-state actors can be relevant for REDD+ functioning. Some scholars have already discussed the importance and need to, for instance, consider and involve indigenous communities in REDD+ processes (Schroeder, 2010). FSC and CCBA might not be considered as groups of non-state actors that "must" be included or involved in REDD+ processes and activities since they are not (directly) affected by REDD+ policies and outcomes. However, I focus on the FSC and CCBA (potential) role under REDD+ because due to the (partial) alignment of their goals, these voluntary certification schemes might contribute (positively or negatively) to REDD+ functioning and success. Moreover, due to all the facts exposed above, the research questions presented in Chapter 1 are further operationalized as it follows:

Sub-Objective 1. To explore the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global, and at the national and local levels in Peru in terms of output and input legitimacy.

i. What is the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level, and at the national and local levels in Peru *in terms of output and input legitimacy?*

Sub-Objective 2. To explore the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level, and at the national and local levels in Peru in terms of output and input legitimacy.

ii. What is the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level, and at the national and local levels in Peru *in terms of output and input legitimacy?*

Therefore, although it is discussed (See Chapter 8), I will not analyze whether the FSC and/or CCBA improve or not REDD+ legitimacy but instead **I will measure the output and input legitimacy of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+.**

4.2.1. Operationalization of Output legitimacy

Following the definitions of the theoretical framework (e.g. of output legitimacy *"revolves around effectiveness or problem solving capacity of the governance system"* (Bäckstrand, 2006a, p. 292)) output legitimacy will be studied in terms of *effectiveness*. Effectiveness is further measured using the concepts of output and outcome which can be seen as criteria. However, as it can be inferred from the definitions of impact in the theoretical framework, it is not possible, within this research project, to measure the (potential) positive or negative changes in economic, social or ecological parameters that the FSC scheme or CCB standard might generate under REDD+. In order to measure changes in these parameters, means that usually go beyond the social sciences field are needed (e.g. means or techniques to measure ecological parameters). Moreover, the "youth" of REDD+ is another added problem when trying to measure the (potential) improvements or negative effects that FSC or CCBA might generate under this mechanism. There are not so many REDD+ experiences on the ground, and in those areas where REDD+ pilot projects have been carried out, it might be too soon to measure some of the needed parameters to assess the impacts of REDD+. Likely, it seems to be too soon to study the (if any) role played by the FSC and/or CCBA when assessing the impact of REDD+ projects certified by these voluntary certification schemes. Therefore, only output and outcome will be measured for the three levels of analysis (global, national and local).

Indicators and measurement of Output

In accordance with the theoretical framework (See Chapter 3), output usually refers to activities such as the production of reports, papers, documented workshops, organization of meetings, etc. (Biermann & Bauer, 2005; Szulecki et al., 2011). Drawing on this definition and the research questions, **output** is the production of reports, papers, documented workshops, etc., when they are **related to REDD+ topics and/or produced by organizations working on REDD+ issues, and where (elements of) the FSC and/or CCBA can be found.** It is important to mention here that from now onwards, I will use "documents" as a general term to refer and summarized all the mentioned activities (reports, documented workshops, etc.). However, output will not refer to the number of found documents but instead to their relevance according to the content. In order to assess the (if any) relevance and measure output, the content of the documents will be grouped under the following categories:

i. **Absence of output:** when (elements of) FSC and/or CCBA are *not found* in the documents.

ii. **The relevance of the output is low**: when *references* to (elements of) FSC and/or CCBA can be found or identified in any of the documents.

iii. **The relevance of the output is medium:** when *recognition* (explicitly or inexplicitly expressed) of the importance of (elements of) the FSC and/or CCBA for REDD+ processes and activities can be found or identified in any of the documents.

iv. **The relevance of the output is high:** when *changes or modifications* in REDD+ process and activities induced by (elements of) FSC and/or CCBA are (explicitly or inexplicitly) expressed in any of the documents.

It is important to note that I will not mention the documents where (elements of) FSC and/or CCBA are not found. However, this should not be understood as an *absence of output.* Absence of output means that (elements of) FSC and/or CCBA are not found in *any* of the documents analyzed for a given level of analysis.

Indicators and measurement of Outcome

In accordance with the theoretical framework (See Chapter 3), outcome refers to (potential) changes in the behaviour of actors targeted by a given set of rules or policy (e.g. Biermann & Bauer, 2005; Szulecki et al., 2011). Drawing on this definition and the research questions, **outcome** refers to **(potential) changes in the behaviour of actors related to REDD+ and induced by FSC and/or CCBA.** These behavioural changes might affect REDD+ in a positive or negative way. It is important to address the relevance of the concept *potential* because due to the "youth" of REDD+, the role of the FSC and CCB voluntary certification schemes regarding the outcome might be difficult to assess based on currents facts. However, certain results might be expected due to the on-going debates, negotiations, development of policies and REDD+ pilot projects. Moreover, the measurement of outcome is particularly complicated for two main reasons: 1) It would be recommendable to have a reference point in order to asses or measure behavioural changes over time, and 2) Behavioural changes may be (partially) caused or influenced by aspects that are not taken into account in this research (e. g. economic aspects). It is therefore important to consider or have in mind these facts when analysing (potential) behavioural changes in the considered actors. In order to explore if there are behavioural changes and measure outcome, the following categories have been established:

i. **No behavioral changes:** when actors related to REDD+ *have not developed an opinion* about the role that FSC and/or CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+.

ii. **Low significance of behavioural changes:** when actors related to REDD+ *have developed an opinion* (positive or negative) towards the role that FSC and/or CCBA can (potentially) play in REDD+.

iii. **Medium significance of behavioural changes:** when actors related to REDD+ show or express *interest* to include or involve FSC and/or CCBA actors during debates, REDD+ political and decision-making processes and/or to promote the implementation of these standards under the development of REDD+ pilot projects.

iv. **High significance of behavioural changes**: when *recognition of (potential) changes* in REDD+ processes and activities induced by FSC and/or CCBA actors and/or their certification schemes are (explicitly or inexplicitly) expressed.

The two first categories area related to wheter actors related to REDD+ have developed an opinion or not about the role that the FSC and/or CCBA can (potentially) play under this mechanism. In other words, it seems a way to measure *perceptions* instead of *behavioral changes.* However, due to the novelty of REDD+ and the topic of this research project, mainly at the national and local levels, it is necessary to measure and analyze if opinions have been development or not. Since opinions can be seen as an indicative of knowledge or being informed about a certain topic, consequent behavioral changes in accordance with a given opinion can be expected. Therefore, it is important for this new topic to integrate in the measurement of outcome if opinions have been development or not. Moreover, to include opinions or perceptions in the measurement of output legitimacy seems also to be justified because this dimension of legitimacy is *"concerned with the perception of results among a broader range of stakeholders"* (Rosendal & Andresen, 2011, p. 1909). Although these authors refer to *results*, the fact is that perception is important for output legitimacy as well.

At last, it is important to note that "actors related to REDD+" do not only refer to the interviewed experts and practitioners (See Chapter 5), but also to actors involved in the elaboration of documents where REDD+ or any of its aspects is discussed and their (if developed) *opinions, interest or recognition of changes* can be found in those documents.

4.2.2. Operationalization of Input legitimacy

In accordance with the definitions presented in Chapter 3 (e.g. *"rely on the rhetoric of participation and of consensus"* (Skogstad (2003, p.322)), input legitimacy is operationalized in terms of *participation*. More especially, input legitimacy is operationalized by looking at the type of participation of FSC and CCBA official and unofficial actors during debates, negotiations, policy and decision-making process, and in the development and implementation of REDD+ pilot projects at the three levels of analysis. Official representatives are considered those who directly work for these organizations while unofficial representatives are those who do not directly work for these organizations, but act on their behalf in some occasions.

Indicators and measurement of Participation

In the theoretical framework it was also mentioned that there are different dimensions that can be studied under participation as well as different ways to measure it. For this research project, six different categories have been established in order to measure the type and extent of participation of the considered actors during REDD+ processe activities such as debates,

decision-making process or implementation of REDD+ pilot projects. The categories are the following (developed from Schroeder, 2010 and IAP2, 2007):

i. **Absence of participation:** when the considered actors are *not present* in any of the processes or activities related to REDD+ and hence there is no participation of any kind.

ii. **Passive participation:** when the considered actors are *informed* about certain problems, facts or opportunities relate to REDD+.

iii. **Indirect and weak participation:** when the considered actors are *invited* or *asked* to *provide input or feedback* about REDD+ issues.

iv. **Indirect and strong participation:** when the considered actors are *involved* in REDD+ processes and activities and their *views and concerns are considered*.

v. **Direct and weak participation:** when the considered actors act like *partners* during REDD+ processes and activities such as decision-making processes, political debates and implementation of REDD+ projects.

vi. **Direct and strong participation:** when authority is bestowed or conferred to the considered actors during REDD+ processes and activities such as decision-making processes, political debates and implementation of REDD+ pilot projects.

4.3. REDD+ in the research context

As it is mentioned in Chapter 2, there is not an agreement on a standard definition for REDD+ yet (Edwards et al., 2010). The scope of this mechanism has been expanded since its inception (Pistorious et al., 2010), and what it was RED before, is now known as REDD+. RED involved the reduction of emissions from deforestation. REDD embraced both deforestation and forest degradation as ways to reduction emissions and at last, REDD+ generally covers the previous elements plus the conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhacement of forest carbon stocks (Lesniewska, 2010; Rosendal & Andresen, 2011; UNFCCC, 2009).

Due to the extension of the scope of REDD+ in just a few years, it is quite common to find both concepts, REDD (e.g. Levin et al, 2008) and REDD+ (e.g. Herold & Skutsch, 2010), in the relatively recent literature and even in the name of organizations (e.g. Mesa REDD), which can lead in some occasions to confusion or misunderstandings. Both terms, REDD and REDD+, can be found throughout the research as well. I make used of both in order to show the gathered information in a more transparent and reliable way. However, I understand REDD+ as **the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, conservation, sustainable management of forests, enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries**

(Danielsen et al., 2010; Lawlor et al., 2010; Lesniewska, 2010; Rosendal & Andresen, 2011; UNFCCC, 2009). I use a broader definition rather than a more restrictive one in order to increase the field for the research and better answer the research questions. Moreover, the elements added from REDD to REDD+ (e.g. sustainable management of forests) are also here taken into account because the FSC and CCBA voluntary certification schemes are concern with social and environmental aspects as well. At last, REDD+ is the most recent term given to this international mechanism. For all the exposed, it seems more logical to use the above mentioned definition.

4.4. Differences between regional and local

Throughout the research the words regional and local are both used under the local level of analysis. Since the meaning and use of these words might not always be clear, it is important to state the differences between them. Peru is divided in what are called *regions* (e.g. San Martin or Madre de Dios) and each of them has an independent regional government which has competences on, for instance, environmental issues. However, all the regional governments are, ultimately, under the sovereignty of the national government of Peru. Therefore, r*egional* is used to refer to REDD+ related political processes where the government of a given region (in this case Madre de Dios) is involved. Within this research the word appears in relation to the negotiations, discussions and debates in the Mesa REDD of Madre de Dios (See Chapter 2). On the other hand, the word *local,* within this level of analysis*,* is used to refer to the processes and activities related to the development and implementation of REDD+ pilot projects. However, when it is said *"local level of analysis"*, it embraces both, political activities related to the regional Mesa REDD and REDD+ pilot projects taking place within Madre de Dios region.

CHAPTER 5: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the methodology used throughout the research process is presented. First the research design is explained. Moreover, the research methods are described. At last, I elaborate on the analysis of the data obtained through each of the research methods.

5.1. Research design

The main objective of this research is to explore and get insight into the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+. Since REDD+ is being developed at different political levels, it is relevant to explore this role at different levels of analysis. Therefore, the research has been divided into 3 levels of analysis: global, national and local levels. For the national and local levels I respectively focus on Peru and on the Peruvian Madre de Dios region. The reasons to choose Peru and Madre de Dios as study cases have been already explained in Chapter 2 (See Chapter 2, section 2.1.2). Moreover, the selection of the FSC as an example of forest certification was based on the popularity of this scheme, on the fact that FSC was the pioneer forest scheme (Rametsteiner & Simula, 2003), and because the use or implementation of this scheme to improve forest management practices is quite popular and extended (e.g. it is currently present in more than 50 countries) (FSC, 2012b). Another popular certification schemes focused on the promotion of sustainable management practices is the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC) (See Chapter 2), but this certification is not currently active in Peru (PEFC, 2012). On the other hand the selection of the CCB standard was based on the increasing popularity of this certification scheme in a relatively short period of time. For instance, in Peru it is the most often used certification on REDD+ pilot projects (Piu & Garcia, 2011). It is also important to mention that, although it would have been interesting to analyze the REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards (See Chapter 2) in this research, I did not select it because I had already started the research process when I first noticed this standard. The role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ has not been studied in depth yet and therefore, from the point of view of the objectives, this research is exploratory in nature (Kumar, 2005). Moreover, the research can be considered as qualitative because, among other things, it does not quantify a phenomenon but rather analyzes it, a few cases rather than a big sample size are explored, themes are used for the analysis of data instead of statistical analysis and typical qualitative research methods such as interviews are used (Kumar, 2005).

5.2. Research methods

Two research methods have been used in this research in order to obtain as much information as possible and satisfactorily answer the research questions. These two methods were used as complementary research means. At certain points of the research the fact of using two different methods was useful to increase the reliability of some data. These methods are: 1) Desk research and 2) In-depth phone interviews.

5.2.1. Desk research

The desk research consisted of 1) The review of documents found on the official websites of the selected organizations, and 2) The search of other documents usually not available on the organizations` official websites, such as academic publications and grey literature.

The organizations whose websites has been researched were selected according to their relation to the topic of this research. The search for documents was carried out using the databases of the websites. When the number of uploaded documents was too large (e.g. UNFCCC website), the desk research was carried out by using key words such as certification, REDD+ or FSC, in order to find the relevant documents. The research and selection of official websites was also done taking into account the level of analysis, differentiating between global, national and local organizations. Annex 4 consists on a list of the reviewed official websites. It is important to mention that the websites are grouped in Annex 4 according to the main working sphere of each organization. However, this fact does not mean that an organization which is considered as international cannot be researched for the national level. For instance, Conservation International (CI) can be described as an international NGO (CI, 2012), but it also works in Peru and hence its website can contain relevant information for the national level. Therefore, many organizations´ websites have been researched for more than one level of analysis. There are some websites that were analyzed and are listed in Annex 4 as well, but where relevant documents were not found. Moreover, the search for other documents not available in official websites was done through Google scholar and Wageningen (online) library. A few documents were also provided by the interviewees. All the documents used for the research can be found in the references list.

5.2.2. In-depth phone interviews

Throughout this investigation 18 people were interviewed; 3 for the international level, 12 for the national and 3 for the local level (See Annex 3). The interviewees were selected in a purposive way by looking at the research objectives. Therefore, all the interviewees are, in different degrees, actors related to REDD+ or have knowledge about REDD+, FSC and/or CCBA voluntary certification schemes. The interviewees work for different types of organizations such as NGOs, the government of Peru or private companies and they were also chosen taking into account the three levels of analysis. However, although I contacted by email people from all the organizations that I considered relevant for the research, it was not always possible to carry out the interviews due to the fact that some of the contacted people did not repply. For instance, an important organization for this research from which some workers were contacted but did not reply is the CCBA. Annex 2 consists on the list of the interviewees, the position they have and the organization they worked for at the moment of the interviews. The interviewees are grouped under the three level of analysis according to the nature and main working sphere of the organizations that they work for. However, this does not mean that they only contributed with information corresponding to that level of analysis. On the contrary, most of the interviewees provided valuable inputs for more than one level of analysis. There are only three interviewees that although they work for non-peruvian organizations, they have experience regarding REDD+ related issues in Peru and were contact for this reason (Greenoxx, Carbon Decisions International and Conservation International)(See Annx 3). These

interviewees and their inputs have been therefore included under the national level of analysis.

In-depth phone interviews were based on an interview guide consisting of open-ended questions in order to collect as much relevant information as possible. The open-ended questions were complemented by follow-up questions which were useful to ensure that the main questions were fully answered. The questions of the interview guide were formulated according to the concepts of output, outcome and participation developed in the conceptual framework (See Chapter 4). There are also some ice-breaking questions that provided additional information which has been used in Chapter 2. Although there was a standard guide for the interviews, some questions were added, skipped or changed depending on the profile of the interviewee and on the development of the interview itself. Moreover, the interviewees were generally contacted by email, where the guide for the interview was attached in order to ensure that the interviewees agreed to contribute to the research. Most of the interviews were via Skype but some were carried out by phone as well. All interviewees agreed to be quoted and make their names public with one exception in which the name is not reproduced throughout the research. Therefore, during the next chapters and the annexes, when quoting this interviewee I only use the name of the organization he/she works for, and the date of the interview. At last, all interviews were recorded and transcribed. Those interviews carried out in Spanish were translated to English as well.

5.2.3. Global level

On the one hand, for output legitimacy all the relevant documents found in the international organizations´ websites and the interviews were used to collect data. On the other hand, the UNFCCC meetings can be considered as the official space for the international negotiations and development of REDD+ (See Chapter 2) and therefore they are the place where the participation and input legitimacy of FSC and CCBA are analyze at the global level.

5.2.4. National level

For output legitimacy the documents researched in national and international organizations´ websites as well as the data from the interviews have been used to obtain the results. Moreover, at the national level, the national Mesa REDD can be considered as the official space to discuss REDD+ matters. Therefore, for input legitimacy the national Mesa REDD was the considered as the appropriate space (See Chapter 2) to analyze the participation of FSC and CCBA in REDD+ processes and activities.

5.2.5. Local level

For the research of output legitimacy at the local level, documents coming from the websites of national and regional organizations as well as the interviews have been used. For input legitimacy the regional Mesa REDD of Madre de Dios has been considered as the official space (See Chapter 2) to discuss REDD+ issues and therefore, the appropriate place to analyze the participation of FSC and CCBA in REDD+ processes and activities.

5.3. Data analysis

The data collected through desk research and in-depth phone interviews were independently analyzed. However, the obtained results from both methods are integrated in the next two chapters. Moreover, content analysis was used to analyze all the data. Content analysis is a method used for texts where the researcher interprets their meaning in a coherent way with the (if any) research theoretical framework and the research objectives (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

5.3.1. Desk research analysis

The relevant documents found through desk research were analyzed looking at their content. The documents were grouped according to the three levels of analysis and the relevant information was coded following the criteria and indicators presented in the conceptual framework (See Chapter 4). Finally, the desk research was mainly useful to obtain the data corresponding to the concept output (See Chapter 4) but it, indeed, provided input for the rest of concepts. The necessary data to analyze output comes from desk research due to the very definition of this concept within this research (the production of reports, papers, documented workshops, etc., when they are related to REDD+ topics and/or produced by organizations working on REDD+ issues and where (elements of) the FSC and/or CCBA can be found). All the analyzed documents for output were found through desk research with the exception of two that were provided by two different interviewees. Outcome and participation were also partially covered by the analysis of the documents found through desk research. There were some occasions where the analysis of the desk research documents was useful as a mean to confirm and support the data gathered during the in-depth phone interviews (e.g. participation data). In other cases, the degree of participation (e.g. Indirect and weak participation) of a given actor could be inferred throught the analysis some of the found documents.

5.3.2. In-depth phone interviews analysis

The analysis of the data collected through in-depth phone interviews consisted of content analysis as well. The interviews were first transcribed and later the content of the key questions was coded according to the concepts presented in the conceptual framework (See Chapter 4). In-depth phone interviews were mainly useful to obtain the data corresponding to the concepts of outcome and participation (See Chapter 4). Due to the definition of outcome within this research (outcome refers to (potential) changes in the behaviour of actors related to REDD+ induced by FSC and CCBA) and looking at the indicators used (e.g. Low significance of behavioural changes: when there is an *opinion* (positive or negative) of actors related to REDD+ towards the role that FSC and/or CCBA can (potentially) play in REDD+), the analysis of the interviews constituted the best way to obtain the information for outcome because the interviewees could express their opinions, interests, etc. Finally, the analysis of the interviews was useful to establish the degree of participation (e.g. Indirect and weak participation) of the considered actors as well as to contrast and support some of the desk research data.

CHAPTER 6: THE FOREST STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL UNDER REDD+

In this chapter the results for the following research question are presented:

i. What is the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level, and at the national and local levels in Peru?

The results are structured according to the three levels of analysis (global, national and local). Moreover, since the initial research questions were further operationalized (See Chapter 4), the results for each level of analysis are divided into output (effectiveness) and input (participation) legitimacy. At last, some additional findings related to the FSC can be found at the end of the chapter.

6. 1. The FSC under REDD+ at the Global level

In this section, the results for the FSC under REDD+ for the global level can be found. The results for the output legitimacy of FSC under REDD+ come from the found documents (a total of 33 documents were analyzed) in the considered international organizations´ websites (See Annex 4), and the data collected through the interviews (See Annex 2). On the other hand, for the input legitimacy of FSC under REDD+ the results come from desk research and the interviews as well. The UNFCCC has been considered as the international official space to discuss and develop REDD+ (See Chapter 2). Therefore, the UNFCCC meetings have been used to analyze the participation of the FSC actors in REDD+ processes and activities.

6.1.1. Output legitimacy

The role that the FSC certification can (potentially) play under REDD+ has been expressed in different types of documents prepared by different organizations. Some of these documents have been elaborated by the FSC itself (e.g. FSC, 2009b) while others were prepared by organizations such as The Nature Conservancy group (e.g. TCN, 2009), CIFOR (e.g. Angelsen et al., 2009a) and Rainforest alliance (Rainforest Alliance, 2012). Since REDD+ embraces many issues, the main discussion topic changes among the documents. However, the relevance of the FSC scheme for REDD+ is mentioned in all of them. In some of these documents the FSC is just cited as an example in relation to REDD+ issues (e.g. Ebeling & Fehse, 2009; Epple et al., 2011; Peskett et al., 2008;) while in others there is an acknowledgment of changes, for instance in REDD+ pilot projects, triggered, among other things, by the FSC certification (e.g. Consejo nacional de áreas protegidas de Guatemala, 2009). However, the predominant tendency is to just recognize the (potential) importance of FSC regarding some of REDD+ aspects (e.g. CBD, 2011c; Dickson et al. 2009; Estrada, 2011; Griscom et al., 2009; Johns et al., 2009; Murphy, 2011; Rainforest Alliance, 2009). Therefore, the **relevance** of the **output** is overall **medium**. As it was mentioned before, the main topics covered by all these documents differ from one to another as well as the nature and goals of the organizations who wrote

them. However, the main items that can be extracted from all of them regarding the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+, making the relevance of output medium, are the following:

i. FSC certification promotes the improvement of management practices in forests which can lead to lower emissions. Therefore, FSC certification can be seen as one of the existing methods or tools that can complement REDD+ (e.g. Cortez & Stephen, 2009; FCPF, 2010; FSC, 2009b; Griscom et al., 2009; Rainforest Alliance, 2009a; Rainforest Alliance, 2012; TCN, 2009).

ii. FSC is one of the existing standards that can generate co-benefits and which could describe how REDD+ safeguards should be defined and measured (e.g. CBD, 2011b; CBD, 2011c; CBD, 2011a; Miles et al., 2010; TNC, CI & Wildlife Conservation Society, 2010; UNIQUE forestry and land use, 2011; WWF, 2008).

iii. In comparison with traditional logged forests, FSC certification usually implies a decrease in the harvest volumes and more sustainable harvesting methods which can reduce the chances of future degradation of a specific area (e.g. Cortez & Stephen, 2009; Rainforest Alliance, 2012; WWF, 2008). In fact, it has been estimated that the low Reduce Impact Logging promoted by the FSC scheme can potentially reduce the emissions up to 10% (Rainforest Alliance, 2012).

iv. FSC scheme can also help to avoid social and tenure conflicts, bring along social benefits and contribute to ensure social safeguards in REDD+ projects (e.g. Griscom et al., 2009; Rainforest Alliance, 2012).

v. FSC systems of monitoring, reporting and verifying (MRV) can be used as basis for surveillance in REDD+ projects where wood extraction takes place (e.g. Griscom et al., 2009; Rainforest Alliance, 2011; Rainforest Alliance, 2012; WWF, 2010b).

vi. The climate benefits that the FSC certification might generate has just begun to being considered and measured (Griscom et al., 2009).

All these statements refer to the (potential) role of the FSC under REDD+, but in the reviewed documents it has also been found that an effective and efficient use of REDD+ funds would be to support FSC certification and the costs of getting certified (e.g. Angelsen et al., 2009a; Petkova et al., 2011). Moreover, there is one more document worth to mentioning. This document is a guide which focuses on the integration of the FSC certification scheme in REDD+ projects, making explicitly clear the importance of the "relation" between FSC scheme and REDD+. This guideline consists of *"a set of concepts, guidelines and procedures useful for integrating the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Forest Management certification into the organization of REDD+ projects…"* (Brotto et al., 2010, p.9). Moreover, the main objective of this guide is *"to facilitate the organization of projects aimed at Reducing the Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) where the forest management area is already*

certified under the FSC standards or obtaining an FSC certification is planned" (Brotto et al., 2010, p.9). The guide is therefore made for project developers and helps them to deliver carbon credits (Brotto et al., 2010), showing a positive perception of the (potential) role of the FSC under REDD+.

Regarding **outcome**, it is evident that opinions about the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+ have been developed among different actors. This is reflected in many of the documents elaborated by some of the selected international organizations (e.g. Cortez & Stephen, 2009; Rainforest Alliance, 2012; WWF, 2008) as well as in the experts´ and practitioners´ opinions collected during the interviews:

> *"I think REDD+ offers really good opportunities because ultimately the objectives… are very much in line…with FSC in terms of aiming to maintain the world´s forest and respecting their social and environmental values. FSC is a sort of a proxy to the whole deforestation and degradation problem that might be ongoing and this is where FSC of course should have a very important contribution. If FSC certifies an operation, then actually an operation should have succeeded to stop any deforestation activities, legal or illegal, or major degradation processes that were happening within the boundaries... I think that if REDD+ is no able to build linkages to existing initiatives that aim to the same direction... then I do not believe that REDD+ will really take off and have a big impact…"* (Stefan Salvador, FSC Policy Manager, January 27th, 2012).

> *"I would say that, a credible certification standard is a useful tool to address safeguards in an appropriate manner"* (Gerald Steindlegger, WWF International, Manager of the Global Forest Programme, January 20th, 2012).

However, despite the fact that an opinion about this topic in actors related to REDD+ and FSC have been developed, it does not mean that this opinion is uniform among all actors[13]:

> *"I do not think there is a uniform picture…there are some opinions that FSC should further evolved and try to include the question of carbon accounting in our system… that FSC should do the whole thing and capture or cover everything and become the leading standard. There are others who think that this is nothing where FSC is applicable because they think that FSC is only for timber production and should stay within these sort of activities…there is probably a third group that thinks that it might be very difficult to apply the voluntary certification approach that FSC uses to governmental programs…it is an open question whether FSC for instance could certified a whole country REDD+ program…There is also group of people who question that certification can be really used in this context. But I was thinking that the majority of what I have heard is that certification has an important role to play and FSC in particular because of our huge membership that support us and because of the market linkages that FSC is able to create* (Stefan Salvador, FSC Policy Manager, January 27th, 2012).

[13] *It is not clear if the different opinions refer just to FSC official actors or to a broader range of actors*

Moreover, despite this topic has gotten more attention during the last years, in the majority of the revised documents, there is neither a clear intention or interest in actors related to REDD+ to involve the FSC in REDD+ debates, political and decision-making processes nor recognition of changes in REDD+ processes or activities induced by the FSC.

> *"I do not think that with our very limited engagement we have had so far any visible impact. I would say that there is not serious impact of the FSC due to its actions"* (Stefan Salvador, FSC Policy Manager, January 27th, 2012).

It is also remarkable the fact that the interviewees noted that changes in REDD+ process and activities induced by the FSC are more likely to take place and easier to find at the national and local levels.

> *"FSC is one of so many actors that are trying to shape the REDD+ debate that is almost impossible to say what kind of contribution each actor is making. We should not forget that, last but not least, decisions about REDD+ have to be made by governments…FSC is a voluntary market initiative while REDD+ is a political issue and the key influence, are of course, the governments."* (Christopher Ties, Greenpeace International Forest campaign policy and strategy coordinator January 16th, 2012)

> *"This is a question that is better addressed by people working in the field and working concretely on national and sub-national programmes… I think it very much depends on who you are talking to"* (Gerald Steindlegger, WWF International, Manager of the Global Forest Programme, January 20th, 2012).

Interest to involved FSC in REDD+ processes and activities is not expressed in many sources and changes in REDD+ processes and activities induce by the FSC have not been found. However, opinions about the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+ have been developed. Therefore, the result for the FSC **outcome** at the global level is that the **significance of the behavioral changes** is **low**.

6.1.2. Input legitimacy

At the global level the FSC has been present in annual and inter-seasonal UNFCCC meetings as well as in some minor conferences. Despite the fact that the discussions around REDD+ under the UNFCCC started at COP-11 in 2005, the first time that the FSC participated in one of the UNFCCC meetings was in 2007, during COP-13 in Bali. Since then, FSC official representatives have been present in other COPs such as COP-15 in Copenhagen and COP-17 in Durban (UNFCCC, 2012).

> *"It started…I think it was COP-13 in Bali where FSC had presence for the first time. There are inter-seasonal meetings where we have partially participated and some, of course, minor conferences. So that is the most obvious, I think, presence or participation in international discussions"* (Stefan Salvador, FSC Policy Manager, January 27th, 2012).

The FSC constitutes one of the observer organizations in the UNFCCC meetings and therefore its participation can be analyzed within two different spaces. FSC as well as other organizations can sometimes participate in the official negotiations as an observer. Although official negotiations are inter-governmental, observer organizations are, in some occasions, allowed to speak. A review of the minutes of the annual UNFCCC meetings[14] was done, but no intervention of the FSC in the official negotiations has been found (the analyzed IISD reports can be found in the references list). On the other hand, the FSC has participated in the side-events of UNFCCC meetings. Side-events consist of platforms where organizations can share information, address climate change issues or have political discussions. They are considered as the natural space for organizations like the FSC to participate (UNFCCC, 2012). It is important to mention that the relevance of the side-events has considerably increased during the last years (UNFCCC, 2012). In some UNFCCC meetings, the FSC has shared a side-event with other organizations but during the last three years FSC has had its own side-event. These side-events have been used, among other things, to promote the potential that the FSC certification system has for sustainable forest management (FSC, 2009a), to explain how FSC could complement REDD (COP-15, Copenhagen) (FSC, 2009b) and to explain the strategic engagement of the FSC in activities aimed at the mitigation of climate change (COP-17, Durban) (FSC, 2011b). The participation of the FSC in the side-events was also mentioned by the interviewees.

> *"The side events usually serve to promote the potential of the FSC certification system"* (Stefan Salvador, FSC Policy Manager, January 27th, 2012).

> *"The FSC (and the CCBA) are present in the debate, less in the political discussion but more in informing negotiators and decision makers on existing standards which can already be used to design good REDD+ programmes… The FSC (or the CCBA) are not there as NGOs for example, directly lobbing political positions but they are informing through side events the interested groups about the relationship of these certification schemes and REDD+"* (Gerald Steindlegger, WWF International, Manager of the Global Forest Programme, January 20th, 2012).

Therefore, it can be considered that overall the FSC has provided inputs and hence, the **participation** at the global level has been **indirect and weak** so far.

Box 1. Results summary for the FSC at the Global level

- The results show that the **relevance** of the **output** is **medium** at this level, which means that overall in the analyzed documents, there is recognition of the importance (explicitly or inexplicitly expressed) of the FSC for some REDD+ processes or activities.
- The result for **outcome** is that the **significance of the behavioral changes is low** which means that opinions have been developed among REDD+ related actors about the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+.
- The UNFCCC meetings are used as the space to analyze the participation of the FSC in REDD+ processes at this level. The result is that the **participation is indirect and weak,** which means that FSC have provided some input or feedback about REDD+ issues

6.2. The FSC under REDD+ at the National level in Peru

In this section, the results for the FSC under REDD+ for Peru can be found. The results for output legitimacy of the FSC under REDD+ come from the relevant documents found (6 documents were found and analyzed) in the considered organizations´ websites as well as from the data collected through the interviews with experts and practitioners (See Annex 2). On the other hand, for input legitimacy at the national level the results come from desk research and interviews. The Mesa REDD has been considered as the national official space to discuss and develop REDD+ (See Chapter 2). Therefore, Mesa REDD meetings are used in this level to analyze the participation of FSC under REDD+ processes and activities.

6.2.1. Output legitimacy

The number of documents that mention or elaborate about the role that the FSC certification can (potentially) play under REDD+ in the national context is quite limited. Despite the fact that output does not take into account the number of documents but rather their relevance, it seems important to mention their scarcity and take this into account, especially when drawing conclusions about output at the national level. Moreover, when analyzing the results for output it is also important to consider that Peru has been officially considered as a REDD+ partner country since 2010, when it submitted to the FCPF the first draft of its R-PP (FCPF, 2011). Therefore, perhaps there has not been enough time to elaborate on certain topics. However, there are a few documents where the main topic is REDD+, and where it is possible to find references to the FSC voluntary certification scheme (MINAM, 2011c; Organización para Estudios Tropicales, 2011; Piu & Garcia, 2011). These documents have been elaborated by national NGOs (Llanos & Feather, 2011; Piu, & García, 2011) and the Peruvian ministry of environment (MINAM, 2011c). There is one more document with relevant information regarding the FSC and REDD+. It is a presentation (CCBA, 2009a) prepared by Conservation International and the CCBA which was exposed in one of the REDD+ training courses. I put more emphasis on this document because it has been the only found document where the FSC scheme appears as not appropriate for REDD+ projects. Although from the presentation the reasons cannot be stated with certainity, it seems that the FSC scheme was classified as non-appropiate for REDD+ projects because it is not oriented to the mitigation of climate change and the emissions voluntary market. However, most of the documents just mention the FSC certification to address the current REDD+ pilot projects that are certified under this scheme (Piu, & García, 2011). Therefore and overall, the **relevance of** the **output** for the FSC at the national level is **low**. The main facts found in the documents regarding FSC and REDD+ are summarized in the following points:

i. By June 2011, there were a total of 35 REDD+ pilot projects in Peru. From these pilot projects, 16 out 35 were certified. From the 16 REDD+ certified projects, 5 were FSC certified (Piu. & García, 2011).

ii. From the 5 REDD+ pilot projects which were FSC certified, 2 of them had only FSC certification while the 3 remaining had FSC and other voluntary certification standard (CCBS, VCS[15] or SCS[16]) (Piu & García, 2011).

iii. All REDD+ pilot projects that are FSC certified in Peru are mainly wood extractive in nature (Llanos, & Feather, 2011; Piu, & García, 2011)

iv. There are local or indigenous communities involved in 4 out the 5 REDD+ pilot projects that are FSC certified. (Llanos & Feather, 2011; Piu & García, 2011)

Regarding **outcome,** the results show that the **significance of the behavioral changes** of actors related to REDD+ induce by (elements of) the FSC at the national level **is low**. As it can be inferred from the results for output (scarcity of documents), through the desk research there were no results for outcome at the national level since this is not a very common or extended topic at this level of analysis. Moreover, despite the fact that the interviewed experts and practitioners have developed an opinion about potential role of the FSC scheme under REDD+, all of them agreed that currently this is not a discussion topic within the Mesa REDD at the national level yet.

> *"I think it will help to faster achieve some goals. If a forest is FSC certified it will take less time to prepare the R-PIN and PDD for REDD+ because the standard can cover some of the safeguards issues. It also takes less time because you already have a quite good forest inventory. However in the case of Peru, it also depends on where a forest is allocated. If we are talking about a forest which is under the threat of migratory agriculture then there is not much that the certification can do. The migratory agriculture is a very complex problem in Peru and it is very difficult to stop it because the roots of this problem are deep and partially located in the way that the regional governments are understanding governance. Therefore, depending on the level of this threat, FSC can help to the elaboration of REDD+ projects or not. Actually we already have experienced this. In forests which are not under this threat it has been much easier to develop the projects and sell carbon credits such as Maderacre and Maderyja forests"* (Teddi peñaherrera, CEDISA, Advisor and promoter, January 14th, 2012).

> *"The FSC certification is a good way to ensure a sustainable management of forests. In order to get FSC certified you have to prove that you are carrying out sustainable forest management practices and low impact logging. These facts help you to register the expenses, make the inventories, and "have under control" the concessions and the operational plans. Therefore, it creates a good basis to engage in REDD+ projects"* (Elvira Gomez, MINAM REDD+ expert, January 12th, 2012).

> *"I think that voluntary certifications, including the FSC, will not play a very important role at the national level…"* (Hugo Che Piu, Director of DAR, January 18th, 2012).

[15] *Verified Carbon Standard is one of the most often used voluntary certification schemes regarding the accounting of GHG emissions reduction within the voluntary carbon market (VCS, 2012)*

[16] *The Scientific Certification Systems consists on an independent certification and verification of environmental, sustainability, food quality, safety, purity and stewardship claims (SCS, 2012)*

> *"I think that the FSC certification can help to reduce emissions because it implies a commitment and permanent monitoring. The activities carried out are planned and that contributes to the conservation of the forest and the biodiversity, and to minimize the impact of the activities in a given area. The FSC scheme can thereby, make REDD+ initiatives more viable"* (Violeta Colan, Rainforest Alliance Peru, Coordinator of the Andean region, February 3rd, 2012).

Due to the novelty of REDD+ in Peru, the official negotiations, discussions and debates around REDD+ at the national level are focused on other issues such as the establishment of a REDD+ national strategy, find a standard definition of forests for REDD+ projects or the selection of appropriate methodologies to make carbon inventories.

> *"This is not a topic that has been really discussed yet* (the role of FSC under REDD+). *Now Mesa REDD Peru is more focused on other topics such as the definition of the concept of forest for REDD+, the development of the national REDD+ strategy, measurement and monitoring of carbon, national forest inventory…these are some of the main discussed topics"* (Aider, REDD+ expert, February 1st, 2012).

> *"In my experience this is not a topic in the official discussions. I can understand this because just design the national REDD+ strategy is enough to be busy for a few years and there has not been much time left to think about other issues"* (Alvaro Vallejo, Carbon Decisions Internal, Forestry expert advisor, November 27th, 2011).

However, the role of voluntary certifications under REDD+ and therefore, of the FSC scheme as well, might be a potential topic within the next months because social and environmental safeguards will be soon discussed more in depth in the Mesa REDD Peru.

> *"We are recently starting to discuss more in depth the issue of the safeguards and also about systems to evaluate social and environmental aspects …"* (Hugo Che Piu, Director of DAR, Januray 18th, 2012).

Either interest of actors related to REDD+ to involved FSC in REDD+ debates, decision-making processes etc., nor changes in REDD+ activities or processes induced by the FSC have been found at the national level. Yet, opinions among experts and practitioners about the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+ have been developed. Therefore, the result for outcome is that currently the **significance of the behavioral changes** is **low**.

6.2.2. Input legitimacy

Despite the fact that the FSC has one of its regional offices in the capital of Peru, Lima, at the national level there has been no participation of FSC representatives in the meetings or activities organized by Mesa REDD so far. On the other hand, there has been participation of other organizations such as NGOs which are in charge of some REDD+ pilot projects which are FSC certified. However, the role of these organizations has not been to represent the FSC or provide any input at the national level about its role under REDD+. Therefore, there has been **absence of participation** of the FSC in REDD+ processes and activities at the national level. This

is supported by the agenda and summaries of the meetings of the Mesa REDD, where no participation of FSC representatives is registered, as well as by the interviews.

> *"In the meetings that I have participated I have not seen the FSC"* (Aider, REDD+ expert, February 1st, 2012).

> *"I have not seen the FSC present as an organization"* (Tatiana Lapeyre, Co-founder and advisor of Ecodevelopment group, January 8th, 2012).

Box 2. Results summary for the FSC at the National level

- The results show that the **relevance** of the **output** is **low**. This means that only mentions to (elements of) FSC have been found or identified in the analyzed document.
- The results for **outcome** is that the **significance of the behavioral changes is low** which means that opinions among actors related to REDD+ about the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+ have been developed in Peru.
- The national Mesa REDD is used to analyze the participation of the FSC in REDD+ processes and activities at this level. The results show that there has been **absence of participation** of FSC in REDD+ processes and activities.

6.3. The FSC under REDD+ at the Local level in Peru

For the local level, the results for output legitimacy of the FSC under REDD+ come from the documents found (3 documents were found and analyzed) in the considered organizations´ websites regarding the region of Madre de Dios and the data collected through the interviews with experts and practitioners (See Annex 2). On the other hand, for the input legitimacy of FSC under REDD+ at the local level, the results come from desk research as well as from the interviews. The regional Mesa REDD of Madre de Dios has been considered as the local natural space to discuss and develop REDD+ (See Chapter 2). Therefore, the regional Mesa REDD meetings have been used to analyze the participation of FSC in REDD+ processes and activities.

6.3.1. Output legitimacy

Regarding the **output** for the FSC at the local level, most of the found documents where the FSC certification scheme and REDD+ appear together are related to REDD+ pilot projects taking place in Madre de Dios region (Schroeder., 2009; Sheil, et al., 2010) or in other regions (Llanos & Feather, 2011; Piu & Garcia, 2011). The documents have been mainly elaborated by the implementers or executors of the pilot projects (Schroeder, A., 2009), but also by other organizations who have not been directly involved in the projects (CCBA, 2009b; Sheil, et al., 2010). Aside from those related to pilot projects, there are not many other documents within the local level where FSC and REDD+ appear related. Moreover, the found documents show recognition, an explicit recognition, of the relevance of getting FSC certified before or during the elaboration and development of the REDD+ pilot projects (Schroeder, A., 2009; Sheil, et al., 2010). The projects are involved in timber production which on the other hand, is not surprising since the main goal of the FSC is the improvement of the forest management

practices. Therefore, the recognition of the importance of the FSC scheme makes the **relevance of the output medium.** Moreover, the main facts found in the documents about the role of FSC under REDD+ pilot projects are summarized in the following points:

i. The FSC certification scheme helps to ensure sustainable management of forests (Schroeder, A., 2009; Sheil, et al., 2010).

ii. The FSC certification scheme contributes to the preservation of biodiverisity (Schroeder, A., 2009; Sheil, et al., 2010).

iii. The FSC certification scheme helps to avoid social conflicts about property rights on the lands and generate social benefits (Schroeder, A., 2009; Sheil, et al., 2010).

iv. The FSC certification scheme contributes to the faster development of REDD+ projects (Schroeder, 2009; Sheil, et al., 2010).

Regarding the **outcome** for the FSC at the local level, it is important to make a distinction between the discussions and debates in the Madre de Dios Mesa REDD and REDD+ pilot projects taking place in this region. On the one hand, regarding the Mesa REDD, the interviewed experts and practitioners have developed an opinion about the role that FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+.

> *"FSC can be seen as a guarantee that the carbon stocks will be maintained over time, that only trees that are big enough will be logged, that the biodiversity of a given area will not be compromised and there is a minimal impact on the forest. FSC certification also implies that the social part of a project is being considered and covered. The combination of the FSC and REDD+ projects is a very good and ideal scenario to conserve and make a sustainable use of the forests"* (Silvia Gomez, Greenoxx, Co-director of Greenoxx, December 9th, 2011).

> *"The FSC certification ensures that the certified area will not be further fragmented and avoids uncontrolled deforestation. It helps REDD+ because FSC certified areas are monitored and the people in charge of the area have to make forests inventories. These facts help to faster elaborate a REDD+ project"* (Tatiana Lapeyre, Co-founder and advisor of Ecodevelopment group, January 8th, 2012).

However, as for the national level, the views and opinions are not expressed during the Madre de Dios Mesa REDD meetings or in the documents elaborated by this group because this has not been a discussion topic. Currently, there are other matters which are being discussed in Madre de Dios regional Mesa REDD as well as in other different regional Mesas REDD such as the one in the region of San Martín.

> *"I have participated in the Madre de Dios regional Mesa REDD and they are discussing about deforestation, different models proposed by different groups for REDD+ projects and carbon accounting methodologies"* (Aider, REDD+ expert, February 1st, 2012).

"The different regionals Mesa REDD are actually reaching some agreements. The case of Madre de Dios is a very good example because they are discussing and reaching agreements about the definition of the base lines for the carbon accounting" (Violeta Colan, Rainforest Alliance Peru, Coordinator of the Andean region, February 3rd, 2012).

"I participated in the San Martin regional Mesa REDD and when I left the last year they were discussing which the available methodologies for carbon accounting were, and which one should be applied" (Ruben Paitan, SERNANP, January 13th, 2012).

Therefore, for the **outcome** of the FSC regarding the Madre de Dios Mesa REDD, it can be considered that there have not been **behavioral changes**. Despite the fact that the experts and practitioners have developed an opinion about the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+, these views are not discussed in this space. Regarding the documents, no opinions, interests or changes were found either. On the other hand, for the **outcome** of the FSC regarding REDD+ pilot projects in Madre de Dios, the significance of **the behavioral changes is high.** In addition to the development of positive opinions towards the role of the FSC under REDD+, interest for FSC certification can be appreciated in the analyzed documents (Schroeder, A., 2009; Sheil, et al., 2010) as well as changes in REDD+ processes and activities, in this case, in the development and implementation of pilot projects. Many interviewees agreed on the fact that REDD+ actors involved in the elaboration and development of REDD+ pilot projects are more and more interested on getting FSC certificated, mainly for those areas where timber extraction takes place. Most of these actors perceive the FSC scheme as beneficial in different ways when trying to elaborate a REDD+ project (e.g. reducing some of the potential negatives impacts or generating additional incomes to those produce by the sales of carbon credits) and other actors have recognized the benefits of its use in some projects.

"Regarding the REDD+ projects level I do think that FSC… can help to reduce some of the potential negative impacts of these projects…I am specially concern about the local and indigenous communities" (Hugo Che Piu, Director of DAR, Januray 18th, 2012).

"For us the FSC is as an absolute guarantee and it seems absolutely necessary when it comes to having a REDD+ project with forest management. I repeat, for me a REDD+ project that includes forest management, FSC is an excellent choice because it implies that the owner of the forest has timber sales revenues, which is something tangible that will not depend on policies and it will be causing minimal impact on the forest. On the other hand, it has the potential to generate carbon credits today as something real but unfortunately markets are not yet so well established to allow people to just rely on the carbon market revenues for their living" (Silvia Gomez, Greenoxx, Co-director of Greenoxx, December 9th, 2011).

"This project[17] consists of two concessions which were already FSC certified…the information about the concessions was already there because FSC asked for it, so basically we just had to organized the information…it has not been easy to develop the

[17] *Madre de Dios Amazon REDD Project*

project but it took a little less time because the information already existed" (Jorge Torres, Bosques Amazónicos, Forest carbon manager, January 13th, 2012).

"We thought[18] *of the FSC as a bridge to get additional incomes and carry out sustainable management practices"* (Roberto Persivale, Asesorandes, Partner and Advisor, December 12th, 2011).

6.3.2. Input legitimacy

Although FSC has one of its regional offices in the capital of Peru, Lima, at the regional level in Madre de Dios there has been **absence of participation** of FSC official representatives. There has been participation of organizations such as NGOs (e.g. AIDER or ACCA) which are in charge of REDD+ pilot projects that are certified by FSC in Madre de Dios. However, despite the fact that these NGOs are the executors of some FSC certified REDD+ pilot projects, their participation in the meetings was not aimed to represent or discuss any matter related to the FSC. The participation of these organizations has been related to the discussion of the topics established in the agenda of the meetings and which, so far, has not included the role of the FSC (or other certifications) under REDD+. This lack of participation can be inferred from the found and analyzed documents for the local level. The interviewees also mentioned that they have not seen FSC participation in the regional Madre de Dios Mesa REDD or in any other regional Mesa REDD.

"I have participated in the Madre de Dios regional Mesa REDD….and I have not seen any participation from the FSC" (Aider, REDD+ expert, February 1st, 2012).

"I do not have directly participated but as far as I know FSC has not participated in this Mesa REDD despite the fact that the FSC has national permanent representation in Peru" (Alfredo Rodriguez, WWF Peru, February 2nd, 2012)

Box 3. Results summary for the FSC at the Local level

- The results show that the **relevance** of the **output** is **medium** which means that overall, in the analyzed documents, there is recognition of the importance (explicitly or inexplicitly expressed) of the FSC in some REDD+ processes or activities.
- The result for **outcome** regarding the regional Mesa REDD is that there are **no behavioral changes**, which means that opinions among REDD+ related actors about the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+ have been developed but they are not expressed or discussed in this space**.**
- The results for **outcome** regarding the development and implementation of REDD+ pilot projects is that the **significance of the behavioral changes is high** which means that there have been changes induced by the FSC among actors.
- The regional Mesa REDD of Madre de Dios have been used to analyze the participation of the FSC in REDD+ processes at this level. The results show that there has been **no participation** of FSC in REDD+ processes and activities

[18] *The Belgica Native Community REDD Project*

6.4. FSC official position towards an engagement in the climate change agenda

The previous results might vary or change in a relatively short period of time due to recent developments. Some additional findings have been obtained regarding the FSC official position towards climate change and this new position points to a higher engagement of the FSC in the mitigation of climate change and hence REDD+.

In 2008, through a Policy Motion passed by the absolute majority of the members of the FSC, a request to explore the positive and negative (potential) consequences of the engagement of the FSC in climate change mitigation was made (FSC, 2011a). For this matter the "FSC Forest Carbon Working Group" (FCWG) was created. The FCWG was compound by 14 experts who work for different organizations such as Greenpeace or WWF (two of the interviewees corresponding to the global level were part of this group). The FCWG finished its analysis and submitted a report by the beginning of 2011 (FSC, 2011a). From the recommendations made by the FCWG, two new policy motions, where carbon references can be found, were approved that year:

Motion 10: *FSC shall identify the risks with respect to claims made and rewards received for the provision of ecosystem services (including carbon sequestration and storage) by certificate holders and take measures to ensure protection and integrity of the FSC brand* (FSC, 2011a, p.4).

Motion 16: *The General Assembly requests the Principles and Criteria Review Working Group to recognize carbon as an environmental value and address responsible stewardship of carbon storage and sequestration* (FSC, 2011a, p.4).

Moreover, five different strategic areas for engagement related to forest carbon were identified by the FCWG and these areas consist of (FSC, 2011a, p.5-7):

1. **Safeguarding:** *"Ensuring that management, monitoring and monetization of forest carbon resources does not come at the expense of people´s right or the environment".*

2. **Carbon stewardship:** *"Responsibly managing forest carbon resources by the maintenance enhancement or restoration carbon stocks".*

3. **Carbon monitoring**: *"Monitoring the impacts of management practices on forest carbon sources by qualitative and quantitative assessments of the carbon stocks".*

4. **Carbon accounting:** *"Quantification of additional carbon sequestration or emissiosn reduction and transforming them into rewardable units, for instance carbon credits".*

5. **Carbon rewards: "***Obtaining financial or otherwise support for carbon stewardship and/or claimed climate benefits".*

The report submitted by the FCWG also contained a strategic framework which is meant to serve as a guide for the FSC during the next years and contains recommendations according to the five identified areas for the engagement of the FSC in climate change issues. Within this framework the areas where the FSC could engage and how it could participate in the specific REDD+ context are describe. It is mentioned that for instance the FSC can promote itself as a REDD+ safeguard, how FSC certification scheme is good for the maintenance of the carbon stocks which is part of the extended scope of REDD+, and how the FSC scheme could be used for national REDD+ programmes because its broad network partners would facilitate this fact (FSC, 2011a).

> *"I think that the FSC can be seen as an approach that could be very much a template for REDD+"* (Stefan Salvador, FSC Policy Manager, January 27th, 2012)

> *"The FSC and its members have increasingly realized over the years that this is a big dynamic debate…they are working to contribute to the improvement of forest management and they have realized that if they can document this, they can play an important role in the context of REDD+…FSC is not explicitly targeted to pursuit goals related to forest carbon but they have, from the very beginning, tried to improve forest management in all the aspects and of course the role of forests in carbon cycles was already quite well- known in the early 90s… So the FSC logically has started to follow more and more closely the REDD+ debate and explore what role FSC can offer in this context"* (Christopher Ties, Greenpeace International Forest campaign policy and strategy coordinator, January 16th, 2012).

However, risks related to the potential strengthen of the engagement of the FSC in climate change and hence in REDD+, have also been identified. These are mainly reputational risks related to the association of the FSC to false carbon claims and carbon markets (FSC, 2011a).

> *"The main concerns that our members see is whether FSC could be associated with undue, improper, inaccurate and false claims. First the question is if FSC gives credibility to a REDD+ project or REDD+ program. Even if we can find our credibility towards maybe social and environmental safeguards being put in place, in the end we might be also held responsible for carbon related claims that are the real objective of REDD+ projects. If this carbon related claims prove to be incorrect then maybe a shadow could fall on our sustainability assessment in the same way. That is one concern, the potential inaccuracy of carbon claims that might become associated with wider sustainability claims. The second aspect is if this whole idea of certifying a program which is meant to allow offsetting the emissions of industrial players that are coming from industrial countries… some people think that FSC should maybe completely absent from such involvement…"* (Stefan Salvador, FSC Policy Manager, January 27th, 2012).

Despite the fact that reputational risks have been identified, it seems that the FSC will try to engage under some of the REDD+ issues. This fact might have consequences for the output and input legitimacy of the FSC under REDD+ at the three level of analysis. The official position towards an engagement in climate change activities adopted at the global level will most likely

percolate to the national and local levels. A higher level of engagement can lead to higher levels of effectiveness (output legitimacy) and participation (input legitimacy).

Table 1. Summary of results for the legitimacy of the FSC under REDD+ for each level of analysis

Level of Analysis	Legitimacy		FSC Results
Global	Output Legitimacy Effectiveness	Output	Medium Relevance
		Outcome	Low significance of behavioral changes
	Input Legitimacy - Participation		Indirect and weak
National	Output Legitimacy Effectiveness	Output	Low Relevance
		Outcome	Low significance of behavioral changes
	Input Legitimacy - Participation		Absence
Local	Output Legitimacy Effectiveness	Output	Medium Relevance
		Outcome	No behavioral changes[1]/High significance of behavioral changes[2]

Input Legitimacy - Participation	Absence

1.The first result for outcome at the local level refers to REDD+ processes and activities taking place in the Madre de Dios Mesa regional REDD.

2.The result for outcome at the local level after the slash refers to REDD+ processes and activities taking place out Madre de Dios Mesa regional REDD such as the design and development of REDD+ pilot projects.

CHAPTER 7: THE CLIMATE, COMMUNITY AND BIODIVERSITY ALLIANCE UNDER REDD+

In this chapter the results for the following research question are presented:

ii. What is the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level, and at the national and local levels in Peru?

The results are structured according to the three levels of analysis (global, national and local). Since the research questions were further operationalized (See Chapter 4), the results for output and input legitimacy are separately discussed within each level of analysis.

7. 1.The CCBA under REDD+ at the Global level

The results for output legitimacy of the CCBA under REDD+ come from the analyzed documents (36 were found and analyzed) and the data collected through the interviews with experts and practitioners (See Annex 2). On the other hand, for input legitimacy of the CCBA under REDD+, the results come from the desk research and the interviews. As for the FSC, the UNFCCC meetings have been considered as the international natural space to discuss and develop REDD+ (See Chapter 2). Therefore, the UNFCCC meetings have been used to analyze the participation of the CCBA in REDD+ processes and activities.

7.1.1. Output legitimacy

Regarding the output of the CCBA at the global level, it is important to make a distinction between two different processes that are currently taking place. On the one hand, in many of the found documents of the reviewed organizations´ websites, the CCBA or the CCB standard is mentioned in relation to REDD+ (e.g. Angelsen, 2009a; Estrada, 2011; Miles, 2010). On the other hand, the CCBA is mentioned several times in other documents in relation to a relatively new voluntary certification scheme, the REDD+SES (See Chapter 2) (e.g. CCBA, 2010c; Moss & Nussbaum, 2011; Saunders & Reeve, 2010; UN-REDD program, 2010). The REDD+SES standards were presented during COP-15 and they are basically being design to match government-led REDD+ national programs (Proforest, 2010). CCBA and CARE International are coordinating its development and therefore, it has been common to find the CCBA in the reviewed documents related to REDD+SES standards. Nevertheless, these documents are not taken into account for the results since they do not mention or elaborate on the role that the CCB standard can (potentially) play under REDD+ (See Chapter 5) but instead about how the CCBA is participating in the REDD+SES standards design and development processes.

The role that the CCBA certification can (potentially) play under REDD+ has been stated in many of the collected documents coming from the different reviewed organizations´ websites. In some documents the CCBA is just mentioned as an example of standard that could be used under REDD+ (e.g. Cortez & Stephen, 2009; Miles et al., 2010) while in others some benefits of

using CCBS in some REDD+ projects are acknowledged (e.g. Angelsen, 2009a; Dickson et al., 2009; Terrestrial Carbon Group & UN-REDD Programme, 2009). However, despite the fact that the main topic might change among documents as well as the organizations who wrote them, in most of the cases the relevance of the CCBS for some REDD+ issues is (explicitly or inexplicitly) recognized (e.g. CCBA, 2008; CCBA, 2010b; Cortez & Stephen, 2009; Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, 2010; Richards & Panfil, 2010; WWF, 2010b). Therefore, the relevance of the **output** is overall **medium.** Moreover, there are some main items in the found documents about the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ that can be summarized in the following points:

i. CCBA voluntary certification standard can be one of the existing tools that have already been tested on the ground and which could be integrated in REDD+ to contribute to its success (e.g. CBD, 2010b; Estrada, 2011; FCPF, 2010; TNC, CI and Wildlife Conservation Society, 2010).

ii. The CCBS constitutes a good guide for project developers, including REDD+ projects, because it put emphasis on the environmental and social aspects (e.g. Angelsen, 2009a; CI, 2011; Richards & Panfil, 2010).

iii. The use of the CCBS in REDD+ pilot projects is relevant, not only to avoid risks, but also to contribute to the generation of social and environmental co-benefits (e.g. Angelsen et al., 2009a; CI, 2011; Dickson et al., 2009).

iv. Many early REDD+ projects have already applied the CCBS to avoid social and environmental risks (e.g. CBD, 2011c; McDermott, 2011; Peskett et al., 2008).

v. CCBS is mentioned several times regarding its role for the conservation of biodiversity in REDD+ projects (e.g. Angelsen et al., 2009a; CI, 2011; CBD, 2010b).

vi. CCBS is favored by project developers, investors and buyers. In fact, many buyers would be willing to pay more from credits coming from CCBA certified projects. (e.g. Estrada, 2011; Richards & Panfil, 2010; WWF, 2008).

vii. CCBA voluntary certification standard has been the most widely used standard regarding multiple-benefit land-based emissions reductions projects so far (e.g. Estrada, 2011; Karousakis, 2009; Richards & Panfil, 2010).

viii. CCBA is seen as a good voluntary certification standard to complement projects which are using other voluntary certifications focused on carbon such as the VCS (Estrada, 2011).

Regarding **outcome**, opinions among different REDD+ related actors about the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ have been developed at the global level. These opinions are reflected in both, analyzed documents and interviews.

"I do think so, certainly (referring to the fact that the CCBA can play a positive role for REDD+)…*this is why we are also promoting the CCBA standards… mostly related to the question on safeguards… CCBA and FSC both are a source of information for the developing of, let´s say, good REDD+ projects"* (Gerald Steindlegger, WWF International, Manager of the Global Forest Programme, January 20th, 2012).

"…CCBA or any other initiatives, I think they cannot really contribute or help to REDD+ unless there is a global agreement and place for REDD+…" (Christopher Ties, Greenpeace International Forest campaign policy and strategy coordinator January 16th, 2012).

The CCBA standard is often considered as a "positive tool" for some REDD+ issues like the social and environmental parts of REDD+ projects. Moreover, the first edition of the CCB standards for land-based carbon projects was released in 2005 (CCBA, 2012b). At this time, what we know today as REDD+ just started to be discussed in the UNFCCC meetings. Therefore, from 2005 onwards, the role that the CCBS can (potentially) play under REDD+ has been mentioned more often. This can be easily noticed through the number and year of edition of the found documents that mention or elaborate on this topic (e.g. Dickson et al., 2009; Griscom et al., 2009; Pistorious et al., 2011). Moreover, there are some documents where an interest among actors related to REDD+ to include the CCBS in REDD+ projects is manifested (e.g. Angelsen et al., 2009a; Cortez & Stephen, 2009; Estrada, 2011; Richards & Panfil, 2010) and others where it is mentioned the relevance and benefits for REDD+ projects of using the CCBS, mainly regarding social and environmental issues (e.g. Epple et al., 2011; Murphy, 2011; Petkova et al., 2011). However, since these documents elaborate on local ground experiences, due to the design of the research, this would correspond to the local level analysis and it will be discussed under the Peruvian context. Moreover, it is also interesting the fact that it is mentioned how the CCBA has been able to get more attention that the FSC at the global level so far.

"I think the CCBA was maybe so far more successful in getting attention than the FSC… for the very simple reason that the main goal of the FSC is no related to climate and carbon. The CCBA was specifically design around forest carbon and climate agendas whereas FSC was not designed for this purpose" (Gerald Steindlegger, WWF International, Manager of the Global Forest Programme, January 20th, 2012).

Therefore, all the above exposed show that for **outcome** the **significance of the behavioral changes** among actors related to REDD+ induced by the CCBA is currently **low**.

7.1.2. Input legitimacy

At the global level the CCBA has participated in many of the annual and inter-seasonal UNFCCC meetings. According to the UNFCCC database, the first time that the CCBA participated in a UNFCCC meeting was at the COP-11 in Montreal, 2005. Since then, CCBA official representatives have been participated in other UNFCCC meetings such as COP-15 in Copenhagen 2009, the Bonn climate talks in 2009 or COP-17 in Durban, 2011. The CCBA participates in these meetings as an observer organization and therefore its participation takes

place mainly through side-events[19]. In some occasions CCBA has had its own side-event but most of the times it has participated in association with other interested organizations or stakeholders. These side-events have been mainly used by the CCBA to, for instance, explain the relevance of CCBS to deliver community and biodiversity benefits (UNFCCC, 2012e), and explain the importance of using certification standards under REDD+, making emphasis on the CCBS (CCBA, 2008).

> *"The (FSC or) CCBA are not there as NGOs for example, directly lobbing political positions but they are informing through side events the interested groups about the relationship of this certification scheme and REDD+"* (Gerald Steindlegger, WWF International, Manager of the Global Forest Programme, January 20th, 2012).

Therefore, it can be considered that the CCBA has provided some input through the presentations and discussions and hence the **participation** at the global level has been **indirect and weak** so far.

Box 4. Results summary for the CCBA at the Global level

- The results show that the relevance of the **output** is **medium** at this level, which means that overall, in the analyzed documents, there is recognition of the importance (explicitly or inexplicitly) of the CCBA for some REDD+ processes or activities.
- The results for **outcome** is that the **significance of the behavioral changes is low** which means that an opinion among actors related to REDD+ about the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ have been developed.
- The UNFCCC meetings have been used to analyze the participation of the CCBA in REDD+ processes at this level. The result is that the **participation is indirect and weak** which means that they have provided input about REDD+ related issues

7.2. The CCBA under REDD+ at the National level in Peru

The results for the output legitimacy of the CCBA under REDD+ come from the documents found (18 documents were found and analyzed) in the considered organizations´ websites as well as from the data collected through the interviews with experts and practitioners (See Annex 2). On the other hand, for input legitimacy of the CCBA at the national level, the results come from desk research and interviews. Mesa REDD has been considered as the national official space to discuss and develop REDD+ (See Chapter 2) and hence Mesa REDD meetings have been used to analyze the participation of the CCBA under REDD+ processes and activities.

7.2.1. Output legitimacy

As for the FSC (See Chapter 6), the number of found documents that mention or elaborate about the (potential) role of the CCBA under REDD+ in Peru is not very abundant either (but it

[19] *As for the FSC, a review was done for the minutes of the UNFCCC meeting from the COP-13 to COP-17*

is larger than in the case of the FSC). The documents where the CCBA appear in relation to REDD+ have been mainly elaborate by the MINAM (e.g. MINAM, 2011a; MINAM, 2011b), NGOs (Amazónicos por la Amazonia, 2011; Conservation International, 2010; Piu & Garcia, 2011) and by Grupo REDD Peru (See Chapter 2) (e.g. Grupo REDD Peru, 2008a; Grupo REDD Peru, 2009a; Grupo REDD Peru, 2010). In most of the REDD+ related documents, the CCBA is just mentioned (e.g. Grupo REDD Peru, 2008b; MINAM, 2011b; MINAM, 2011c) due to the participation of CCBA representatives in some of the national REDD+ activities (See section 7.2.2) for which there are attendance lists. Moreover, there are just a few documents where the (potential) role of CCBS in REDD+ is addressed, and which have been, in fact, elaborated by the CCBA (e.g. CCBA, 2009c; CCBA, 2009d). Therefore, the **relevance of the output** for the CCBA in Peru is considered as **low**. Moreover, the main items about CCBA under REDD+ activities and processes found in the documents are summarized in the following points:

i. CCBA standard was the most often used standard by June 2011 in REDD+ pilot projects. The second most often used voluntary certification scheme is the VCS. However, they are not mention as competing schemes but rather as complementary certifications for REDD+ projects. (Amazónicos por la Amazonia, 2011; Organización para Estudios Tropicales, 2011; Piu & Garcia, 2011)

ii. By June 2011, there were 35 REDD+ pilot projects and 16 of them were certified. Since CCBA is the most often used certification, 14 out of the 16 projects were CCBA certified. The other 2 projects were FSC certified (Piu & Garcia, 2011)

iii. Three of these pilot projects were certified just by CCBA while the rest combine CCBA with other voluntary certifications such as VCS, SCS and FSC (Piu &Garcia, 2011)

iv. Currently, the most popular combination of standards for REDD+ project in Peru is CCBS-VCS (Amazónicos por la Amazonia, 2011; Piu & Garcia, 2011)

v. CCBS is considered as an additional certification to carbon standards that can contirbute to generate social and environmental benefits in REDD+ projects (Amazónicos por la Amazonia, 2011; Piu & Garcia, 2011).

Regarding **outcome**, as for the FSC, the results show that the **significance of the behavioral changes** in REDD+ related actors induced by the CCBA in Peru **is low.** As it was previously mentioned, the documents found though desk research showed that in most of the cases the CCBA is mentioned just to address the participation of its representatives during national REDD+ activities. Moreover, as for the global level, opinions have been developed among experts and practitioners and this standard is especially appreciated in relation to the social and environmental aspects of REDD+ projects.

> *"CCBA is a plus for the development of projects because it covers the social aspects and the benefits that can be generated for the local communities or for people living near to the forests"* (Aider, REDD+ expert, February 1st, 2012).

"The CCBA is mainly related to the safeguards because in a way CCBA is also concern with the social and environmental co-benefits" (Jorge Torres, Bosques Amazónicos, Forest carbon manager, January 13th, 2012).)

"CCBA ensures that the social, climatic and biodiversity parts are covered and these are issues which are also included under REDD+. Therefore, CCBA helps you to make sure that these aspects are covered in the projects" (Elvira Gomez, MINAM REDD+ expert, January 12th, 2012).

"I think of all the certification schemes as a tool that allow the monitoring of activities and achievement of objectives…I think they are something that can complement REDD+ projects" (Renso Barrón SERNANP, Natural protected areas expert, January 17th, 2012).

"CCBA is quite oriented to REDD+" (Tatiana Lapeyre, Co-founder and advisor of Ecodevelopment group, January 8th, 2012).

The fact that the significance of the behavioral changes is low might be for two reasons, the insufficient promotion of the CCBS in Peru, and due to the fact that other topics are being currently discussed or have more relevance at the national level.

"I find curious how many people does not know yet anything about the certifications…I think that…CCBA should promote more its standards and bring knowledge and understanding to the field" (Alfredo Rodriguez, WWF Peru, Global Forest Trade and Network Coordinator, February 2nd, 2012).

"I think that currently the discussions are more focus on policy matters, on defining how the country is going to further develop REDD+" (Violeta Colan, Rainforest Alliance Peru, Coordinator of the Andean region, February 3rd, 2012).

However, and regardless of the cause, the fact is that no interest to involve the CCBA in national decision-making processes has been expressed and no changes in REDD+ process or activities induced by the CCBA have been found. Therefore, as it was previously stated, the **outcome** for the CCBA in Peru is that the **significance of the behavioral changes** is **low**.

7.2.2. Input legitimacy

The results for input legitimacy of the CCBA in Peru are quite different from those corresponding to the FSC. The CCBA does not have a permanent official representation at the national level because there are no offices allocated in this country. However, CCBA representatives have participated in the national Mesa REDD Peru in some occasions. They have participated in REDD+ activities from 2008 until 2010. The participation of the CCBA is reflected in both, found documents (e.g. Grupo REDD Peru, 2008c; MINAM, 2011d; MINAM, 2011e; MINAM, 2011f) and interviews.

"From my experience, I can tell you that the CCBA has participated in some workshops where Steve Panfil was representing this organization" (Aider, REDD+ expert, February 1st, 2012).

"In some occasions Steve Panfil has participated in some workshops to tell what the CCB standard is" (Jorge Torres, Bosques Amazónicos, Forest carbon manager, January 13th, 2012).

The first meeting where the CCBA participated was in 2008, in an introductory REDD+ course in the region of Cusco; this course was co-organized by CCBA CI, TNC and all the members of Mesa REDD Peru were invited (Grupo REDD Peru, 2008a). The last registered time that CCBA participated in the Mesa REDD activities was in 2010. In this occasion CCBA and DAR (national NGO) organized a workshop to have a discussion about the nested approach in Peru (See Chapter 2) (Grupo REDD Peru, 2010). The rest of the times that CCBA official representatives have participated in national REDD+ activities have been to provide input about the CCBS through presentations. These presentations were basically aimed to explain what the CCB standard is, the requirements to get CCBA certified and the positive aspects of getting this certification, all of this under the REDD+ framework or context (CCBA, 2009c; CCBA, 2009d)

"The CCBA colleagues have been participating in Peru since 2008, not directly in the debates but rather as people which have resources…" (Hugo Che Piu, Director of DAR, Januray 18th, 2012).

Moreover, CCBA has also participated in some occasions through unofficial actors. For instance in 2009 in one of the Mesa REDD meetings, WWF was in charge of presenting a proposition from the CCBA to the Mesa REDD. This proposition consisted of an offer from CCBA to provide advisory support for a period of one year and a half to three Peruvian organizations in the elaboration of REDD+ projects; some members of the Mesa REDD Peru were in charge of choosing these organizations (Grupo REDD Peru, 2009a; Grupo REDD Peru, 2009). Therefore, although there has not been participation of the CCBA at the national level in many occasions, from all the mentioned above, it can be considered that the times that the CCBA has participated in national REDD+ processes or activities, the **participation has been indirect and weak** because the CCBA representatives have mainly provide input.

"In some meetings CCBA have provided input…but they have not had a preponderant role in the decision-making processes, they were there to offer their opinion and experience" (Hugo Che Piu, Director of DAR, January 18th, 2012).

Box 5. Results summary for the CCBA at the National level

- The results show that the relevance of the **output** is **low.** This means that only mentions to (elements of) CCBA have been found or identified in the analyzed documents.
- The results for **outcome** is that the **significance of the behavioral changes is low** which means that opinions among actors related to REDD+ about the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ have been developed in Peru.
- The national Mesa REDD meetings have been used to analyze the participation of the CCBA in REDD+ processes at this level. The results show that the **participation** is **indirect and weak** which means that CCBA representatives have provided input about REDD+ related issues.

7.3. The CCBA under REDD+ at the Local level in Peru

For the local level, the results for output legitimacy of the CCBA come from the documents found (10 documents were found and analyzed) in the considered organizations´ websites regarding the region of Madre de Dios and the data collected through the interviews with experts and practitioners (See Annex 2). On the other hand, for input legitimacy the results come from desk research as well as from the interviews. The regional Madre de Dios Mesa REDD has been considered as the local natural space to discuss and develop REDD+ (See Chapter 2). Therefore, the regional Mesa REDD meetings have been used to analyze the participation of CCBA in REDD+ processes and activities at the local level.

7.3.1. Output legitimacy

At the local level the significance of the **output** for CCBA in the region of Madre de Dios is **medium**. As for the FSC, the number of found documents is rather scarce. Most of the documents where there is recognition of the relevance or importance of the CCBS for REDD+ are documents related to ongoing REDD+ pilot projects in the region of Madre de Dios. There are documents which have been elaborated by the implementers of the pilot projects (Schroeder, 2009) but there are also some others which have been prepared by other organizations (e.g. ACCA, 2009; CCBA, 2009b; Sheil, et al., 2010). Regardless of the number of documents concerned with this topic, the fact is that those that are currently available explicitly recognize the positive role of the CCBS in REDD+ pilot projects (CCBA, 2009c; Schroeder, 2009; Sheil et al., 2010). Moreover, the main facts found in the documents are summarized in the following points:

i. CCBA voluntary certification standard is mainly used to avoid risks and generate social co-benefits (CCBA, 2009c; CCBA, 2009d; CCBA, 2009c; Schroeder, 2009; Sheil et al., 2010)

ii. CCBS is also used to avoid risks and ensure the production of co-benefits regarding environmental matters (CCBA, 2009c; CCBA, 2009d; CCBA, 2009c; Schroeder, 2009; Sheil et al., 2010)

iii. CCBS helps to quicker develop REDD+ projects (Sheil et al., 2010)

Regarding the **outcome** of CCBA in the region of Madre de Dios, it is also important to make a distinction between the discussions, debates or decision-making processes in the regional Mesa REDD and the REDD+ pilot projects taken place in this region. On the one hand, regarding the Mesa REDD, it can be considered that there have been **no behavioral changes** induced by the CCBA in actors related to REDD+ so far. As explained for the FSC, there are currently other issues being discussed in all the regional Mesa REDD and the same is happening in Madre de Dios. Therefore, although the interviews show that opinions and views about the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ have been developed, this is not currently a topic of discussion in the regional Mesa REDD.

"At the regional level they are working a lot on issues such as the base lines for carbon accounting…as far as I know there are currently no discussions about the CCBA…" (Violeta Colan, Rainforest Alliance Peru, Coordinator of the Andean region, February 3rd, 2012).

On the other hand, the significance of the **behavioral changes** induced by the CCBA in actors related to REDD+ involved in pilot projects can be considered as **high**. In many interviews interest from actors related to REDD+ and involved in pilot projects in getting the projects CCB certified have been expressed. Some interviewees have also manifested the interest of many project developers to get their projects certificated just by the CCBA or by the CCBA in combination with other voluntary certifications. In some occasions the beneftis of using the CCBS has been recongnized as well.

"In the second place we got CCB certified[20] in order to cover the social and environmental parts of the project and actually it got the CCB Gold standard[21]…" (Silvia Gomez, Greenoxx, Co-director of Greenoxx, December 9th, 2011).

"I see that there is an interest in the proposals of the new projects of getting certified…also organizations, like ours, which are searching for funds for the projects see the certifications as a good alternative. In my experience, most the new project proposals are fomenting the use of certifications for REDD+ projects" (Alfredo Rodriguez, WWF Peru, Global Forest Trade and Network Coordinator, February 2nd, 2012).

"Many projects go under a certification process with CCBA and VCS…the fact of getting certified can actually act as a first filter for REDD+ pilot projects because is not that easy to get these certifications" (Jorge Torres, Bosques Amazónicos, Forest carbon manager, January 13th, 2012).

7.3.2. Input legitimacy

As it was previously mentioned, the CCBA has no permanent representation in Peru because it has no offices in this country. However, in some occasions there has been participation of CCBA representatives in the meetings of the Mesa REDD of Madre de Dios. This fact has been found in some documents. For instance, participation of CCBA official representatives in Madre de Dios was registered on May 2009 during the "International workshop on REDD" (CCBA, 2009c). During this workshop the representative of CCBA gave three presentations where the main topics were related to the role of voluntary certification standards under REDD+ projects and the carbon markets (CCBA, 2009c; CCBA, 2009d; CCBA, 2009c). Some interviewees have confirmed the participation of CCBA representatives in the regional Mesa REDD meetings at the very beginning, when the discussions and debates around REDD+ just started in Peru.

"I have been once to one of the workshops where a specialist from CCBA participated in Madre de Dios" (Teddi peñaherrera, CEDISA, Advisor and promoter, January 14th, 2012).

[20] *Referring to Madre de Dios Amazon REDD Project*
[21] *See Chapter 2 for more information about the CCB Gold standard*

"I have been in a workshop where Steve Panfil from CCBA participated… but there have been more than one workshop where he has participated" (Aider, REDD+ expert, February 1st, 2012).

Therefore, the **participation** of the CCBA in the Made de Dios Mesa REDD can be considered as **indirect and weak** because it has been mainly based on providing input about the CBBS in a REDD+ context.

Box 6. Results summary for the CCBA at the Local level

- The results show that the **relevance** of the **output** is **medium** which means that overall, in the analyzed documents, there is recognition of the importance (explicitly or inexplicitly expressed) of the CCBA in some REDD+ processes or activities.
- The results for **outcome** regarding the regional Mesa REDD is that there are **no behavioral changes** which means that although opinions among actors related to REDD+ about the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ have been developed they are not expresses or discussed in this space.
- The results for **outcome** regarding REDD+ pilot projects is that the **significance of the behavioral changes is high** which means that there have been changes in REDD+ in the development and implementation of REDD+ projects induced by the CCBA.
- The regional Mesa REDD of Madre de Dios is used to analyze the participation of the CCBA in REDD+ processes at this level. The results show that the **participation** is **indirect and weak** which means that the actors have provided input about REDD+ related issues.

Table 2. Summary of results for the legitimacy of the CCBA under REDD+ for each level of analysis

Level of Analysis	Legitimacy		CCBA Results
Global	Output Legitimacy Effectiveness	Output	Medium Relevance
		Outcome	Low significance of behavioral changes
	Input Legitimacy - Participation		Indirect and weak
National	Output Legitimacy Effectiveness	Output	Low Relevance
		Outcome	Low significance of behavioral changes
	Input Legitimacy - Participation		Indirect and weak
Local	Output Legitimacy Effectiveness	Output	Medium Relevance
		Outcome	No behavioral changes[1]/High significance of behavioral changes[2]

Input Legitimacy - Participation	Indirect and weak

1. The first result for outcome at the local level refers to REDD+ processes and activities taking place in the Madre de Dios Mesa regional REDD+.

2. The result for outcome at the local level after the slash refers to REDD+ processes and activities taking place out Madre de Dios Mesa regional REDD+ such as the design and development of REDD+ pilot projects.

CHAPTER 8: SUMMARY OF RESULTS, DISCUSSION & REFLECTIONS

Chapter 8 is structured in three different but related blocks. First I present a summary of the results (See Chapter 6 & 7) which are grouped on the one hand, under output legitimacy and effectiveness and, on the other hand, under input legitimacy and participation. Moreover, I discuss the empirical findings regarding the theoretical and conceptual frameworks (See Chapter 3 & 4). At last, I reflect on the theoretical and conceptual approaches as well as the methodology used during the research process (section 8.3 & 8.4).

8.1. Summary of results

In chapters 6 and 7 the results of output and input legitimacy for the FSC and CCBA were structure according to the global, national and local levels of analysis. This allowed a better overview of the current processes taking place for FSC and CCBA under REDD+ at each level of analysis. However, the results are at many points the same for the FSC and CCBA, and the research questions were further operationalized in terms of output and input legitimacy. Therefore, I have integrated the results of FSC, CCBA and the different level of analysis under output (effectiveness) and input (participation) legitimacy. Some common remarks or observations are also summarized at the end of this section.

8.1.1. Output legitimacy and Effectiveness

For the **global level** the results show that in the found documents there is recognition of the importance of the FSC and CCBA as tools that can help to attain REDD+ objectives. FSC and CCBA are, in general, seen as tools that can generate some environmental and social benefits and therefore can contribute to the attainment of (some) REDD+ objectives. This idea is also supported by the experts` and practitioners` opinions. However, this recognition and support might partially be caused by the good reputation of both the FSC and CCBA, instead of by REDD+ experiences on the ground. The fact that FSC and CCBA do not have governmental actors among their members as well as the third-party certification system can have positive consequences for their legitimacy and credibility in many occasions. Moreover, some REDD+ pilot projects which are FSC and/or CCBA certified have already reported the accomplishment of some REDD+ objectives (e.g. See Annex 5). However, the levels of output legitimacy obtained in this research are mainly based on opinions and statements about the role that FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play in the "future" rather than on REDD+ experiences on the ground. This is, indeed, influenced by the "youth" of REDD+ and the remaining uncertainty about some of its components, such as the financial aspects.

For the **national level** the results show that the output legitimacy levels are low for the FSC and CCBA, being these voluntary certification schemes just mentioned in some documents, while experts and practitioners have developed positive opinions towards the role of that these schemes can (potentially) under REDD+. Peru is currently developing its national REDD+

programme, and other topics such as the proper methodologies for carbon accounting or a standard definition of forest, have been, among other things, the focus of the discussions so far. This could partially explain why effectiveness and hence output legitimacy is low. However, REDD+ is just starting to be shaped in this country and according to the interviewees, REDD+ safeguards is a topic that will be soon discussed. The coming discussions about safeguards might constitute a starting point for changes in the levels of output legitimacy of the FSC and CCBA. In the analyzed documents and the interviews, the fact that FSC and CCBA voluntary certification schemes are considered as tools which can help to attain REDD+ objectives and how they are positively related to safeguards, is manifested several times. Moreover, in Peru it has also been reported some cases of FSC and/or CCBA REDD+ certified projects in which these certifications have contributed to generate social and environmental benefits (e.g. See Annex 5).

Output legitimacy is higher for the **local level** than for the global and national levels. The results show that there is recognition of the importance of the FSC and CCBA schemes for some REDD+ processes and activities as well as positive opinions among experts and practitioners towards the (potential) role of these certifications under REDD+. However, these opinions have not been discussed in the regional Mesa REDD so far. Regarding REDD+ projects, a shift in the beahvour of some actors have been found. There are more and more REDD+ projects developers that show interest on getting FSC and/or CCBA certified. It has also been reported some FSC and/or REDD+ certified projects where the benefits of using these certification have been recognized.

8.1.2. Input legitimacy and Participation

For the **global level**, the results show that the participation for both FSC and CCBA can be considered as indirect and weak under the UNFCCC annual and inter annual meetings. As mentioned in Chapter 6 and 7, the participation of the FSC and CCBA mainly takes place in side-events through presentations where information about the benefits of using these certifications under the REDD+ context is shared.

Regarding the participation at the **national level**, there are differences between the FSC and CCBA. There is an absence of participation for the FSC while the participation for the CCBA is indirect and weak. Moreover, the participation of the CCBA has mainly taken place through one of its official representatives in some of the Mesa REDD workshops and meetings when REDD+ was starting to be discussed in Peru. The CCBA has introduced in these activities the CCBS under the REDD+ context and it offered its expertise for the development of three REDD+ pilot projects

As for the national level, the participation in the **regional Madre de Dios Mesa REDD** is different between the FSC and CCBA. While for the FSC there is an absence of participation, for the CCBA is indirect and weak. Regarding the CCBA, its participation is indirect and weak because it has only provided some input about the CCBS under the REDD+ context. It is important to consider that these data just refer to one out of the six Peruvian regions which are involved in REDD+ activities and have their own regional Mesa REDD. However, the fact of including other regions in the research will probably not have led to find higher levels of

participation (mainly for the FSC). Some of the interviewed experts and practitioners have participated in the discussions of other regional Mesa REDD (e.g. San Martin) but did not mentioned facts that could lead to an increase of input legitimacy.

Common remarks for Effectiveness

There are some common remarks or considerations for the three level of analysis that can help to better understand the results of output legitimacy for the FSC and CCBA and infer future potential changes. FSC and CCBA certification schemes are seen, in general, as tools that can contribute to attain REDD+ objectives. However, the official positions as well as their different main goals can also be related to the current levels of effectiveness. On the one hand, although there are still some concerns among FSC members about the reputational risks, this organization is currently studying and working on the different possibilities of engagement in activities aimed to the mitigation of climate change, including REDD+. This approach from the FSC to a more active engagement in climate change activities can lead to make its (potential) role under REDD+ more evident, increasing FSC effectiveness and hence output legitimacy. Since the official position of the FSC towards climate change will most likely percolate to the national and local levels, an increase of output legitimacy can (possibly) be expected at the three levels of analysis. CCBA did not have to sort out these types of issues making its engagement in REDD+ processes and activities easier, not only at the global level but also at the national and local levels. As it was mentioned in Chapter 2, CCBA is coordinating with CARE another set of standards (REDD+SES) which are oriented to fit REDD+ national programmes. Although REDD+SES standard is different from the CCBS, the involvement of the CCBA in this REDD+ oriented activity gives a better idea of the different official positions between the FSC and CCBA towards REDD+. On the other hand, the difference between FSC and CCBA official positions towards climate change is partially related to the main goals of their voluntary certification schemes. The FSC scheme put special emphasis on the promotion of sustainable forests management practices while the CCBS is more oriented to the mitigation of climate change.

Common remarks for Participation

While for the global level the results for FSC and CCBA are the same, differences have been found regarding the national and local levels. There is an absence of participation of the FSC while the CCBA participation in indirect and weak for the two latter levels of analysis. Moreover, the differences in participation between the FSC and CCBA can be partially caused by the already mention official positions towards climate change mitigation activities and the link of FSC and CCBA main goals to these official positions. The absence of FSC participation and the indirect and weak participation of the CCBA in REDD+ processes and activities can also be related to the stage of development and implementation of REDD+ at the national and local levels. Due to the novelty of REDD+ in Peru, the national and regional Mesa REDD have been focused on the discussion of other issues (e.g. definition of forests or proper carbon accounting methodologies) where the competences of FSC and CCBA are more limited. However, REDD+ safeguards is a topic that will be include in the agenda this year and the results show that FSC and CCBA are seen as tools that can positively contribute to the

establishment of REDD+ safeguards. This fact makes possible an increase in the participation levels of the FSC and CCBA, and hence input legitimacy at the national and local levels in Peru.

Table 3. Summary of results for the output and input legitimacy of FSC & CCBA under REDD+

Legitimacy		Level of analysis	FSC	CCBA
Output legitimacy Effectiveness	Output	Global	Medium	Medium
		National	Low	Low
		Local	Medium	Medium
	Outcome	Global	Low significance	Low significance
		National	Low significance	Low significance
		Local	No behavioral Changes [1]/High significance [2]	No behavioral Changes[1]/High significance[2]
		Global	Indirect and weak	Indirect and weak

Input legitimacy Participation	National	Absence of participation	Indirect and weak
	Local	Absence of participation	Indirect and weak

Low output: *when allusions or references to (elements of) FSC and/or CCBA have been found or identified in any of the documents.* ***Medium output:*** *when recognition (explicitly or inexplicitly expressed) of the importance of (elements of) the FSC and/or CCBA for REDD+ can be found or identified in any of the documents.* ***No behavioral changes:*** *when actors related to REDD+ have not developed an opinion about the role that FSC and/or CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+.* ***Low significance outcome:*** *when actors related to REDD+ have developed an opinion (positive or negative) towards the role that FSC and/or CCBA can (potentially) play in REDD+.* ***Medium significance outcome:*** *when actors related to REDD+ show or express interest to include or involve FSC and/or CCBA actors during debates, political and decision-making processes surrounding REDD+ and/or to promote the implementation of these standards under the development of REDD+ pilot projects.* ***Absence of participation:*** *when the considered actors are not present in any of the processes or activities related to REDD+ and hence there is no participation of any kind****. Indirect and weak participation:*** *when the considered actors are invited or asked to provide input or feedback about REDD+ issues.*

1*. It refers to the regional Madre de Dios Mesa REDD.*

2*. It refers to the development and implementation of REDD+ pilot projects in the region of Madre de Dios.*

8.2. Discussion

It was discussed in the theoretical framework how within global environmental governance the power wielded by non-state actors has increased during the last years (Arts, 2006; Pattberg, 2005; Visseren-Hamakers & Glasbergen, 2007) and how the national governments have partially retreated and "shared" their authority with new forms of governance regarding some political fields such as the environmental one (Arts, 2006; Cashore, 2002; Pattberg, 2005). I argued that the case of REDD+ and its interaction with other political environmental tools such as the FSC and CCBA voluntary certification schemes, can be seen as one case which is currently taking place and where not only national governments are involved and in charge of the development and implementation of a new political mechanism, but also other actors that can exercise self-regulation in some degree. It can be argued that REDD+ cannot be seen as a mechanism whose development and implemention relies on different type of actors because in the international sphere national governments are the ones who make the decisions under the UNFCCC meetings and national governments decide how REDD+ national programmes will be developed in their respective countries. However, despite the fact that national governments hold a large part of the authority regarding REDD+ issues, this mechanism implies the involvement and participation of a great variety of groups of non-state actors with their respective interests (Corbera & Schroeder, 2011). For instance, in the case of Peru, the national government is involved in the development of the REDD+ national programme, but also other groups of actors such as NGOs or research institutions participate. At the local level there is also involvement of the regional governments in the political process, but REDD+ pilot projects, which consititute the ultimately real scenario to achieve a reduction of emissions, are developed and implemented by non-state actors without the involvement of any governmental authority in most of the cases.

Moreover, due to the characteristics of the international (environmental) political processes and negotiations, traditional political systems to grant or justify the authority (e.g. citizen vote) of the public actors involved in these processes cannot be applied anymore in most of the cases. This has led to questioning, among other things, the legitimacy of the public actors involved in the policy-making processes regarding environmental matters as well as the legitimacy of the outcomes of these processes. It has been argued by many authors the importance of legitimacy for the functioning and success of different policies, tools or mechanisms (e.g. Bodansky, 1999; Cashore, 2002; Gulbransen, 2005), and the involvement of non-state actors in international (environmental) political processes has been addressed as a fact that can help to partially close the legitimacy gap in the international political sphere (Lövbrand et al., 2009). REDD+ is a result of several international environmental negotiations and hence it can be argued that the involvement of non-state actors during the different development and implementation phases of REDD+ can enhance its legitimacy and success as well. I have explored the role of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+ in terms of output and input legitimacy, by looking at their effectiveness and participation under this mechanism. Therefore, the discussion focuses on output and input legitimacy. However, I also discuss the (potential) relation among these concepts *within* levels of analysis. At last, a (potential) relation between output and input legitimacy *among* different levels of analysis is suggested as well. Although these last two elements of the discussion (relation of output and input

legitimacy *within* and *among* levels of analysis) **do not** directly answer the research questions, some indicators found during the research process point to a (potential) relation. Therefore, it is worth it to discuss them in order to enrich the discussion.

8.2.1. Output legitimacy and effectiveness

It has been discussed how output legitimacy *"revolves around effectiveness"* (Bäckstrand, 2006, p.) and the fact that a given political tool, mechanism etc., can be seen as effective when they ameliorate or solve the problem that motivated their creation in the first place (Guldbransen, 2005). However, I have not explored the effectiveness of FSC and CCBA regarding their main goals or the reasons behind the creation of these organizations but their effectiveness regarding REDD+. REDD+ as a political mechanism that has emerged within the international political arena can be subject to criticism regarding its effectiveness and hence legitimacy. The involvement of groups of non-state actors in the development and implementation of this mechanism can help to enhance both the (perceived) effectiveness and legitimacy of REDD+. It has been documented that FSC and CCBA are, in general terms, seen as considerable alternatives to international environmental politics (Cashore et al., 2003; Pattberg, 2005; Woods, 2011). In line with this statement, the results of this research also show how these voluntary certification schemes are usually considered by actors belonging to different levels of analysis as effective tools, that in this case, can contribute to the attainment of (some) REDD+ goals. Moreover, some scholars (e.g. Bäckstrand, 2006) have also addressed the relevance of non-state actors as key groups that can, in different degrees, offset the (perceived) lack of effectiveness and legitimacy of many (environmental) political instruments. Although due to the "youth" of REDD+ it might be too early to discuss whether the FSC and CCBA are being effective regarding REDD+ goals, the results show that these voluntary certification schemes can "potentially" contribute to cover some REDD+ weakness. Ecosystem leakages or local communities' displacement are some of the problems often related to REDD+ which can led to the questioning of the effectiveness and legitimacy of this mechanism. However, as the results show, FSC and CCBA voluntary certification schemes are usually mentioned in relation to REDD+ safeguards as tools that can ameliorate or prevent the mentioned problems. Therefore, it can be argued that the effectiveness of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+ is important for this mechanism since they are regarded as means that could avoid some REDD+ related problems, having positive effects for its the success and legitimacy. The fact that actors belonging to different levels of analysis have developed similar opinions towards the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+, make the relevance of their effectiveness even greater for REDD+, and supports the theoretical idea that groups of non-state actors can offset the (potential) lack of legitimacy and effectiveness of an international political instrument. It is important to note again that the results mainly refer to "future" events rather than to current experiences on the role of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+. However, this fact should not downplay the importance of the collected data and their contribution to the theory. On the contrary, even without much real experiences on this topic, the data point to the relevance of the effectiveness of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+ for the success of this mechanism mainly regarding some of its most controversial aspects. In other words, the data address how the current and "future" effectiveness of these two forms of international private governance can help to the success and hence legitimacy of a political

instrument that embraces a broad range of actors but whose inception took place within the traditional international political sphere.

The results of this research and their contribution to the theory are particularly important in this case due to the early stage of development of REDD+. Knowing that FSC and CCBA are, in general terms, seen as tools that can (potentially) contribute to the attainment of (some) REDD+ goals can lead to the future enhancement of the effectiveness of FSC, CCBA and ultimately REDD+. For instance, in the case of Peru, there have not been developed at the national level any criteria or indicators to identify which projects can actually be classified as REDD+ projects yet. However, there has been a great proliferation of projects which are listed in different documents and websites (e.g. Piu & Garcia, 2011) as *REDD+ projects*. This proliferation has been partially caused by the *nested approach* that Peru supports and the extension of the scope of REDD+. On the one hand, the nested approach enables the development of projects without a defined REDD+ national programme. On the other hand, the fact that REDD+ scope has been expanded including objectives such as the sustaianble management of forests, has probably allowed the addition of projects which have not to be necessarily focused on the reduction of emissions through the avoidance of deforestation and forest degradation. Although many projects are classified as REDD+ projects, there are not criteria to identify which of them actually are aimed at the attainment of REDD+ objectives or to differentiated which of them are being carried out as *"good REDD+ projects"* from those which are not. Once the national REDD+ programme is completely defined and decisions about the finances, definition of forests or the proper carbon accounting methodologies are made, the current levels of output legitimacy of FSC and CCBA voluntary certification schemes could change. Looking at the positive opinions of the experts and practitioners involved in REDD+ national processes and activities, it is likely that the FSC, CCBA and maybe also other voluntary certification schemes (e.g. VCS or SCS), will be taken into account to identify *"good REDD+ projects".* Moreover, this fact could be reinforced if by the time that the REDD+ national programme is defined, projects which have used FSC and/or CCBA standards can prove the attainment of (some) REDD+ objectives (e.g. See Annex 5). If the described events take place this case would constitute a clear evidence of the positive role that non-state actors can play in an international political mechanism at different levels of governance. However, I argue that the general and positive "stream of thought" that have been found in the three levels of analysis regarding the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ could have a counterpoint. Although FSC and CCBA can (potentially) contribute to attainment of some REDD+ objectives as well as cover some of the weakness of this mechanism, it is important to be aware that these certification schemes have limitations. One of the main drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in Peru, as well as in many other developing countries, are illegal logging, migratory farming, different activities associated to people living in illegal settlements, etc. In fact, Peru is currently experiencing significant migratory movements from the Andes to the Amazon region and a consequent increase of the pressure over the lands in this area (See Chapter 2). It was addressed in the results (See Chapter 6 & 7) that FSC and CCBA certification schemes can contribute, among other things, to solve some social conflicts (e.g. land tenure disputes). However, solving problems related to the mentioned illegal activities (and their usual negative consequences for forests) is usually beyond the FSC and CCBA competences (e.g. "…*if we are talking about a forest which is under*

the threat of migratory agriculture then there is not much that the certification can do…" Teddi peñaherrera, CEDISA). Moreover, the fact that certification schemes are used in many occasions in areas which are under recovery processes and where sustainable practices were already taking place, has been often documented and criticized in the literature (e.g. Pattberg, 2005). This research has shown that there is an increasing interest among project executers to go under FSC and/or certification processes in order to faster develop REDD+ projects, and this fact might bring along some risks. If sustainable management practices were already taking place in areas which get FSC and/or CCBA certified in order to faster develop REDD+ projects, a "real" and significant reduction of emissions might not be attained. In these cases, REDD+ economic benefits would be used to "reward" practices which were already sustainable. Although I do not argue that this is a negative fact, it could however, contribute to make less appealing to work on forest areas which are significantly threated by deforestation and forest degradation, downplaying the contribution of REDD+ to the reduction of emissions. For instance, one of the interviewees addressed the fact that "...*in forests which are not under this threat* (agriculture migratory threat) *it has been much easier to develop the projects and sell carbon credits…"* (Teddi peñaherrera, CEDISA). Therefore, although the current levels of effectiveness of the FSC and CCBA certification schemes can be seen as a positive fact, it is important take into consideration these risks and analyze if certified projects are contributing to a significant reduction of emissions or if on the contrary, they are taking place in areas where this reduction was already achieved and therefore further avoidance of deforestation and forest degradation processes have not occurred. In addition, the expansion of the scope of REDD+ can excarbate these risks. Conservation and sustainable management of forest are currently included in the UNFCCC definition of REDD+ as well, making easier for those areas in which sustainable management practices were already taking place to perceive REDD+ economic derived benefits, but not necessarily reducing deforestation and forest degradation rates in a given country. From a more theoretical perspective, the described facts could have negative consequences for the effectiveness and output legitimacy of FSC, CCBA and REDD+. On the one hand, these certification schemes would be harder criticized regarding their own goals. From a global governance point of view, the effectiveness of non-state actors could be questioned. On the other hand, REDD+ could be perceived as an unsuccessful mechanism regarding the reduction of emissions in developing countries. Although it is still too early to make such statements with certainty, since REDD+ project developers are more and more interested in these certifications (and in others), it is important to take into consideration the mentioned risks. In Peru there are 16 REDD+ projects out of 35 which are FSC and/or CCBA certified (by June 2011) (See Annex 6 & 7). Therefore, this country constitutes a very good example of the relevance that these certifications are acquiring for REDD+ and hence, the need to analyzed the described issues. At last, although effectiveness is high for FSC and CCBA at the local level, the number of REDD+ pilot projects certified by the CCBA is higher than those certified by the FSC (not only in Madre the Dios but also in the rest of regions)(See Annex 6 & 7). The fact the CCBA is considered as a useful tool mainly to addres REDD+ safeguards as well as for generation of social and environmental co-benefits might point to the risk of putting too much attention to these issues which although very important, are not direcly related to the main REDD+ objective, the reduction of CO_2 emissions.

Moreover, as it can be appreciated in the previous summary (See section 8.1), the results are the same for the FSC and CCBA within the different levels of analysis. In terms of output, the FSC and CCBA have been more effective at the global and local levels while regarding outcome, the highest levels can be found in the development and implementation of REDD+ pilot projects. Skjaerseth & Wettestad (2002) stated that behavioral changes (outcome) are necessary but not sufficient for effectiveness and they addressed the need to first produce output in order to induce outcome (these authors refer to the effectiveness of regimes). However, this "linear" relation between output and outcome is only found for the international level in this research. Since REDD+ is a "youth" mechanism that is still under discussion at the international level and in an early stage of implementation at the national level in Peru, it could be argued that at this point output "should be higher" that outcome; in other words, that the current production of documents which discuss the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+, will lead to future behavioral changes in actors related to REDD+, having effects for the effectiveness of FSC and CCBA under this mechanism. While for the international level this relation has been found (for FSC and CCBA output is medium and the significance of the behavioral changes is low), for the national level there are no differences between output and outcome. Moreover, at the local level this relation between output and outcome have been found regarding the regional REDD+ political processes (the level of output is medium but there not behavioral changes), but it cannot be applied to the development and implementation of REDD+ projects (the significance of the behavioral changes is high). The fact that at the international level a relation between output and outcome has been found is probably a consequence of a "logical succession of processes". Fist REDD+ emerges in the international political sphere; second, different actors start to discuss different options to make REDD+ success; third the FSC and CCBA start to be considered as useful tools for the attainment of REDD+ objectives and this idea is discussed and expressed in different documents; at last, the idea propagates and behavioral changes in actors related to REDD+ can be expected. However and as the results show, at the national and local level this "linear" or "logical" relation between output and outcome is different. Many REDD+ countries like Peru, are rushing to implement their REDD+ national programmes and to develop REDD+ pilot projects in order to obtain the benefits, not only economic but also environmental and social that REDD+ can bring along. In fact, the nested approach that Peru supports can be seen as an indicator of this "rush" and can partially explains why there is no "logical" relation between output and outcome. As it was mention before, in Peru there has been a great proliferation of REDD+ pilot projects without a completely defined national REDD+ programme and this proliferation is one of the consequences of the nested approach. However, the nested approach should not be considered as a strategy that only addresses this "rush". In the Declaration of Tarapoto (2008) it was already mentioned that one of the advantages of the nested approach is that the allowance of the development of REDD+ pilot projects can be useful to contribute to the future development of the REDD+ national strategy. Moreover, some of the developed pilot projects are FSC and/or CCBA certified and for some of them it has been already documented the benefits of using these certifications to attain (some) REDD+ objectives (See Annex 5). These facts, favored by the nested approach, address an opposite relation between output and outcome: behavioral changes in actors related to REDD+ towards the role of FSC and/or CCBA under this mechanism have first taken place by mechanisms not related to output and this fact has afterwards, led to a given output where

the role of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+ are discussed. However, these differences might not be surprising due to the different political characteristics among levels of governance. Behavioral changes leading to "real" actions seem more likely to take place at "lower" levels of governance while global political processes are many times characterized by a stagnancy on the discussions and hence in the actions that need to be carried out in order to make new policies and mechanisms work.

The (potential) consequences of other aspects which have not been taken into account in this research can also be relevant for the (future) effectiveness of FSC and CCBA under REDD+. If FSC and/or CCBA are associated to REDD+ pilot projects where for instance, problems or disputes have arisen with local communities, the current (perceived) effectiveness of FSC and CCBA under REDD+ can be "harmed". This "harm" could be especially important within the local and national levels since the actors working at these levels are usually more directly involved in this type of issues. Moreover, the nature and characteristics of the problem can also be considered as important elements when looking at the effectiveness (Kalfagianni & Pattberg, 2011; Skjaerseth & Wettestad, 2002) of FSC and CCBA under REDD+. For instance, REDD+ is a mechanism focused on the mitigation of climate change and therefore, the spatial scale of the problem is global making more difficult both to become effective under REDD+ and to asses effectiveness. It should also be considered that the FSC and CCBA are just two of the multiple groups of actors working in REDD+ related issues. The results of the effectiveness of these voluntary certification schemes under REDD+ are important to shed some light into what is currently taking place or what is likely to happen in the not too distant future regarding the attainment of REDD+ goals, but the role of other relevant groups (e.g. local communities) has also to be considered.

8.2.2. Input legitimacy and participation

It was discussed in the theoretical framework how input legitimacy *"rely on the rhetoric of participation and of consensus"* (Skogstad, 2003, p.322) or refers to "*the democratic quality of rule-making process"* (Lövbrand et al., 2009, p.77). It was also mentioned that some authors have argued how the (perceived) lack of legitimacy in (environmental) political decision-making processes could partially be offset by an increase of the involvement and participation of groups of non-state actors (e.g. Beisheim & Dingwerth, 2008; Lövbrand, 2009; Newig & Fritsch, 2009b). Moreover, Skogstad (2003) addressed that through participation a "democratization" of a given policy takes place and hence the outcomes of that policy might be better accepted. In the case of this research, it can be argued that the participation of FSC and CCBA can make of REDD+ a more "democratic" international mechanism and therefore, be better accepted by a given community (community here ranges from the local to the global sphere and can also refer to different groups of stakeholders involved in REDD+ related issues). It is important to note that the FSC and CCBA are not regarded as groups that "must" participate in REDD+ political processes and activities since they are directly not affected by the outcomes of REDD+. However, it is often assumed that the quality of decision making-processes and political outcomes can be enhanced through an increase of the participation of different groups of actors (Bulkeley & Mol, 2003; Newig & Fritsch, 2009b), and that participation has a learning component that is important to consider (Bulkeley & Mol, 2003). Following this statement, I argued that the participation of the FSC and CCBA at different levels

of analysis is important, not because they are seen as groups affected by REDD+ that have the "right" to participate in REDD+ processes, but because their participation have a learning component that can be relevant for some REDD+ issues such as the safeguards or development of "*good REDD+ projects"*. For instance, at the national and local levels the CCBA has participated in some of the REDD+ activities and workshops promoting the benefits of using the CCBS for some aspects of REDD+ pilot projects and offered its expertise for the development of three REDD+ projects. This shows that despite the fact that the competences of CCBA are not directly related to the political development of REDD+, this organization can provide valuable inputs and expertise for some REDD+ activities, making evident the learning component of participation. Moreover, the participation of the CCBA in the national and regional Mesa REDD can be also seen as an indicator of the willingness of this group to develop REDD+ on a participatory basis, giving voice to different groups of actors. In the same line, the participation of the CCBA in some REDD+ activities can be considered as a sign of the "democratic" processes taking place in the development of this mechanism in Peru. This involvement reinforces an approach to REDD+ with a stronger stakeholder participation which may have positive consequences for its success and hence legitimacy. Regarding the absence of the FSC, it has already been mentioned that this is probably related to the official position towards an engagement in climate change mitigation activities rather than on "restrictive" REDD+ participatory processes in Peru. Therefore, the participation of these relatively new forms of private governance in some of the REDD+ processes and activities show how nowadays debates, political and decision-making processes, are more accessible to a broader range of actors and thereby, it can be argue that a democratization of some political processes is, to some extent, taking place.

The participatory features of any process are an important element that has to be taken into account when considering the results for the participation of the FSC and CCBA in REDD+ activities. Schroeder (2010) mentioned how the norms and characteristics of the participatory processes can be determinant for the degree of involvement or participation of a given group. This theoretical statement is, in this research, especially evident for the international level. Although FSC and CCBA have already been participating for a few years in the side-events of UNFCCC annual and inter-annual meetings, their participation regarding REDD+ issues remains indirect and weak. *"The norms of participation"* make that organizations such as the FSC and CCBA are usually invited to provide input or feedback about a given issue, mainly through side-events. Therefore, their views and concerns are not considered (indirect and weak participation) during the official negotiations and they do not act as partners in these decision-making processes (direct and weak participation). On the other hand, although for national and local levels the participation of the CCBA is also indirect and weak, this organization has been involved in the official meetings of the national and regional Mesa REDD and thereby in contact with actors who are directly related to the development of the REDD+ national strategy and REDD+ pilot projects. Therefore, although the level of participation is the same for the three levels of analysis, it can be argued that at the national and local levels in Peru, the CCBA has been more involved in the "core" of the processes and activities to develop REDD+ than at the international level due to, among other things, the differences in the characteristics of the participatory processes at the different levels of analysis. The consequences of interacting with actors who are, in different degrees and ways, involved in

the development of REDD+ might be important for the future participation of the CCBA as well as for its effectiveness. However, this fact has not been taken into account and further research would be needed in order to asses *"the effectiveness of participation"* looking at the actors involved in these REDD+ processes.

8.2.3. Relation between effectiveness and participation *within* a level of analysis

As it was addressed in the theoretical framework, a relation or trade-offs between output and input legitimacy has been discussed by many authors (e.g. Bäckstrand, 2006; Bernstein & Dingwerth, 2008; Lederer, 2011; Lövbrand et al., 2009). Although the research objectives were not aimed at the study or exploration of the relationship between output and input legitimacy, the results of the research can contribute to this theoretical debate, making worth to briefly discuss these findings regarding the theory. Moreover, in the context of this research, this relation takes place in terms of effectiveness and participation of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+ at the international, national and local levels in Peru. However, it is important to mention that since this was not the objective of the research, the discussion about the relation between effectiveness and participation is focused on the comparison of the results of FSC and CCBA instead of on the specific outcomes obtained for each organization.

The levels of effectiveness and participation are the same for the FSC and CCBA at the international level but different at the national and local levels in Peru. It is therefore, at the national and local levels where a relation between effectiveness and participation becomes more evident. The results show that the participation of the CCBA at the national and local levels is indirect and weak while there is an absence of participation of the FSC in REDD+ processes and activities. Moreover, it was mentioned in the results (See Chapter 7) that the CCBA is currently the most often used voluntary certification scheme, being 14 REDD+ projects certified by the CCBA out of the 16 projects which have any kind of certification. On the other hand, there are just 5 REDD+ projects certified by the FSC. The number of REDD+ pilot projects that are certified either by the CCBA and/or FSC can be seen as an indicative of their effectiveness reaching REDD+ related actors, making them more interested in obtaining these certifications for REDD+ projects. The fact that the CCBS is used more often than the FSC scheme for REDD+ pilot projects can be a consequence of the higher level of participation in REDD+ processes and activities of the former organization. It has been mentioned how the CCBA has provided input about the benefits of using CCBS in REDD+ pilot projects and offered its expertise for the development of three REDD+ initiatives. These facts might have enhanced CCBA effectiveness (mainly regarding the behavioral changes or outcome dimension) because by sharing information and considering the learning processes that take place thought participation (Bulkeley & Mol, 2003), the CCBA perhaps has been able to get the attention and interest of a broader range of REDD+ related actors in comparison to what it would have happened in a participation absence scenario, which is the case of the FSC. The higher number of REDD+ pilot projects certified by the CCBA can be hence seen as an evidence of its effectiveness reaching REDD+ related actors and inducing behavioral changes through its participation. Therefore, the comparison between the levels of effectiveness and participation of the FSC and CCBA within a level of analysis (in this case the local level) contributes or supports the theoretical idea of a relation between output and input legitimacy. Moreover,

these results are also in line with the general assumption that an increase in participation can be one of the key strategies to offset a lack of effectiveness or to enhance effectiveness (Newig & Fritsch, 2009). At last, at the international level the results for effectiveness and participation are the same, which makes stronger the argument in favor of a relation between output and input legitimacy. In other words, it can be argued that equal levels of participation for the FSC and CCBA have led to equal levels of effectiveness for both organizations or *vice versa,* pointing again to a relationship between these two concepts. However, it is important to consider or have in mind that other factors might have influenced the relation between effectiveness and participation. This becomes especially important when comparing the results of FSC and CCBA. For instance, the CCBS is oriented to climate change mitigation projects and thereby this standard seems more appropriate for REDD+ projects, mainly for those where logging and wood management are not the core or do not take place within a project. In order to be more certain about the described relation between effectiveness and participation, it should be necessary to, for instance, look at the nature and characteristics of all REDD+ projects which are certified by the CCBA and/or FSC. It would also be recommendable to look the effectiveness and participation of other voluntary certification schemes that can be currently found in REDD+ projects in Peru such as the VCS, as well as to consider more indicators than just the number of REDD+ projects that are certified by FSC and/or CCBA.

8.2.4. Relation between effectiveness and participation *among* levels of analysis

Newing & Fristch (2009a) addressed that although little is known, it is likely that a relationship between participation, multi-level governance and governance effectiveness exists. I have already discussed a potential relationship *within* levels of analysis, but following these authors I argued that a relation between participation, effectiveness and different levels of governance is likely to take place regarding the legitimacy of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+. In the context of this research the defined levels of analysis would correspond to different levels of governance and hence it is possible to make a distinction between global, national and local levels of governance. Moreover, this suggestion of relationship between effectiveness and participation among different levels of governance is partially based on the theory and some of the collected data, but also on some personal reflections about possible future events and developments in the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+. I argue that in a multi-level governance context such as in the case of REDD+, the relevance of participation and effectiveness can change depending on the approach adopted. On the one hand, when a top-down approach is adopted, participation seems to play a more important role than effectiveness. On the other hand, using a bottom-up approach, the role of effectiveness seems to become more relevant than participation.

REDD+ is a political mechanism which *"permeates through multiples spheres of decisions-making and organization"* (Corbera & Schroeder, 2011, p. 90) and therefore, different activities related to REDD+ and carried out by groups such as the FSC and CCBA, are likely to take place and have consequences for more than one level of governance. This is also related to the fact that actors do not *"*belong*"* or work just within one level of governance. I have grouped the experts` and practitioners` opinions according to the different levels of (governance) analysis by looking at the main working spheres of their organizations. However,

in many cases the interviewees have reported their experiences on REDD+ related issues for more than one level of governance (e.g. national and local). This fact was also observed in the attendance lists of the national and regional Mesa REDD meetings, where the participation of certain organizations at both levels of governance is registered. Moreover, some of the interviewees that "belong" to the national and/or local levels of governance have attended some UNFCCC meetings. Therefore, I argue that the participation of REDD+ related actors in a given level of governance can have (positive or negative) consequences for the effectiveness and participation of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+ at "lower" levels of governance. Adopting a top-down approach, the participation of the FSC and CCBA in side-events during UNFCCC meetings can be seen as a platform where actors related to REDD+ can pick up some *"take-home messages"* about the benefits of using these certifications to, for instance, develop *"good REDD+ projects".* In other words, the participation of the FSC and CCBA in the side-events has a learning component and the dissemination of information and knowledge can permeates to "lower" levels of governance. Peruvian REDD+ related actors attending UNFCCC meetings can thereby pick some *"take-home messages"* which could further enhance the effectiveness and participation of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+ at the national and local levels. It is also important to consider that for this research I have only analyzed the participation of the FSC and CCBA in REDD+ processes and activities at UNFCCC meetings. However, FSC, CCBA and Peruvian REDD+ related actors, could be involved in other platforms or spaces where REDD+ issues are also discussed at the global level. Although these discussions might not have a visible impact on the decisions made under the official UNFCCC negotiations, they should not be underestimated. Parallel REDD+ discussions can constitute a mean to get the interest and raise the awareness in actors related to REDD+ about the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under this mechanism, permeating to "lower" levels of governance as well. Moreover, following the same line of reasoning, the participation of the CCBA and FSC in national REDD+ processes and activities can help to get attention of REDD+ related actors which are also working at the local governance level, influencing effectiveness and participation. I also argue that in the case of Peru this relationship is more likely to take place or be more evident in a not too distance future. REDD+ safeguards are going to be discussed during this year in Peru and it has already been mentioned that the results show a "positive relation" between FSC, CCBA and REDD+ safeguards. Regarding the skepticism expressed by some scholars about the benefits of more participatory process (See Chapter 3), I also argue that in multi-level governance context participation at "higher" levels of governance is a positive fact for effectiveness and participation at "lower" levels of governance. The potential (democratic and legitimation) benefits for REDD+ derived from the participation in processes and activities of organizations such as the FSC and CCBA have already been discussed. In addition, as it was mentioned before, the relevance of the learning and dissemination elements of participation are especially evident in some platforms such as the UNFCCC side-events, where a great variety of actors who belong to difference levels of governance are involved. The fact that the relevance of the side-events has considerably increased over the years (UNFCCC, 2012) can be already understood an evidence of the importance of participation. Moreover, the involvement of the FSC and CCBA also suggests that the members of these organizations are well-aware of the importance of participating in these types of platforms to reach other actors and increase their effectiveness at different governance levels.

On the other hand, adopting a bottom-up perspective, the effectiveness of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+ processes and activities at "lower" levels of governance can have (positive or negative) consequences for their output and input legitimacy at "higher" levels of governance. For instance, in Peru some REDD+ pilot projects have reported through documents (output) the benefits of using FSC and/or CCBA voluntary certification schemes for REDD+ projects. Some of these positive experiences have reached the national and global levels. The case of Madre de Dios Amazon REDD Project (See Annex 5) is a very good example because its success has been internationally recognized. The experiences and results of this project have been documented by organizations such as CI or the Woods Hole Research Center and integrated in reports presented during the COP-15 (See Chapter 7). In all these documents the FSC and CCBA are mentioned as positive elements which have contributed to the "success" of the project. Therefore, this example can constitute an evidence of how positive experiences regarding the role of the FSC and CCBA in REDD+ projects have "permeated" from the local to the global level and might hence have consequences for their effectiveness and participation at "higher" governance levels. As a counterpoint, the relation between effectiveness, participation and multi-levels of governance could also be negative for the (potential) role of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+ if bad experiences from REDD+ pilot projects which are certified by either one or both certification schemes are reported. For instance, this is reflected in the awareness and concern among FSC members about a (potential) link or association of the FSC scheme with improper, inaccurate or false carbon claims (See Chapter 6) coming from projects at the local level. This "negative association" could cause damages to the image of the FSC but also for the CCBA, at different levels of governance, having (potential) negative effects for the legitimacy of these organizations. Moreover, to take the (potential) results of REDD+ certified projects to argue that effectiveness seems to play a more relevant role from a bottom-up approach can be seen as a "weak" argument and a narrow perspective. However, the reduction of emissions has to take place on the physical ground through REDD+ projects. Therefore, if experiences (positive or negative) from REDD+ certified projects are reported from "low" levels of governance (e.g. local or regional levels), changes in effectiveness and participation at "higher" levels of governance (e.g. national or global levels) can be expected. The report of experiences can take place through the output (elaboration of documents, presentation, etc.) and/or outcome (behavioral changes in REDD+ related actors such as recognition of the benefits of using certification schemes in REDD+ projects) dimensions of effectiveness.

However, as I said before, this part of the discussion is partially based on theoretical considerations and the obtained results but also on some personal reflections and observations about the possible relation between multi-level governance, participation and effectiveness regarding FSC, CCBA and REDD+. Therefore, further research would be needed in order to be more certain about a (potential) relationship among effectiveness and participation in a multi-level governance context as well as to assess if there are differences between the relevance of effectiveness and participation regarding the study approach (top-down or bottom-up) in a multi-level governance context.

8.3. Reflection on theoretical and conceptual approaches

Global environmental governance has been used as the theoretical context to explore the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+. Global environmental governance, in general terms, embraces the study of public, private and hybrid forms of governance, political tools and mechanism and it has therefore constituted a good and appropriate theoretical lens to approach the research objectives and answer the research questions. The fact that global (environmental) governance and many of the different actors included under this field have been studied and analyzed by many scholars provided a good theoretical basis for the research as well. Moreover, legitimacy has been used to further operationalize the research questions. Legitimacy has also been extensively discussed within the political academic literature, facilitating the use and operationalization of this theoretical concept in the research. However, legitimacy was not the main element when this thesis was first sketched. I first intended to use *"agency"* to explore the (potential) role of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+, and legitimacy was "just" considered as an important element to analyze agency. At last, since a large part of the theoretical and conceptual approach was based on legitimacy issues and this concept can constitute a whole research element by "itself", agency was discarded.

The operationalization of output and input legitimacy through effectiveness, participation and their respective indicators was also facilitated by the information found in the academic literature. However, I faced some problems when applying this information to my research. The "youth" of REDD+ and the early stage of implementation of this mechanism in Peru are strongly related to these problems. The operationalization of effectiveness through output and outcome was especially conflictive and the novelty of REDD+ and some issues related to this mechanism, led to a measurement of current events (the role that FSC and CCBA play under REDD+) but also of potential facts (the role that FSC and CCBA can (potentially) under REDD+). Moreover, it is also important to consider that output legitimacy was operationalized just by using two elements of effectiveness (output and outcome). Other relevant aspects of output legitimacy that were presented in theoretical framework (e.g. institutional effectiveness) were discarded in order to narrow down the research. The same limitation can be found for input legitimacy and participation, for which concepts such as responsiveness, fairness or representativeness were discarded. Moreover, input legitimacy has only been analyzed in the official negotiations of each level of analysis (UNFCCC meetings for the global level, national Mesa REDD meetings and Madre de Dios regional Mesa REDD meetings). Perhaps, the analysis of other parallel discussions where FSC, CCBA and REDD+ related actors participate can provide more or even new inputs regarding the objective of the research. At last, the fact that the same indicators have been used to look at the output and input legitimacy of FSC and CCBA might partially explain why the results are the same, for instance, at the global level. A shaper or more detailed definition of the indicators (output, outcome and participation) could have provided more or new insights to the research. I have mentioned how the specific characteristics of these organizations such as their specific goals or official position towards climate change mitigation activities, are relevant to understand and discuss the results. Therefore, incorporating or integrating these considerations into the operationalization of

output and input legitimacy could allow to find (if any) differences between the role of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+.

Despite the fact that there are some limitations or shortcomings, this research has contributed to the theoretical debated around the relevance of legitimacy in global environmental governance and it illustrates some important events taking place under one of the current most controversial international environmental mechanism: REDD+. This research can be seen as a basis of the relevance to further investigate the output and input legitimacy of different groups of actors working under REDD+. Gaining knowledge about these issues is especially important at this early stage of the development of REDD+ because (new) actions and decisions to ensure the success of this mechanism can be easier made. The contribution of this research is also important since it addresses how the involvement of FSC and CCBA in REDD+ processes and activities can be relevant for the attainment of REDD+ goals and hence contribute to the success of this mechanism.

8.4. Reflection on methodology

In order to explore the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+, I have carried out desk research and in-depth phone interviews with REDD+ experts and practitioners. The main limitation of the desk research is the possible unavailability of some valuable documents regarding the objectives of the research. This fact is especially important for the national and local levels where documents are rather scarce. Moreover, in order to narrow down the research, some websites were selected. Therefore, increasing the spectrum of the researched websites would probably lead to find more documents which could have provided valuable inputs. Regarding the interviews, the global level is the one which a lower number of interviewees. FSC, CCBA as well as other international organizations were contacted but it was not always possible carry out interviews with the targeted actors. For instance, I did not have any interview with actors working for CCBA probably because they were busy. Interviews with CCBA actors would have been very valuable to incorporate information about the (in case they have one) future strategy of CCBA in Peru and further discuss its effectiveness and participation in this country. However, to measure output and participation, interviews with CCBA actors were not needed since most of the information can be found in documents. For outcome, I did not intend to measure behavioral changes in CCBA related actors but instead in REDD+ actors induce by the CCBA. Therefore, although it would have been valuable and interesting, interviews with CCBA official representatives was not a major need for the research. On the other hand, I believe that for the national and local level the interviews have covered a broad and diverse group of actors which are related, in different degrees, to REDD+ issues. The fact that many interviewees recommended me to talk with other people that whether, I had already interviewed or I had an appointment for a future interview, can be seen as an indicator that supports my argument.

However, at the beginning it was difficult sometimes to understand the REDD+ structure and processes taking place in Peru just through desk research and the interviews. Probably being present in some of the activities, workshops or having face-to-face interviews would have facilitated the investigation process and perhaps it could have provide more input for the

exploration of the (potential) role of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+ for the national and local levels of analysis.

CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

This last chapter is divided in two main sections. The first section contains the conclusions of the research were the most relevant facts of the results (See Chapter 6 &7) and the discussion (See Chapter 8) are addressed. The second section of this chapter consists on some suggestions or recommendations for further research regarding the topic of the thesis.

9.1. Conclusions on the research

This thesis has aimed to explore the role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+. In order to accomplish this objective, four initial research questions were presented in Chapter 1 and were further operationalized in terms of output and input legitimacy in Chapter 4. The research questions are:

i. What is the role that the FSC can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level and at the national and local levels in Peru, in terms of output and input legitimacy?

ii. What is the role that the CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ at the global level and at the national and local levels in Peru in terms of output and input legitimacy?

As it can be seen in previous chapters, the results have answered these questions. Since the results are in many cases the same for FSC and CCBA, the conclusions follow the same structure of the discussion:

i. ***In terms of legitimacy (output and input).*** The legitimacy of the FSC and CCBA is an important element for REDD+ due to the (partial) alignment of the objectives of these organizations and REDD+ goals. FSC and CCBA certification schemes are seen as tools that can contribute to the attainment of REDD+ goals. Although FSC and CCBA are not directly affected by REDD+, the output and input legitimacy of these organizations can be relevant for the "democratization", effectiveness and acceptance of REDD+. In other words, as an international environmental political mechanism, REDD+ can be subject of critics, and FSC and CCBA are two important groups of non-state actors which can contribute to the legitimatization of REDD+ "itself". The fact that these organizations are in general, preceded by a good reputation, makes their relevance for REDD+ even greater.

ii. ***In terms of output legitimacy.*** The role that the FSC and CCBA can (potentially) play under REDD+ is a topic that is increasingly being discussed by different actors and by different organizations. These voluntary certification schemes can (potentially) contribute to attain REDD+ objectives acting as tools that can be

useful to avoid some of REDD+ related problems (e.g. problems related to local communities), and reinforce some of the positive effects that this mechanism can bring along (e.g. generation of environmental co-benefits). This relatively new "stream of thought" has been found in most of the analyzed documents for FSC and CCBA, and it is supported by expert´s and practitioners 'opinions within the the three levels of analysis. However, it seems that there is still a lack of certainty about these facts and a large part of the discussion around this topic still takes place in terms of *"future"*, *"potential", "possible"* or *"likely"*. This is caused by the "youth" of REDD+ rather than by doubts about the benefits of using that FSC and CCBA for some REDD+ activities. Although scarce, there are already in Peru a few REDD+ pilot projects which have reported positive experiences regarding the use of FSC and/or CCBA certification schemes. These early experiences have reinforced the development of positive opinions towards the (potential) role of FSC and CCBA under REDD+. Therefore, if this research is conducted in a more advance development stage of REDD+, higher levels of effectiveness and output legitimacy, are likely to be found. As a counterpoint, the effectiveness of the FSC and CCBA, mainly at the local level, could have negative consquences for REDD+. It has been claimed in many occasions how certification schemes are often more used in areas under recovery processes or where sustainable management practices were already taking place rather than in threated areas. Therefore, if REDD+ certified projects are not allocated in threated areas, REDD+ could be seen as unsuccessful regarding the attainment of its main goal (the reduction of emissions though the avoidance of deforestation and forest degradation).

iii. ***In terms of input legitimacy****.* At the global level both organizations are participating in UNFCCC meetings, promoting their respective certification schemes under climate change mitigation projects and, in most occasions, specifically under REDD+ context. However, in Peru the CCBA has been involved in some national and regional REDD+ activities while the FSC has been absence so far. The fact that these organizations are participating, in different degrees, in some of the REDD+ activities implies that FSC and CCBA are aware of the (potential) contribution of their respective certification schemes to REDD+. The differences between FSC and CCBA found for the national and local levels are probably a consequence of the differences in the official positions towards climate change mitigation activities. Due to the "norms of participation" higher levels of input legitimacy at the international level are unlikely to be found. However, since a shift towards REDD+ safeguards will take place in the Peruvian REDD+ agenda during the next months and the "norms of participation" are less restrictive, higher levels of input legitimacy at the national and local levels are likely to be found for FSC and CCBA. This fact will also depend not only on the participation norms at the national and local levels, but also on the official positions and specific actions taken by the FSC and CCBA towards an involvement in REDD+ activities. In addition, the participation of the FSC and CCBA actors in REDD+ processes and activites and in platforms such as the side-events constitute a potential way to

disseminate information about their (potential) role in REDD+, raising the awareness about this topic among different actors.

Other relevant conclusions can be drawn from the results and discussion but are not directly realted to the research questions are:

i. ***In terms of a (potential) relation between output and input legitimacy within a level of analysis.*** Since the exploration of this (potential) relation was not among the research questions, conclusive data have not been found. However, some indicators points to a (potential) relation between output and input legitimacy which might be more evident in the next months or years. The fact that for the international level, output and input are the same for FSC and CCBA can be understood as an indicator of this (potential) relation. On the other hand, the fact that a higher number of REDD+ pilots projects certified by the CCBA than those certified by the FSC, can be a consequence of the participation of the former organization in some REDD+ processes and activities. This fact supports the existence of relationship between output and input legitimacy within a level of analysis.

ii. ***In terms of a (potential) relation between output legitimacy, input legitimacy and multi-level governance.*** The research was not aimed to explore this (potential) relation either but some of the facts found during the research processes point to a possible relation between output and input legitimacy among levels of governance. Actors related to REDD+ can be found at different levels of governance and hence the effectiveness or (when there is) participation of the FSC and CCBA is probably not confined to one level, having effects on other levels of governance as well. This (potential) relation can take place in a bi-directional way. For instance, positive experiences on the ground related to the use of FSC and CCBA certification schemes can reach higher levels of governance while the participation and "stream of thought" at higher levels of governance is likely to permeated to lower levels. However, it seems that adoting a top-down approach participation at "higher" levels of governance can play a more relevant role for effectiveness and participation at "lower" levels of governance. From a bottom-up perspective, effectivennes seems to be more important.

9.2. Recommendations for further research

Based on the results, discussion and conclusions, some recommendations for further research are made. The list of recommendations that I present here might seem rather large but this fact is, indeed, related or caused by the novelty of this topic.

i. In order to get a better overview of the effectiveness of FSC and CCBA under REDD+, it would be advisory to integrate studies which has considered the dimension of impact with those focused on output and outcome. The integration of output, outcome and impact could give a better view of the (positive or negative) effects of FSC and CCBA on

the attainment of REDD+ goals and, indeed, of the output legitimacy of these organizations under REDD+. The integration of output, outcome and impact can also help to infer to what extent FSC and CCBA can contribute to the legitimatization and success of REDD+.

ii. I also suggest the consideration and study of other elements such responsiveness or representativeness, in order to better asses input legitimacy of FSC and CCBA under REDD+. A more complete or better assessment of input legitimacy will also help to understand the contribution of the FSC and CCBA to the legitimatization and success of REDD+.

iii. Further research on the relation between output and input legitimacy of the FSC and CCBA within a level of governance is needed. This information can be useful to determine to what extent the (potential) role of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+ is dependent on the engagement of these organizations on REDD+ activities and processes, or to what extent this role is based on their good reputation as alternatives to international environmental policies.

iv. It would be also recommendable to further research the relation between participation, effectiveness and multi-level governance of the FSC and CCBA under REDD+. This will bring more insights into the mechanisms and processes that can benefit or impair the success of REDD+.

10. REFERENCES

ACCA (2009a) Proyecto REDD para a Concesión de Conservación Los Amigos (CCLA) (Available at: http://www.amazonconservation.org/pdf/redd_Los_Amigos_Carbon_Project-Augusto_Mulanovich.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Asociación para la Conservación de la Cuenca Amazónica

ACCA (2009b) Memoria Taller REDD Cusco (Available at: http://server.dsicconcytec.com/portalcorcytec/images/stories/corcytecs/cusco/memoria_red.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Asociación para la Conservación de la Cuenca Amazónica

Adger, N. W., Benjaminsen, T.A., Brown, K. & Svarstad, H. (2001) Advancing a political ecology of global discourses. Development and Change, Vol. 32, pp. 681-715

AIDER (2012) In AIDER: AIDER (Available at: http://www.aider.com.pe/acerca.html [Accessed on: 11th June, 2012]) Asociación para la Investigación y el Desarrollo Integral

Amazónicos por la Amazonia (2011) Procesos Participativos para Proyectos de Ordenamiento Territorial, Conservación de Bosques y REDD Plus. Módulo Teórico Practico. (Available at: http://www.gruporeddperu.net/images/stories/publicaciones/Modulo_OT_Conservacion.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Andresen, S. & Hey, E. (2005) The Effectiveness and Legitimacy of International Environmental Institutions. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics , Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 211-226

Angelsen, A., Brockhaus, M., Kanninen, M., Sills, E., Sunderlin, W. D. & Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S. (eds) (2009a) Realising REDD+: National strategy and policy options. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia. (Available at: http://redd-net.org/resource-library/realising-redd+-national-strategy-and-policy-options [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Angelsen, A., Brown, S., Loisel, C., Peskket, L., Streck, C. & Zarin, D. (2009b) Reducing emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD): An options for an assessment report. Government of Norway (Available at: http://www.un-redd.org/AboutREDD/tabid/582/Default.aspx [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Arts, B. (2006) Non-state actors in global environmental governance – new arrangements beyond the state. In: Koenig-Archibugi, M., Zürn, M. (Eds.), New Modes of Governance in the Global System – Exploring Publicness, Delegation and Inclusiveness. Palgrave Macmillan, Hamshire, pp. 177–200.

Asesorandes (2012) In Asesorandes: Sobre Nosotros (Available at: http://www.asesorandes.com/sobre-nosotros.html [Accessed on: 11th Junes, 2012])

Auer, M.R. (2000) Who participates in global environmental governance? Partial answers from international relations theory. Policy Sciences, Vol.33, No.2, pp. 155-180

Bäckstrand, K. (2006a) Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Rethinking Legitimacy, Accountability and Effectiveness. European Environment, Vol.16, No. 5, pp. 290- 306

Bäckstrand, K. (2006b) Democratizing Global Environmental Governance? Stakeholder Democracy after the World Summit on Sustainable Development. European Journal of International Relations, Vol. 12, No.4, pp. 467–498

BAM (2012) In BAM: ¿quienes somos? (Available at: http://www.bosques-amazonicos.com/es/acerca-de-bam/quienes-somos [Accessed on: 11th June, 2012]) Bosques Amazónicos

Bartley, T. (2003) Certifying Forests and Factories: States, Social Movements, and the Rise of Private Regulation in the Apparel and Forest Products Fields. Politics & Society, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 433-464

Beisheim, M. & Dingwerth, K. (2008) Procedural Legitimacy and Private Transnational Governance. Are the Good Ones Doing Better? SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 14, Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin

Bernstein, S. & Cashore, B. (2007) Can non-state global governance be legitimate? An analytical framework. Regulation & Governance, Vol.1, No.4, pp. 347-371

Betsill, M. M. & Bulkeley, H. (2004) Transnational networks and global environmental governance: The cities for climate protection program. International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 48, No.2, pp. 471-493

Biermann, F. & Bauer, S. (2005) Managers of Global Governance. Assessing and Explaining the Influence of International Bureaucracies. Global Governance Working Paper No 15. Amsterdam, Berlin, Oldenburg, Potsdam: The Global Governance Project

Biermann, F. & Gupta, A. (2011) Accountability and legitimacy in earth system governance: A research framework. Ecological Economics, Vol. 70, No. 11, pp. 1856-1864

Biermann, F. & Pattberg, P. (2008) Global Environmental Governance: Taking stock, moving forward. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, Vol. 33, pp. 277-294

Biermann, F., Betsill, M.M., Gupta, J., Kanie, N., Lebel, L., Liverman, D., Schroeder, H., Siebenhüner, B. & Zondervan, R. (2010) Earth system governance: a research framework. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, Vol. 10, No.4, pp. 277-298

Blom, B., Sunderland, T. & Murdiyarso, D. (2010) Getting REDD to work locally: lessons learned from integrated conservation and development projects. Environmental Science and Policy, Vol.13, No. 2, pp.164-172

Bodansky, D. (1999) The legitimacy of international governance: A coming challenge for international environmental law. The American Journal of International Law, Vol. 93, No. 3, pp. 596-624

Bouteligier, S. (2011) Exploring the agency of global environmental consultancy firms in earth system governance. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, Vol.11, No. 1, pp. 43-61

Brack, A. (2000) Diversidad biológica y mercados en el Perú: el problema agrario en debate. SEPIA VIII, Lima, Peru, 443-501

Brotto, D., Pettenella, D., Secco, L. & Masiero, D. (2010) Integrating FSC certification in REDD+ projects: a guideline for Projects Developer. Dept. of Land, Environment, Agriculture and Forestry (LEAF). University of Padova. Italy. (Available at: http://www.agraria.unipd.it/it/home/manuali.asp [Accessed on: 05th March, 2012)

Bulkeley, H. &Mol, A. P.J. (2003) Participation and Environmental Governance: Consensus, Ambivalence and Debate. Environmental Values, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 143-154

Busch, J., Godoy, F., Turner, W. R. & Harvey, C. A. (2011) Biodiversity co-benefits of reducing emissions from deforestation under alternative reference levels and levels of finance. Conservation letters, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 101-115

Cashore, B. (2002) Legitimacy and the privatization of environmental governance: how non-state market-driven (NSMD) governance systems gain rule-making authority. Governance: An international journal of policy administration and institutions, Vol.15, No. 4, pp. 503-529

Cashore, B., Auld, G. & Newson, D. (2003) Forest certification (eco-labeling) programs and their policy-making authority: explaining divergence among North American and European case studies. Forest Policy and Economics, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 225-247

CBD (2010a) Report of the proceedings of the international workshop on innovative financial mechanisms, Bonn, Germany, 27-29 January 2010 (Available at: http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/fin/wsifm-01/draft/wsifm-01-04-en.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Convention on Biological Diversity

CBD (2010b) International workshop on innovative financial mechanisms. Issue document, Bonn, January 27-29, 2010 (Available at: http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/fin/wsifm-01/draft/wsifm-01-03-en.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Convention on Biological Diversity

CBD (2011a) Presentación de la Secretaria del Convenio sobre la Diversidad Biológica a la Secretaria de la Convención de Marco de la Naciones Unidas sobre Cambio Climático, September 26, 2011 (Available at: http://www.cbd.int/forest/doc/2011-09-26-cbd-submission-unfccc-reddplus-es.pdf[Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Convention on Biological Diversity

CBD (2011b) REDD-plus Biodiversity Safeguards Decisions and activities of the CBD. Presentation in the Regional workshop for Africa Cape Town, September 20-23, 201 (Available at: http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/for/wscbredd-afr-01/other/wscbredd-afr-01-cbd-en.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Convention on Biological Diversity

CBD (2011c) Asia-Pacific regional consultation and capacity-building workshop on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD-plus), including on relevant biodiversity safeguards Singapore, March 15-18, 2011 (Available at: http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/for/wscbredd-apac-01/official/wscbredd-apac-01-02-en.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Convention on Biological Diversity

CCBA (2005) Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (First Edition), Washington DC. (Available at: www.climate-standards.org [Accessed on: 05th December, 2011])

CCBA (2008) The importance of multiple benefits and robust standards for effective REDD. Presentation on December 5th, 2008, Poznan (Available at: http://regserver.unfccc.int/seors/reports/archive.html?session_id=COP14 [Accessed on: [15th March, 2012]) Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance

CCBA (2009a) Estándares para proyectos REDD Steven Panfil. Presentation on May 05, 2009, Puerto Maldonado, Madre de Dios (Available at: http://amazonconservation.org/pdf/redd_Certifications-Steve_Panfil.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance

CCBA (2009b). Final CCBA project validation report. Madre de Dios Amazon REDD Project, Puerto Maldonado, Peru (Available at: http://www.climate-standards.org/projects/files/madre_peru/CCB_Greenoxx_MM_RPT_FINAL_ValidationReport_with_VCS_Comments_011510.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Community, Climate and Biodiversity Alliance

CCBA (2009c) El Mercado para Carbono Forestal. Presentation on May 04, 2009, Puerto Maldonado, Madre de Dios (Available at: http://amazonconservation.org/pdf/redd_Carbon%20Markets-Steve_Panfil.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance

CCBA (2009d) Consideraciones Sociales y Ambientales de REDD. Presentation on May 05, 2009, Puerto Maldonado, Madre de Dios (Available at: http://amazonconservation.org/pdf/redd_Biodiversity_and_Social_Considerations-Steve_Panfil.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Climate, community and Biodiversity Alliance

CCBA (2010a) Standards to Ensure Social and Environmental Benefits from REDD+ Projects and Programs. Presentation on November 09, 2011 (Available at: http://www.conservation.org/sites/japan/about/science/cbd/Documents/CCB%20Standards%20webup%2020101105.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance

CCBA (2010b) REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards Initiative. Greening REDD+, Presentation on April 2010, Freiburg, Germany (Available at: http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_details&gid=2006&Itemid=63 [Accessed on: [15th March, 2012]) Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance

CCBA (2012a) In CCBA: Mission & Goals (Available at: http://www.climate-standards.org/mission/index.html [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance

CCBA (2012b) In CCBA: CCBA Standards, History of the Standards (Available at: http://www.climate-standards.org/standards/history.html [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance

CCBA (2012c) In CCBA: CCBA Projects (Available at: http://www.climate-standards.org/projects/index.html [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance

CCBA (2012d) In CCBA: Using the Standards (Available at: http://www.climate-standards.org/standards/using.html [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance

CCBA (2012e) In CCBA: Who we are, members (Available at: http://www.climate-standards.org/who/partgroups.html [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance

CEDISA (2012) In CEDISA: Inicio (Available at: http://www.cedisa.org/cedisa/ [Accessed on: 11thJune, 2012]) Centro de Desarrollo e Investigación de la Selva Alta

CI (2010) Ciclo de vida de un proyecto de carbono. REDD training course (Available at: http://www.google.es/search?rlz=1C1TEUA_enES465ES465&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8&q=CICLO+DE+VIDA+D+EUN+PROYECTO+DE+CARBONO [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Conservation International

CI (2011) Climate change is a defining challenge if our time. CI is delivering solutions, one solution: REDD+ (Available at: http://www.conservation.org/Documents/CI_Climate_Solutions_REDDplus.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Conservation International

CI (2012) CI: About CI. (Available at: http://www.conservation.org/about/pages/about_us.aspx [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) Conservation International

Climate Investment Funds (2012a) In Climate Investment Funds: Climate funds profile (Available at: http://www.climatefundsupdate.org/listing/forest-investment-program [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012])

Climate Investment Funds (2012b) In Climate Investment Funds: Strategic climate fund, forest investment program (Available at: http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/node/1[Accessed on: 10th March, 2012])

Consejo nacional de áreas protegidas de Guatemala (2009). Maximizing forests benefits: REDD and sustainable forestry in the Maya Biosphere Reserve, Guatemala. Presentation on 16th December 2009, Copenhagen. FSC side-event (Available at: http://regserver.unfccc.int/seors/reports/archive.html?session_id=COP15 [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Corbera, E. & Schroeder, H. (2011) Governing and implementing REDD+. Environmental science & policy, Vol. 14, No.2, pp. 89-99

Cortez, R. & Stephen, P. (eds) (2009) Introductory Course on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+): A Participant Resource Manual. (Available at: http://unfccc.int/files/methods_science/redd/application/pdf/participant_resource_manual_final_2.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Danielsen, F., Skutsch, M., Burgess, N.D., Jensen, P.M., Andrianandrasana, H., Karky, B., Lewis, R., Lovett, J.C., Massao, J., Ngaga, Y., Phartiyal, P., Poulsen, M. K., Singh, S. P., Solis, S., Soresen, M., Tewari, A., Young, R. & Zahabu, E. (2011) At the heart of REDD+: A role for local people in monitoring forests?. Conservation Letters, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 158-167

DAR (2012) In DAR: Acerca de DAR (Available at: http://www.dar.org.pe/acerca.htm [Accessed on: 11th June, 2012]) Derecho Ambiente y Recursos NaturalesDeclaracion de Tarapoto (2008) Gobierno Regional de San Martin y el Grupo REDD Perú. Tarapoto, Perú (Available at:

http://www.gruporeddperu.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=54&Itemid=111&limitstart=5 [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012])

Dellas, E., Pattberg, P. & Betsill, M. (2011) Agency in earth system governance: refining a research agenda. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, Vol. 11, No.1, pp. 85-98

Dickson, B. & Miles, L. (eds) (2010) Proceedings of the UN-REDD workshop on identifying and promoting ecosystem co-benefits from REDD+, Kaetsu Centre, Cambridge. Prepared on behalf of the UN-REDD Programme. UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge, UK (Available at: http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/for/ewredd-01/other/ewredd-01-oth-un-redd-en.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Dickson, B., Dunning, E., Killen, S., Miles, L. & Pettorelli, N. (2009) Carbon markets and forest conservation: A review of the environmental benefits of REDD mechanisms. UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre. (Available at: http://redd-net.org/resource-library/Carbon+markets+and+forest+mechanisms%3A+a+review+of+the+enviro... [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Dooley, K. & Horner, K. (2012) FW Special Report – Durban aimed to save the market, not the climate, December 2011. EU Forest Watch Durban Special Issue January 2012 (Available at: http://libcloud.s3.amazonaws.com/93/d1/3/1057/Durban_update.pdf [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012])

Dowling, J. & Pfeffer, J. (1975) Organizational Legitimacy: Social Values and Organizational Behavior Pacific Sociological Review, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 122-136

Ebeling, J & Fehse, J. (2009) Challenges for a business case for high-biodiversity REDD projects and schemes. Ecosecurities (Available at: http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_details&gid=277&Itemid=53 [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Edwards, D. P., Fisher, B. & Boyd, E. (2010) Protecting degraded rainforests: enhancement of forest carbon stocks under REDD+. Conservation letters, Vol. 3, No. 5, pp. 313-316

Eliasch Review (2008) Climate Change: Financing Global Forests, The Stationery Office, London (Available at: www.occ.gov.uk/activities/eliasch/Full_report_eliasch_review(1).pdf [Accessed on: 06th March, 2012])

Elliott, C. & Schlaepfer, R. (2001a) The advocacy coalition framework: application to the policy process for the development of forest certification in Sweden. Journal of European Public Policy, Vol.8, No.4, pp. 642-661

Elliott, C. & Schlaepfer, R. (2001b) Understanding certification using the Advocacy Coalition Framework. Forest Policy and Economics, Vol. 2, pp. 257-266

Emirbayer, M. & Goodwin, J. (1994) Network Analysis, Culture, and the Problem of Agency. American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 99, No. 6, pp. 1411-1454

Epple, C., Dunning, E., Dickson, B. & Harvey, C. (2011) Making Biodiversity Safeguards for REDD+ Work in Practice. Developing Operational Guidelines and Identifying Capacity Requirements. Summary Report. UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge, UK (Available at: http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/for/wscbredd-afr-01/other/wscbredd-afr-01-wcmc-safeguards-en.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Estrada, M. (2011) Standards and methods available for estimating project-level REDD+ carbon benefits: reference guide for project developers. Working Paper 52. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia. (Available at: http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/WPapers/WP52CIFOR.pdf [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012])

FAO (2011) Situación de los bosques del mundo Organización 2011. (Available at: http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2000s/i2000s00.htm [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012]) Food and Agricultural Organization

FCPF (2010) Harvesting Knowledge on REDD+: Early Lessons from the FCPF Initiative and Beyond. (Available at: http://wbi.worldbank.org/wbi/document/harvesting-knowledge-reddearly-lessons-fcpf-initiative-and-beyond [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

FCPF (2012a) Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN) Template Submitted by Peru (Available at: http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/sites/forestcarbonpartnership.org/files/Documents/PDF/Peru_R-PIN_07-31-08.pdf [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012]) Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

FCPF (2012b) In: REDD+ country participants, Peru. (Available at: http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/PE [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012]) Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

FCPF (2012c) In FCPF: About FCPF, Introduction (Available at: http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/node/12 [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012]) Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

Fisher, B., Turner, R. K. & Morling, P. (2009) Defining and classifying ecosystem services for decision making. Ecological economics, Vol. 68, No. 3, pp. 643-653

Forest Carbon Portal (2012) In forestcarbonportal: Made de Dios (Available at: http://www.forestcarbonportal.com/project/madre-de-dios-amazon-redd-project [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Franquis, F. R. & Infante, A. M. (2003) Los bosques y su importancia para el suministro de servicios ambientales. Rev. For. Lat., Vol. 34, pp. 17-30.

FSC (1994) Principios y Criterios del FSC para el Manejo Forestal Responsable con el Complemento de Notas Explicativas y Justificaciones (Available online at: http://vote.fsc.org/md.static/FSC-STD-01-001_V5-0_D5-0_ES_Principios&Criterios.pdf [Accessed on: 07th March, 2012]) Forest Stewardship Council

FSC (2009a) Avoiding forest degradation beyond carbon – the multiple safeguards and benefits provided through FSC certification. Presentation on November 05, 2009, Barcelona. FSC side-event (Available at: http://regserver.unfccc.int/seors/reports/archive.html?session_id=RAWG7-AWG9 [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Forest Stewardship Council

FSC (2009b) FSC in a REDD context Carbon benefits partnered with social and environmental safeguards. Presentation on December 16, 2009, Copenhagen. FSC side-event (Available at:

http://regserver.unfccc.int/seors/reports/archive.html?session_id=COP15 [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Forest Stewardship Council

FSC (2011a) Strategy Paper. Strategic Framework for an FSC Climate Change Engagement (Available online at: http://www.fsc.org/fileadmin/web-data/public/document_center/publications/Climate_change/FSC_Strategy_Climate_Change_Engagement_-.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Forest Stewardship Council

FSC (2011b) Strategic engagement in climate change mitigation and adaptation. Presentation on 5th December 2011, Durban. FSC side-event (Available at: http://regserver.unfccc.int/seors/reports/archive.html?session_id=COP17/CMP7 [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Forest Stewardship Council

FSC (2012a) In FSC: Certification (Available at: http://www.fsc.org/certification.html [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) Forest Stewardship Council

FSC (2012b) Global FSC certificates: type and distribution (Available online at: http://www.fsc.org/fileadmin/webdata/public/document_center/powerpoints_graphs/facts_figures/2012-01-15-FSC-FIG-Global_FSC_certificates-EN.pdf [Accessed on: 07th March, 2012]) Forest Stewardship Council

FSC (2012c) In FSC: Worldwide (Available at: http://www.fsc.org/fsc-locations.html [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) Forest Stewardship Council

FSC (2012d) In FSC: About FSC, History (Available at: http://www.fsc.org/history.html [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) Forest Stewardship Council

FSC (2012e) In FSC: About FSC, Worldwide (Available at: http://www.fsc.org/fsc-locations.html [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) Forest Stewardship Council

FSC (2012f) In FSC: About FSC, Worldwide, Peru (Available at: http://www.fsc.org/latin-america_peru.html [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) Forest Stewardship Council

FSC (2012g) Global FSC certificates: type and distribution (Available at: http://www.fsc.org/facts-figures.19.htm [Accessed on: 10th June, 2012]) Forest Stewardship Council

Giddens, A. (2008) The politics of climate change: National responses to the challenge of global warming. Policy network paper (Available at: http://www.fcampalans.cat/images/noticias/The_politics_of_climate_change_Anthony_Giddens(2).pdf) [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012])

Gilley, B. (2006) The meaning and measure of state legitimacy: Results for 72 countries. European Journal of Political Research, Vol. 45, No.3, pp. 499–525

Greenoxx (2012) In Greenoxx: Inicio (Available at: http://www.greenoxx.com/es/ [Accessed on: 11th June, 2012])

Griscom, B., Ganz, D., Virgilio, N., Price, F., Hayward, J., Cortez, R., Dodge, G., Hurd, J., Lowenstein, F. L. & Stanley, B. (2009) The Hidden Frontier of Forest Degradation: A Review of the Science, Policy and Practice of Reducing Degradation Emissions. The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, VA. (Available at:

http://www.rainforestalliance.org/resources/documents/hidden_degradation.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Grupo REDD Peru (2008a) Resumen de la Reunión del Grupo REDD Peru. Lima, Septiembre 23, 2008 (Available at: http://www.gruporeddperu.net/dmdocuments/Reuni%C3%B3n%2023SET08.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Grupo REDD Peru (2008b) Resumen de la Reunión del Grupo REDD Peru. Lima, Agosto 12, 2008 (Available at: http://www.gruporeddperu.net/dmdocuments/Reuni%C3%B3n%2012AGO08.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Grupo REDD Peru (2008c) Resumen de la Reunión del Grupo REDD Peru. Lima, November 04, 2008 (Available at: http://www.gruporeddperu.net/dmdocuments/Reuni%C3%B3n%2015ENE09.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Grupo REDD Peru (2009a) Resumen de la Reunión del Grupo REDD Peru. Lima, January 15, 2009 (Available at: http://www.gruporeddperu.net/dmdocuments/Reuni%C3%B3n%2015ENE09.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Grupo REDD Peru (2009b) Resumen de la Reunión del Grupo REDD Peru. Lima, Marzo 03, 2009 (Available at: http://www.gruporeddperu.net/dmdocuments/Reuni%C3%B3n%2003MAR09.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Grupo REDD Peru (2010) Resumen de la Reunión del Grupo REDD Peru. Lima, Junio 08, 2010 (Available at: http://www.gruporeddperu.net/dmdocuments/Reuni%C3%B3n%2014MAY10.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Grupo REDD Peru (2012a) In Grupo REDD Peru: Quienes Somos (Available at: http://www.gruporeddperu.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=88&Itemid=94 [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012])

Grupo REDD Peru (2012b) In Grupo REDD Peru: Quienes Somos, Miembros (Available at: http://www.gruporeddperu.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=86&Itemid=95 [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012])

Grupo REDD Peru (2012c) In Grupo REDD Peru: Quienes Somos, Objetivos (Available at: http://www.gruporeddperu.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=89&Itemid=97 [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012])

Grupo REDD Peru (2012d) In Grupo REDD Peru: Mesas Regionales, Madre de Dios (Available at: http://www.gruporeddperu.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=501&Itemid=125 [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012])

Gulbrandsen, L. H. (2004) Overlapping Public and Private Governance: Can forest certification fill the gaps in the global forest regime?. Global Environmental Politics, Vol.4, No.2, pp. 75-99

Gulbrandsen, L. H. (2005) The effectiveness of Non-State Governance schemes: A comparative study of Forest Certification in Norway and Sweden. International Environmental Agreements, Vol.5, No. 2, pp. 125–149

Haas, P. M. (2004) Addressing the Global Governance Deficit. Global Environmental Politics, Vol.4, No.4, pp. 1-15

Hajek, F., Ventresca, M. J., Scriven, J. & Castro, A. (2011) Regime-building for REDD+: Evidence from a cluster of local initiatives in south-eastern Peru. Environmental Science & Policy, Vol.14, No. 2, pp. 201-215

Harvey C. A., Zerbock O., Papageorgiou S. & Parra A. (2010) What is needed to make REDD+ work on the ground? Lessons learned from pilot forest carbon initiatives. Conservation International, Arlington, Virginia, USA.

Hayes, T. & Persha, L. (2010) Nesting local forestry initiatives: Revisiting community forest management in a REDD+ world. Forest Policy and Economics, Vol. 12, No. 8, pp. 545-5

Herold, M. & Skutsch, M. (2011) Monitoring, reporting and verification for national REDD+ programmes: two proposals. Environmental Research Letters, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 1-11

Higgins, C. (1998) The role of traditional ecological knowledge in managing for biodiversity. The forest chronicle, Vol.74, No. 3, pp. 323-326

Hsieh, H. F. & Shannon, S. E. (2005) Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. Qualitative health research, Vol. 15, No. 9, pp. 1277-1288

Humphreys, D. (2005) The Elusive Quest for a Global Forests Convention. Review of European Community and International Environmental Law, Vol.14, No. 1, pp. 1-10

Humphries, S. S. & Kainer, K. A. (2006) Local perceptions of forest certification for community-based enterprises. Forest Ecology and Management, Vol. 235, No. 1-3, pp. 30-43

IAP2 Spectrum of public participation (2007) International association of public participation (IAP2) (Available online at: http://www.iap2.org/associations/4748/files/IAP2%20Spectrum_vertical.pdf [Accessed on: 5th November, 2011])

IISD (2005) Eleventh session of the Conference of the Parties to the Climate Change Convention *and* first meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol. Earth Negotiations Bulletin, Vol. 12, No. 280-291 (Available at: http://www.iisd.ca/climate/cop11/ [Accessed on: 07th June, 2012])

IISD (2006) Twelfth session of the Conference of the Parties to the Climate Change Convention *and* second meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol. Earth Negotiations Bulletin, Vol. 12, No. 307-318 (Available at: http://www.iisd.ca/climate/cop12/ [Accessed on: 07th June, 2012]) The International Institute for Sustainable Development – Reporting Services Division

IISD (2007) Thirteenth Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and third meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol. Earth Negotiations Bulletin, Vol.12, No.343-354 (Available at: http://www.iisd.ca/climate/cop13/ [Accessed on: 07th June, 2012]) The International Institute for Sustainable Development – Reporting Services Division

IISD (2008) Poznan Climate Change Conference. Earth Negotiations Bulletin, Vol.12, No.390-395 (Available at: http://www.iisd.ca/climate/cop14/ [Accessed on: 07th June, 2012]) The International Institute for Sustainable Development – Reporting Services Division

IISD (2009) Fifteenth Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol. Earth Negotiations Bulletin, Vol.12, No.448-459 (Available at: http://www.iisd.ca/climate/cop15/ [Accessed on: 07th June, 2012]) The International Institute for Sustainable Development – Reporting Services Division

IISD (2010) Cancún Climate Change Conference. Earth Negotiations Bulletin, Vol. 12, No.487-498 (Available at: http://www.iisd.ca/climate/cop16/ [Accessed on: 07th June, 2012]) The International Institute for Sustainable Development – Reporting Services Division

IISD (2011) Durban Climate Change Conference - COP17/CMP7. Earth Negotiations Bulletin, Vol.12, No.523-53 (Available at: http://www.iisd.ca/climate/cop17/ [Accessed on: 07th June, 2012]) The International Institute for Sustainable Development – Reporting Services Division

IISD (2012) In IISD: Reporting services (Available at: http://www.iisd.ca/ [Accessed on: 12th May, 2012])

Indexmundi (2012) In Indexmundi: South America, Peru , Demoraphics (Available at: http://www.indexmundi.com/es/peru/poblacion_perfil.html [Accessed on: 09th June, 2012])

IUCN (2011) (Available online at: http://www.iucn.org/unfccc/about/ [Accessed on: 14th October, 2011]) International Union for Conservation of Nature

Jacquemont, F. & Caparrós, A. (2002) The convention on biological diversity and the climate change conservation 10 years after Rio: Towards a synergy of the two regimes? Review of European Community and International Environmental Law, Vol.11, No. 2, pp. 169-180

Johns, T., Merry, F., Stickler, C., Nepstad, D., Laporte, N. & Goetz, S. (2008) A Three-Fund Approach to Incorporating Government, Public and Private Forest Stewards into a REDD Funding Mechanism. International Forestry Review, Vol. 10, No.3, pp.458-464

Johns, T., Johnson, E. & Greenglass, N. (eds.) (2009) An Overview of Readiness for REDD: A compilation of readiness activities prepared on behalf of the Forum on Readiness for REDD. The Woods Hole Research Center (Available at: http://redd-net.org/resource-library/an-overview-of-readiness-for-redd [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Kalfagianni, A. & Pattberg P. (2011) The Effectiveness of Transnational Rule-Setting Organisations in Global Sustainability Politics: An Analytical Framework. Global Governance Working Paper No 43. Amsterdam et al.: The Global Governance Project (Available at: http://www.glogov.org/images/doc/GGWP43.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Karousakis, K. (2009), "Promoting Biodiversity Co-Benefits in REDD", OECD Environment Working Papers, No. 11 (Available at: http://www.cbd.int/climate/doc/oecd-promoting-biodiversity-redd-en.pdf [Accessed on: [15th March, 2012])

Karsenty, A. (2008) The Architecture of Proposed REDD Schemes After Bali: Facing Critical Choices. International Forestry Review, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 443-457

Kaul, I., Grunberg, I. & Stern, M. A. (1999) Global public goods: international cooperation in the 21st century. The United Nations Development Programme (undp). New York Oxford, Oxford University press

Kiser, E. (1999) Comparing Varieties of Agency Theory in Economics, Political Science, and Sociology: An illustration from State Policy Implementation. Sociological Theory, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 146-170

Kumar, R. (2005) Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners. London. SAGE

Lawlor, K., Weinthal, E. & Olander, L. (2010) Institutions and Policies to Protect Rural Livelihoods in REDD Regimes. Global Environmental Politics, Vol. 10, No.4, pp. 1-11

Lederer, M. (2011) From CDM to REDD+ - What do we know for setting up effective and legitimate carbon governance? Ecological Economics, Vol. 70, No. 11, pp. 1900-1907

Lesniewska, F. (2010) REDD: The Copenhagen effect. Law, Environment and Development Journal, Vol. 6, No.1, pp. 102-111

Levin, K., McDermott, C. & Cashore B. (2008) The climate regime as global forest governance: Can reduced emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) initiatives pass a 'dual effectiveness' test?. International Forestry Review, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 538-549

Llanos, R. E. & Feather, C. (2011) La realidad de REDD+ en Perú: entre el dicho y el hecho... Análisis y alternativas de los Pueblos Indígenas Amazónicos. AIDESEP, FENAMAD, CARE & FPP (Available at: http://www.forestpeoples.org/sites/fpp/files/publication/2011/11/la-realidad-de-redd-en-peru-entre-el-dicho-y-el-hecho-para-el-sitio-web_0.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Lövbrand, E., Rindefjäll, T. & Nordqvist, J. (2009) Closing the legitimacy gap in global environmental governance? Lessons from the merging CDM market. Global Environmental Politics, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 74-100

McDermott, L. C. (2011) Certification and Equity. A working paper prepared for the project 'Safeguarding local equity as global values of ecosystem services rise'. Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation Programme (Available at: http://redd-net.org/files/McDermott%20Certification%20and%20Equity%20updated%20Nov2011.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Meinshausen, M., Meinshausen, N., Hare, W., Raper, S. C. B., Frielen, K., Knuttis, R., Frames, D. J. & Allen, M. R. (2009) Greenhouse-gas emission targets for limiting global warming to 2 oC. Nature, Vol.458, pp. 1158- 1163

Melick, D. (2010) Credibility of REDD and Experiences from Papua New Guinea. Conservation biology, Vol.4, No.2, pp. 359-361

Merger, E., Dutschke, M. & Verchot, L. (2011) Option for REDD+ voluntary certification to ensure net GHG benefits, poverty alleviation, sustainable management of forests and biodiversity conservation. Forests, Vol. 2, pp. 550-577

Meynard, C. N., Lara, A.,Pino, M., Soto, D., Nahuelhual, L., Nuñez, D., Echevarria, C., Jara, C., Oyarzun, C., Jiménez, M. & Morey, F. (2007) La integración de la ciencia, la economía y la sociedad: servicios ecosistémicos en la ecoregión de los bosques lluviosos valdivianos en el cono sur de Sudamérica. Gaceta ecológica, número especial, pp. 84-85.

Miles, L. & Dickson, B. (2010) REDD-plus and biodiversity: Opportunities and challenges. Unasylva, Vol. 61, pp.56-63

Miles, L. (2010) Implications of the REDD negotiations for forest restoration. v2. UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge (Available at: http://www.theredddesk.org/sites/default/files/resources/pdf/2010/UNEP_WCMC_2010_REDD_negotiations_and_forest_conservation.pdf [Accessed on: [15th March, 2012])

Miles, L., Dunning, E. & Doswald, N. (2010) Safeguarding and enhancing the ecosystem-derived benefits of REDD+. Multiple benefits, series 2. UN-REDD Programme (Available at: http://www.un-redd.org/MultipleBenefitsPublications/tabid/5954/Default.aspx [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) Washington, DC, Island Press. (Available at: http://www.who.int/globalchange/ecosystems/ecosys.pdf [Accessed on: 2nd April, 2012])

MINAM (2011a) Taller Internacional REDD: "Reducción de Emisiones por Deforestación y Degradación de los Bosques. Una alternativa económica, social y ambiental para Madre de Dios" Puerto Maldonado , Mayo 4-6, 2009. (Available at: http://cambioclimatico.minam.gob.pe/taller-internacional-redd-%E2%80%9Creduccion-de-emisiones-por-deforestacion-y-degradacion-de-los-bosques-una-alternativa-economica-social-y-ambiental-para-madre-de-dios%E2%80%9D [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Ministerio del Ambiente de Peru

MINAM (2011b) Seminario Taller: REDD. Cuzco, Diciembre 3 – 4, 2009 (Available at: http://cambioclimatico.minam.gob.pe/seminario-taller-redd/ [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Ministerio del Ambiente de Peru

MINAM (2011c) Proyectos REDD+ a nivel de regiones (Available at: http://cambioclimatico.minam.gob.pe/mitigacion-del-cc/avances-en-la-mitigacion/a-nivel-de-mecanismos-de-mitigacion/redd/proyectos-redd-a-nivel-de-regiones/ [Accessed on: 15thMarch, 2012]) Ministerio del Ambiente de Peru

MINAM (2011d) Primer Taller CCBA de facilitación de Proyectos REDD en el Perú. Tarapoto, Abril 20 – 22, 2009 (Available at: http://cambioclimatico.minam.gob.pe/primer-taller-ccba-de-facilitacion-de-proyectos-redd-en-el-peru/ [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Ministerio del Ambiente de Peru

MINAM (2011e) Curso Corto: Introducción a REDD. Lima, Octubre 9 – 11, 2008 (Available at: http://cambioclimatico.minam.gob.pe/curso-corto-introduccion-a-redd/ [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Ministerio del Ambiente de Peru

MINAM (2011f) II Curso Introductorio REDD. Chaclacayo, Agosto 25 – 27, 2009. (Available at: http://cambioclimatico.minam.gob.pe/ii-curso-introductorio-redd/[Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Ministerio del Ambiente de Peru

Moss, N. & Nussbaum, R. (2011) A review of the three REDD+ safeguard initiatives. Commissioned by theUN-REDD Programme & the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility UK

(Available at: http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/sbstta/sbstta-16/information/sbstta-16-inf-24-en.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Murphy, D. (2011) Safeguards and Multiple Benefits in a REDD+ Mechanism. International Institute for Sustainable Development. (Available at: http://redd-net.org/resource-library/safeguards-and-multiples-benefits-in-a-redd+-mechanism [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Naka, K., Hammett, A. L. & Stuart, W. B. (2000) Forest Certification: Stakeholders, constraints and effects. Local Environment, Vol. 5, No.4, pp. 475-481

Nanz, P. & Steffeck, J. (2004) Global Governance, Participation and the Public Sphere. Government and Opposition, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 314-335

Nasi, R., Putz, F. E., Pacheco, P., Wunder, S. & Anta, S. (2011) Sustainable forest management and carbon in Tropical Latin America: The case for REDD+. Forests, Vol.2, No. 1, pp. 200- 217

Newig, J. & Fritsch, O. (2009a) Environmental governance: Participatory multi-level-and effective?. Environmental Policy and Governance, Vol. 19, No.3, pp.197–214

Newig, J. & Fritsch, O. (2009b) More input–better output: does citizen involvement improve environmental governance?. In Search of Legitimacy. Policy Making in Europe and the Challenge of Societal Complexity, Blühdorn I (ed.). Farmington Hills: Opladen

Palmer, C. & Engel, S. (2009) Avoided deforestation: Prospects for mitigating climate change. Routledge, London/New York

Paterson, M., Humphreys, D. & Pettiford, L. (2003) Conceptualizing global environmental governance: From interstate regimes to counter-hegemonic struggles. Global Environmental Poilitics, Vol.3, No.2, pp. 1-8

Pattberg, P. & Stripple, J. (2008) Beyond the public and private divide: remapping transnational climate governance in the 21st century. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 367-388

Pattberg, P. (2005) What Role for Private Rule-Making in Global Environmental Governance? Analysing the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 175-189

Pedroni, L., Dutschke, M., Streck, C. & Porrua, M. E. (2009) Creating incentives for avoiding further deforestation: the nested approach. Climate Policy, Vol. 9, No.2, pp. 207-220

PEFC (2011) PEFC and FSC: Global Sustainable Forest Management Certification Schemes (Available at: http://www.pefc.co.uk/news-page/publications-a-documentation/brochures-a-toolkits/item/download/142 [Accessed on: 15th June, 2012])

PEFC (2012) In PEFC: Certification services, PEFC Global Certification Statistics, Peru (Available at: http://register.pefc.cz/STATISTICS1.ASP?COUNTRY=Peru&COUNTRY_CODE=64 [Accessed on: 10th June, 2012]) Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification

Peskett, L & Brockhaus, M. (2009) Cuando REDD+ se traslada al ámbito nacional: Panorama de las realidades, oportunidades y desafíos. Angelsen, A. (Ed.) La implementación de REDD+:

Estrategia nacional y opciones de política. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, pp. 26-44

Peskett, L. & Harkin, Z. (2007) Risk and responsibility in Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation. Overseas Development Institute. Forestry Briefing, No. 15, pp. 1-7

Peskett, L., Huberman, D.,Jones, E. B., Edwards, G. & Brown, J. (2008) Making REDD work for the poor. Prepared on behalf of the Poverty Environment Partnership (PEP) (Available at: http://redd-net.org/resource-library/making-redd-work-for-the-poor [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Peskett, L., Luttrell, C. & Iwata, M. (2007) Can standards for voluntary carbon offsets ensure development benefits?. Overseas Development Institute. Forestry Briefing, No. 13, pp. 1-6

Petkova, E., Larson, A. y Pacheco, P. (eds) (2011) Gobernanza forestal y REDD+: Desafíos para las políticas y mercados en América Latina. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia (Available at: http://www.cifor.org/nc/online-library/browse/view-publication/publication/3642.html [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Phelps, J., Guerreo, M. C., Dalabajan, D. A., Young, B. & Webb, E. L. (2010a) What makes a 'REDD' country?. Global Environmental Change, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 322–332

Phelps, J., Webb, E.L. & Agrawal, A. (2010b) Does REDD+ Threaten to Recentralize Forest Governance? Science, Vol. 328, No. 5976, pp. 312-313

Pistorius T., Schmitt, C. B., Benick, D. & Entenmann, S. (2010) Greening REDD+: Challenges and opportunities for forest biodiversity conservation. Policy Paper, University of Freiburg, Germany (Available at: http://www.theredddesk.org/resources/reports/greening_redd_challenges_and_opportunities_for_forest_biodiversity_conservation [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012])

Piu, H. C. & García, T. (2011) Estudio REDD Perú: La Situación de REDD en el Perú. Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (DAR), Lima (Available at: http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/rome2007/docs/REDD_peru01_2.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Porras, I. M. (1992) The Rio declaration: A new basis for international co-operation. Review of European Community and International Environmental Law, Vol.1, No.3, pp. 245-253

Proforest (2010) REDD+ SE Standards: Briefing on Complementarities with other REDD+ Social and Environmental Safeguard Mechanisms (Available at: http://www.proforest.net/publication/bibliog.2011-12-06.5160191792 [Accessed on: 12th March, 2012]) Organización para Estudios Tropicales

Proforest (2011) Diagnóstico de las Necesidades de Capacitación de las Organizaciones Públicas y Privadas para el Desarrollo del Mecanismo REDD en el Perú. (Available at: http://www.dar.org.pe/prensa_publicaciones.htm [Accessed on: 10th December, 2011]) Organización para Estudios Tropicales

Rainforest Alliance (2009) Responsibly forestry, reducing degradation in managed forests. Rainforest alliance climate initiative. Presentation on December 16, 2009, Copenhagen. FSC side-event (Available at:

http://regserver.unfccc.int/seors/reports/archive.html?session_id=COP15 [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Rainforest Alliance (2011) Mitigation, conservation & livelihoods potential for sustainable management of forests: forest certification in REDD+. Presentation on December 05th, 2011, Durban. FSC side-event (Available at: http://regserver.unfccc.int/seors/reports/archive.html?session_id=COP17/CMP7[Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Rainforest Alliance (2012) FSC certification keeps trees standing and forests intact: Responsible forestry reduce emissions (Available at: http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/climate/documents/climate_position.pdf [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012])

Rametsteiner, E. & Simula, M. (2003) Forest certification—an instrument to promote sustainable forest management?. Journal of Environmental Management, Vol. 67, pp. 87-98

REDD services (2011) REDD services: Background REDD (Available online at: http://www.redd-services.info/content/redd [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012])

REDD+ SE Standards: Briefing on complementarities with other REDD+ social and environmental safeguards mechanisms. (2010) ProForest (Available on: http://www.climate-standards.org/redd+/docs/REDD_SES_Briefing_on_Complementarities_V1_Oct_10.pdf) [Accesed on: 08th March, 2012])

Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD): A Casebook of On-the-Ground Experience (2010) The Nature Conservancy, Conservation International and Wildlife Conservation Society. Arlington, Virginia. (Available at: http://change.nature.org/wp-content/uploads/REDD-Casebook-TNC-CI-and-WCS.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD): A Casebook of On-the-Ground Experience (2010) The Nature Conservancy, Conservation International and Wildlife Conservation Society. Arlington, Virginia. (Available at: http://change.nature.org/wp-content/uploads/REDD-Casebook-TNC-CI-and-WCS.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996) The New Governance: Governing without Government. Political Studies, Vol. 44, No. 4, pp. 652–667,

Richard, M. & Panfil, S.N. (2011) Towards cost-effective social impact assessment of REDD+ projects: meeting the challenge of multiple benefit standards. International Forestry Review Vol.13, No.1, pp. 1-12

Richards, M. & Panfil, S.N. (2010) Manual for Social Impact Assessment of Land-Based Carbon Projects. Version 1. Forest Trends, Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance, Rainforest Alliance and Fauna & Flora International. Washington, DC (Available at: http://redd-net.org/resource-library/manual-for-social-impact-assessment-of-land-based-carbon-proje [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Rosendal, G. K. & Andresen, S. (2011) Institutional design for improved forest governance through REDD: Lessons from the global environment facility. Ecological Economics, Vol.70, No. 11, pp. 1908-1915

Saunders, J. & Reeve, R. (2010) Monitoring Governance for Implementation of REDD+. Monitoring Governance Safeguards in REDD+. Expert workshop 24th – 25th May 2010, Chatham House, London Background Paper One (Available at: http://ww.bavmet.com/uploads/Paper1REDDplusGovernanceMonitoringMeeting2425May2010.final.pdf [Accessed on: 15thMarch, 2012])

Schroeder, A. (2009) Madre de Dios Amazon REDD Project. Greenoxx (Available at: http://www.climatestandards.org/projects/files/madre_peru/Madre_de_Dios_Amazon_REDD_Project_REVISED.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

Schroeder, H. (2010) Agency in international climate negotiations: the case of indigenous peoples and avoided deforestation. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 317-332

SCS (2012) In SCS: About us (Available at: http://www.scscertified.com/about_scs.php [Accessed on: 13th May, 2012])

Sheil, D., Putz, F. E. & Zagt, R. J. (eds) (2010) Biodiversity conservation in certified forests. Tropenbos international, Wageningen, The Netherlands. Vol. 51 (Available at: http://www.etfrn.org/etfrn/newsletter/news51/index.html [Accessed on: 15th Match, 2012])

SERNANP (2012) In SERNANP: Quienes Somos (Available at: http://www.sernanp.gob.pe/sernanp/contenido.jsp?ID=5 [Accessed on: 11th June, 2012])
Servicio Nacional de Áreas Protegidas por el Estado

Skjaerseth, J. B. & Wettestad, J. (2002) Understanding the effectivennes of EU environmental policy: How can regime analysis contribute?. Environmental Politics, Vol. 11, No.3, pp.99-120

Skogstad, G (2003) Legitimacy and/or policy effectiveness?: Network governance and GMO regulation in the European Union. Journal of European Public Policy, Vol.10, No.3, pp.321-338

Skutsch, M. M. & Trines, E. (2008) Report from the UNFCCC meeting in Bali. African Journal of Ecology, Vol. 46, No.1, pp. 1–2

Somorin, O. A., Brown, H. C. P., Visseren-Hamakers, I. J., Sonwa, D. J., Arts, B. & Nkem, J. (2011) The Congo Basin forests in a changing climate: Policy discourses on adaptation and mitigation (REDD+). Global environmental change, Vol. 22, No.1, pp. 288–298

Stern, N. (2007) The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review. Cambridge University Press.

Streck, C. (2010) Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation: national implementation of REDD schemes. An Editorial Comment. Climatic Change, Vol. 100, No. 3-4, pp. 389–394

Sunderlin, W. D. & Atmadja, S. (2009) REDD+: ¿Una iniciativa cuyo momento ha llegado o cuyo momento ya pasó?. Angelsen, A. (Ed.) La implementación de REDD+: Estrategia nacional y opciones de política. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, pp. 45-54

Szulecki, K., Pattberg, P. & Biermann, F. (2011) Explaining variation in the effectiveness of transnational energy partnerships. Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 713-736

Taylor, P. L. (2005a) A Fair Trade approach to community forest certification? A framework for discussion. Journal of Rural Studies, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 433-447

Taylor, P. L. (2005b) In the Market But Not of It: Fair Trade Coffee and Forest Stewardship Council Certification as Market-Based Social Change. World Development Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 129–147

Terrestrial Carbon Group & UN-REDD Programme (2009) Background Analysis of REDD Regulatory Frameworks (Available at: http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=search_result&Itemid=63 [Accessed on: [15th March, 2012])

Thompson, M. C., Baruah, M. & Carr, E. R. (2011) Seeing REDD+ as a project of environmental governance. Environmental Science & Policy, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp.100-110

TNC (2009) Can we credibly and Affordably Measure Reduce Emissions from Improved management of Forests? Presentation on November 05th, 2009, Barcelona. FSC-TNC side-event Barcelona (Available at: http://regserver.unfccc.int/seors/reports/archive.html?session_id=RAWG7-AWG9 [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) The Conservancy Nature group

UNFCCC (1992) United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (Available at: http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/conveng.pdf [Accessed on: 10th June, 2012]) United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

UNFCCC (2007) Bali Action Plan. In UNFCCC: Key documents, Bali Action Plan (Available at: http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2007/cop13/eng/06a01.pdf [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

UNFCCC (2010) Cancun Agreements. In UNFCCC: Key documents, Cancun Agreements (Available at: http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2010/cop16/eng/07a01.pdf#page=2 [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012])

UNFCCC (2011) Report of the Conference of the Parties on its seventeenth session, held in Durban from 28 November to 11 December 2011(Available at: http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/cop17/eng/09a01.pdf [Accessed on: 10th June, 2012]) United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

UNFCCC (2012a) In UNFCCC: Essential Background. (Available at http://unfccc.int/essential_background/items/6031.php [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

UNFCCC (2012b) In UNFCCC: Essential Background, Kyoto Protocol (Available at: http://unfccc.int/essential_background/kyoto_protocol/items/6034.php [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

UNFCCC (2012c) In UNFCCC: National Programmes (Available at: http://www.un-redd.org/AboutUNREDDProgramme/NationalProgrammes/tabid/584/Default.aspx [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012]) United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

UNFCCC (2012d) In UNFCCC: Methods &Science, Mitigation, REDD (Available at: http://unfccc.int/methods_science/redd/items/4615.php [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012]) United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

UNFCCC (2012e) In UNFCCC: Meetings Programmes (Available at: http://unfccc.int/meetings/items/6240.php [Accessed on: 02nd March, 2012]) United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

UNIQUE forestry and land use (2011) Practical lessons from forest & carbon certification for national REDD+. Presentation on December 05, 2011, Durban. FSC side-event (Available at: http://regserver.unfccc.int/seors/reports/archive.html?session_id=COP17/CMP7 [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

University of Freiburg, Germany (Available at: http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/sbstta/sbstta-15/information/sbstta-15-inf-03-en.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

UN-REDD program (2010) Newsletter, Issue No 8, Junio 2010 (Available at: http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_details&gid=2124&Itemid=53 [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

UN-REDD program (2011) Newsletter, Issue No 19, Junio 2011 (Available at: http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_details&gid=5584&Itemid=53 [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

UN-REDD Programme (2012a) In UN-REDD: About the UN-REDD Programme (Available at: http://www.un-redd.org/AboutUNREDDProgramme/tabid/583/Default.aspx [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) The United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions form Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries

UN-REDD Programme (2012b) In UN-REDD: About the UN-REDD Programme, National programmes, Peru (Available at: http://www.un-redd.org/AboutUNREDDProgramme/NationalProgrammes/tabid/584/Default.aspx [Accessed on: 10th March, 2012]) The United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions form Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries

Van der Werf, G.R., Morton, D. C., Olivier, J. G. J., Kasibhatla, P. S., Jackson, R. B., Collatz, G. J. & Randerson, R. S. (2009) CO2 emissions from forest loss. Nature geoscience, Vol.2, pp. 737-738

Van Kersbergen, K. & Van Waarden, F. (2004) "Governance" as a Bridge between Disciplines: Cross-Disciplinary Inspiration Regarding Shifts in Governance and Problems of Governability, Accountability and Legitimacy'. European Journal of Political Research, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 143–171

VCS (2012) In VCS: How it works (Available at: http: http://v-c-s.org/how-it-works/vcs-program [Accessed on: 13th May, 2012]) Verified Carbon Standard

Vega, J (2009) Análisis del proceso de descentralización fiscal en el Perú. Economía y sociedad, CIES, No. 69, pp. 16-23

Vich, V. (2004) Desobediencia simbólica. Performance, participación y política al final de la dictadura fujimorista, en Grimson, A. (comp.): La cultura en las crisis latinoamericanos, CLACSO, Buenos Aires

Visseren-Hamakers, I. & Glasbergen, P. (2007). Partnerships in forest governance. Global Environmental Change, Vol. 17, No. 3-4 Issues 3-4, pp. 408-419

Volgy, T. J., Fausett, E., Grant, K. A. & Rodgers, S. (2008) Identifying Formal Intergovernmental Organizations.Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 45, No. 6, pp. 837-850

Walther, G. R., Post, E., Coney, P., Menzel, A., Parmesank, C., Beebee, T.J.C., Fromentin, J. M. Guldberg, O.H. & Bairlein, F. (2002) Ecological responses to recent climate change. Nature, Vol.416, No. 6879, pp. 389-395

Weiss, T. G. (2000) Governance, good governance and global governance: conceptual and actual challenges. Third World Quarterly, Vol. 21, No. 5, pp. 785-814

Wood, R. G. (2011) Carbon finance and pro-poor co-benefits: The Gold standard and Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards. Sustainable markets, Discussion paper 4. International Institute for Environment and Development (Available at: http://pubs.iied.org/15521IIED.html Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

WWF (2008) Greening carbon guidebook (Available at: http://wwf.panda.org/what_we_do/how_we_work/conservation/forests/publications/?uNewsID=135062 [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Wildlife World Fund

WWF (2010a) MRV of REDD+ Safeguards: Ensuring effective REDD+ with environmental and social co-benefits and strengthened governance (Available at: http://www.worldwildlife.org/climate/Publications/WWFBinaryitem20094.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Wildlife World Fund

WWF (2010b) Reducing international drivers of deforestation: All countries contribute to forest loss so all countries should commit to reducing it (Available at: http://www.worldwildlife.org/climate/Publications/WWFBinaryitem20092.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012]) Wildlife World Fund

Zambrano-Barragán, C. & Cordero, D. (2008) REDD en América del Sur Caracterización de los principales actores. Unión Internacional para la Conservación de la Naturaleza, UICN (Available at: http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/actores_y_posiciones_redd.pdf [Accessed on: 15th March, 2012])

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. INTERVIEW GUIDE

My name is Coraina de la Plaza and I am currently working on my thesis which is part of the Forest and Nature Conservation Master program at the University of Wageningen, The Netherlands. My thesis focuses on the (potential) role that FSC and CCBA certification schemes might play under REDD+. I am especially interested in the role of actors related to these certifications schemes in debates, development of policies or decision making-process surrounding REDD+ as well as in the development and implementation of REDD+ pilot projects.

I am interested in your opinion and expertise on this topic because I think that may be of great help to get input for my thesis. First, I would like to know if you consent to record our conversation and if it would be possible to quote you within my thesis when necessary. If you do not want to be identified I can maintain your name anonymous. The duration of the interview will be of approximately one hour.

Question 1. General Information

Name:
Email:
Location of the interviewee:
Name of the organization / company / institution you work for:
Position /job:

Question 2. Could you tell me what are your main duties in your current job?

2. a. What is your (if any) experience working on issues related to REDD +?

2. b. What is you experience (if any) working with FSC and/or CCBA certifications?

Question 3. Could you tell me your opinion about the REDD + initiative?

3.a. What, in your opinion, could be the role (if any) of voluntary certification, specifically of FSC and CCBA, in REDD+?

Question 4. Can you tell me about your experience or participation in REDD+ activities such as workshops, political negotiations, debates, development of pilot project, etc.?

Question 5. In your experience, has appeared an opinion among actors related to REDD+ about the possible role of FSC or CCBA certification under REDD+?

5.a. What express those opinions and views about his topic?

Question 6. In your experience, was it expressed or discussed in any of the mentioned REDD + activities the relevance or importance that the FSC and CCBA certifications could have under REDD+?

6.a. What was discussed about this topic?

Question 7. In your experience, there have been any impacts or modifications in the processes surrounding REDD+ such as decisions-making processes, debates, development of pilot projects, etc., induced by the FSC and CCBA certifications or its actors?

7.a. What are those impacts or modifications?

Question 8. In your experience, there has been presence of actors related to FSC and CCBA in REDD+ activities such as debates, decision-making processes, development of REDD+ pilot projects, etc.?

8.a. Could you tell me in what way these actors have participated?

8.b. Were these actors just informed about facts, problems, etc.? Were they asked to provide for feedback or their opinions, engage in these activities, considered as partners, etc.?

Question 9. In your opinion, is there any interest from actors related to REDD+ to include or involve FSC and CCBA actors in REDD+ activities such as debates or decision-making processes?

9.a. Is there any interest from actors related to REDD+ to include or involve FSC and CCBA certifications and promote their use in the development of REDD+ pilot projects?

Thank you very much for your time!

ANNEX 2. LIST OF INTERVIEWEES BY LEVEL OF ANALYSIS

1. Global level

Christopher Ties - Greenpeace International

Gerald Steindlegger - World Wildlife Fund International (WWF)

Stefan Salvador - Forest Stewarship Council International (FSC)

2. National level

Alfredo Rodríguez - World Wildlife Fund Peru (WWF)

Alvaro Vallejo - Carbon Decisions International

Braulio Andrade - Conservation International (CI) Peru

Elvira Gómez - Ministry of Environment, Peru (MINAM)

Hugo Che Piu - Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (DAR)[1]

Interviewee - Asociación para la Investigacion y el Desarrollo Integral (AIDER)[2]

Jorge Torres - Bosques Amazónicos[2] (BAM)

Mario Chacon - Conservation International (CI)

Renzo Barrón - Servicio Nacional de Areas Protegidas por el Estado[4] (SERNANP)

Ruben Paitan - Servicio Nacional de Areas Protegidas por el Estado (SERNANP)

Silvia Gómez - Greenoxx[5]

Violeta Colan - Rainforest Alliance (RA)

3. Local level

Teddi Peñaherrera - Centro de Desarrollo e Investigación de la Selva Alta[6] (CEDISA)

Tatiana Lapeyre - Ecodevelopment group S.A.C[7]

Roberto Persivale - Asesorandes[8]

1. DAR is a Peruvian NGO whose main goals is to contribute to the sustainable development of Peru throught the sustainable management of the natural resources and biodiversity conservation , and which works in public and private projects at national, regional and local levels (DAR, 2012).

2. BAM is a private company founded on 2004 and focused in the development of forestry projects in the Amazon (BAM, 2012).

3. AIDER is a non-govermental organization founded on 1986 that develops projects and inititatives related with the conservation of forests and environment in different Peruvian regions (AIDER, 2012).

4. SERNANP is the acronym used for the National Service of natural protected areas. The SERNANP is in charge of the biodiversity conservation and it has the competences to establish managerial and technical criteria to ensure the conservation of protected natural areas. It is part of the Peruvian ministry of environment (SERNANP, 2012).

5. Greenoxx is an organization which has a consultancy area as well as a non-profit one. Greenoox main focus is the mitigation of climate change through the conservation of forests (Greenoxx, 2012).

6. CEDISA is an NGO founded in 1981 which promotes the sustainable development in the region of San Martin (CEDISA, 2012).

7. Ecodevelopment group S.A.C is a quite new Peruvian consultancy company regarding environment which also offers engineering services.

8. Asesorandes is a company specialized in financial and consultancy and development of business. This company works on project since their inception until their final implementation (Asesorandes, 2012)

ANNEX 3. LIST OF INTERVIEWEES BY ALPHABETICAL ORDER

Alfredo Rodríguez	WWF Peru Global Forest Trade and Network Coordinator
Álvaro Vallejo	Carbon Decisions International Forestry expert advisor
Braulio Andrade	Conservation International (CI) Peru Field work coordinator
Christopher Thies	Greenpeace International Forest campaign policy and strategy coordinator
Elvira Gómez	MINAM REDD+ expert
Gerald Steindlegger	WWF International Manager of the Global Forest Programme
Hugo Che Piu	DAR Director of DAR;Coordinator of the REDD+ division DAR
Jorge Torres	Bosques Amazónicos Forest carbon manager
Mario Chacón	Conservation International Training manager in the Science and Knowledge division
Interviewee	Aider REDD+ expert
Renzo Barrón	SERNANP Natural protected áreas expert
Roberto Persivale	Asesorandes Partner and advisor
Rubén Paitan	SERNANP REDD+ expert
Silvia Gómez	Greenoxx Co-director of Greenoxx
Stefan Salvador	FSC International Policy manager of the Forest Carbon and Climate Change

Tatiana Lapeyre	Ecodevelopment group Co-founder and advisor of Ecodevelopment group
Teddi Peñaherrera	CEDISA Advisor and promoter
Violeta Colan	Rainforest Alliance Peru Coordinator of the Andean region

ANNEX 4. LIST OF THE REVIEWED WEBSITES

1. Global Level

Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA)

http://www.climate-standards.org/

Forest Inestment Progam (FIP)

http://www.climatefundsupdate.org/listing/forest-investment-program

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

http://www.cifor.org/

Conservation International (CI)

http://www.conservation.org/Pages/default.aspx

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

http://www.cbd.int/

Food Agricultural Organization (FAO)

http://www.fao.org/

Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)

http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/

Forest Stewarship Council (FSC)

http://www.fsc.org/

Greenpeace International

http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/

Iternational Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)

http://www.itto.int/es/

Rainforest Alliance (RA)

http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/

REDD-desk

http://www.theredddesk.org/

REDD-net

http://www.redd-net.org/

REDD+ partnership

http://reddpluspartnership.org/en/

The conservancy group (TNC)

http://www.nature.org/

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

http://unfccc.int/2860.php

United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF)

http://www.un.org/esa/forests/

United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (UN-REDD)

http://www.un-redd.org/

World Bank

http://www.worldbank.org/

World Wildlife Fund International (WWF)

http://wwf.panda.org/

2. National Level

Asociación para la Conservación de la Cuenca Amazónica (ACCA)

http://www.acca.org.pe/

Asociación para la Investigación y el Desarrollo Integral (AIDER)

http://www.aider.com.pe/

CARE

http://www.care.org/

Centro de Conservación, Investigación y Manejo de Áreas Naturales (CIMA)

http://www.cima.org.pe/

Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (DAR)

http://www.dar.org.pe/

3. Local Level

Gobierno regional de Madre de Dios

http://www.regionmadrededios.gob.pe/goremad/

Gobierno regional de San Martin

http://www.regionsanmartin.gob.pe/

Greenoxx

http://www.greenoxx.com/es/

Asesorandes

http://www.asesorandes.com/

Federación Nativa del rio de Madre de Dios y Afluentes Reserva (FENAMAD)

http://fenamad.org.pe/

Fondo Nacional del Ambiente (FONAM)

http://www.fonamperu.org/default.php

Grupo REDD Perú

http://www.gruporeddperu.net/

Ministerio de Agricultura (MINAG)

http://www.minag.gob.pe/portal/

Ministerio del Ambiente (MINAM)

http://www.minam.gob.pe/

Servicio Natural de Áreas Protegidas por el Estado (SERNANP)

http://www.sernanp.gob.pe/sernanp/

ANNEX 5. MADRE DE DIOS AMAZON REDD PROJECT

The Madre de Dios Amazon REDD project covers an area of 98.932 hectares which include different types of rainforest. In this area there are two concessions which are part of this project and belong to two different companies: Maderacre and Maderija (Schroeder, 2009). Moreover, the forests are located in a region that belongs to the ecological corridor Vilcabamaba-Amboró, which is a very important area in terms of biodiversity (Brotto, 2010; Schroeder, 2009). Regarding the social component, some indigenous communities are living nearby the concessions but not within their boundaries (Schroeder, 2009). The project developer is Greenoxx, which is an organization based in Uruguay that has a consultancy for-profit part as well as an NGO area that is usually on charge of the REDD+ projects (Schroeder, 2009). Despite Greenoxx is the executor of the project other international and national organizations such as WWF, CESVI, ProNaturaleza or Aider, have participated in its development.

Moreover, the project area was under higher threats of deforestation, forest degradation, increase of migratory movements or illegal loggers and farmers (Hajek et al., 2011; Schroeder, 2009). These risks were associated to the construction of the Inter-oceanic highway because this project is located less than 50 km from the sides of the road (Hajek et al., 2011; Schroeder, 2009). This road links Brazil with the Peruvian ports and it has been described as one the mega-development projects in Madre de Dios (Hajek eta al., 2011). In fact, in the Brazilian part of this road, direct and indirect negative impacts can already be appreciated (Schroeder, 2009). Therefore, these threats had to be minimized and this implied that the presence of the companies in charge of the concessions had to be more evident. This means that they had to put more efforts and investment in the surveillance of the area (control, patrolling and monitoring) which generated a need to increase the monetary incomes (Hajek et al., 2011; Schroeder, 2009; Sheil et al., 2010). The need to increase the profits led to both companies to obtain FSC certification for the 100% of their respective concessions in 2007. One of the main reasons to get FSC certification was the future generation of carbon credits (Schroeder, 2009) through the improvement of forests management practices which could be used to get extra-incomes that would help to afford the new surveillance costs. The FSC certification also promoted the conservation of the biodiversity in this area (Sheil et al., 2010). Moreover, the Madre de Dios Amazon REDD project also obtained the Golden level of the CCBA certification in 2009. This is the third project worldwide that obtains the Golden level certification. The CCBA standard guaranteed the environmental and social parts of the project. Up to 70% of the needed requirements to obtain the CCBA certification were already covered by the FSC scheme (Sheil et al., 2010) and therefore this second voluntary certification was easier to obtain.

Regarding the reduction of emissions, it has been estimated that between the two concessions there is a stock of 82.950.966 Mt of CO_2 (Schroeder, 2009). The average reduction of emissions has been predicted to be around 1.100.000 $MtCO_{2e}$/year and the reduction of emissions in the next ten years has been estimated on 11.000.000 $MtCO_{2e}$/year (Schroeder, 2009). This REDD+

project is actively selling credits (Forestcarbonportal, 2012) and the first 40.000 t CO2 were worth USD7 each ton (Forestacarbonportal, 2012; Sheil et al., 2010). The CCBA and the FSC certifications helped to these companies to quicker develop the REDD+ projects (Schroeder, 2009; Sheil et al., 2010). One of the facts that allows to sell the credits at higher prices is to be CCBA certificated (Schroeder, 2009). Moreover, FSC certification has been recognized by Greenoxx as a major and additional guarantee of the sustainability of the project and its long term permanence (Schroeder, 2009). According to Sheil et al. (2010, p.112), FSC certification allowed to these companies "*to obtain REDD+ carbon payments to offset higher management costs*".

The character of this project and its success has been internationally recognized. Organizations such as CI or the Woods Hole Research Center have integrated this project in some of their reports. The Madre de Dios Amazon REDD project was also included in reports which were published during the COP-15 and elaborated by Idesam[22] and TNC. The success of this REDD+ certified project (and other projects) and the extent to which these projects are known in the international and national spheres can also have consequences (in this case positive) for the legitimacy of the FSC and CCBA voluntary certification schemes under REDD+.

[22] *Institute for Conservation and Sustainable Development of Amazonas*

ANNEX 6. REDD+ PILOT PROJECTS IN MADRE DE DIOS

Table 4. REDD+ pilot projects taking place within Madre de Dios region

REDD+ Project	Area (ha)	Type of certification(s)	Project status
[1]Conservation Concesion "Los Amigos"	145.945,00	CCBA, VCS	In Design
The Castaña Corridor REDD Project	378.911,00	CCBA, VCS	In Design
[2]National park of Bahuaja Sonene and National reserve of Tampotapa REDD project	588.258,00	CCBA, VCS	In Design
[3]Chesnut concession Madre de Dios REDD Project	150.000,00	-	In Design
[4]"Infierno" native community REDD project	11.165,00	-	In Design
[5]Reforestation concessions in Madre de Dios REDD project	80.000,00	-	In Design
The Belgica Native Community REDD Project	53.394,00	CCBA, FSC	In Design

Piramide REDD Project	21.868,00	-	In Design
Madre de Dios Amazon REDD Project	98.900,00	CCBA, SCS, FSC	In Execution
[6]REDD project in the Ecotiurist Concession "Inkaterra" and the conservation concessions of "Bioconservación Amaru Mayo" and "Inkaterra-Tampobata"	11.771,00	-	In Design

For some projects the name in English was not found. The translation of these projects ´names is non-official. The original name of these projects are the following: 1. Concesión de Conservación "Los Amigos"; 2. Proyecto REDD en el Parque Nacional Bahuaja Sonene y la Reserva Nacional Tambopata; 3.Proyecto REDD en Concesiones de Castaña en Madre de Dios; 4. Proyecto REDD en la Comunidad Nativa Infierno; 5. Proyecto REDD en Concesiones de Reforestación en Madre de Dios; 6. REDD en el Proyecto Ecoturístico de Concesión "Inkaterra" y las concesiones conservación de "Bioconservación Amaru Mayo" y "Inkaterra – Tambopata" (Source: Developed from Piu & Garcia, 2011).

Table 5. REDD+ pilot projects taking place in Madre de Dios and neighbor regions

REDD+ Project	Area (ha)	Type of certification(s)	Project status
[1]REDD pilot experiences with native communities in three regions of the Peruvian Andean Amazon	150.000,00	-	In Design
[2]Manu-Amarakaeri Environmental credits program	56.000,00	CCBA, VCS	In Design

[3]Sustainable management for the conservation of two Biosphere Reserve in the Amazon (Peru y Ecuador) by reducing emissions form deforestation and forest degradation (REDD)	Data not available	-	In Design
Amarakaeri REDD Project	402.335,00	-	In Design

For some projects the name in English was not found. The translation of these projects ´names is non-official. The original name of these projects are the following: 1. Desarrollo de experiencias piloto REDD con comunidades nativas de tres regiones de la Amazonía Andina peruana; 2. Programa de Créditos Ambientales Manu- Amarakaeri; 3.Gestión sostenible para la conservación de dos reservas de biósfera en la Cuenca Amazónica (Perú y Ecuador) mediante la Reducción de Emisiones de CO2 por Deforestación y Degradación de Bosques (REDD) (Source: Developed from Piu & Garcia, 2011).

ANNEX 7. REDD+ PROJETCS IN OTHER PERUVIAN REGIONS

REDD+ Project	Area (ha)	Region	Type of certification(s)	Project status
Sustainable management in 3 certified communities as alternative to the deforestation and forest degradation in the Peruvian Amazon[1]	24.636	Ucayali	CCBA, VCS, FSC	In Design
Deforestation avoidance through forest management in FSC certified forests with indigenous communities in the Peruvian Amazon[2]	135.000,00	Huánuco, Pasco, Ucayali	FSC	In Design
REDD project in the Conservation concession of Alto Huayabamba[3]	143.928,09	San Martín	CCBA, VCS	In Design
Pampa Hermosa REDD Project	22.000	Junín	-	Idea for project

Chavini REDD Project	11.000	Junín	-	Idea for project
Reserva Comunal Ashaninka REDD Project	184.668	Junín	CCBA	Idea for project
Conservation area Cordillera Escalera[4]	100.190	San Martín	CCBA	In Design
Alto Mayo Conservation Initiative[5]	340.000	San Matín	CCBA, VCS	In Design
Yanachaga – Chemillén national park management program[6]	-	Pasco	-	In Design
Developing a REDD Project in Peru's Cordillera Azul National Park	1.353.191,00	Huánuco, Loreto, San Martín, Ucayali	CCBA, VCS	In Design
Sustainable management of the Shiringa forests as an	48.046,00	Ucayali	FSC	In Design

alternative to the deforestation and forest degradation in the Peruvian Amazon[7]				
Mappin *Polypelis* forests in the private concession of Cordillera del Vilcanota[8]	-	Cusco	-	-
Recuperation of the degraded forests in the Saywite-Choquequirao-Ampay communities, Apurímac, Perú[9]	21.889	Apurímac	-	Idea for project
Viability analysis of the implementation of REDD+ proyects in the Pómac forests historical Sancturary[10]	-	Lambayeque	CCBA	Idea for project
REDD+ Project in Ashaninka Communities -"TSIMI"	54.000	Cusco, Junín	-	In Design
REDD Project in Loreto's Timber Concession	40.000	Loreto	-	Idea for projects
REDD Project for the protection of the Cacataibo indigenous territory and its communities[11]	-	Ucayali	-	-

Yacus community conservation area[12]	28.477	Junín	-	In Design
Climática Selva Central Project[13]	11.000	Piura	-	In Design
Reforestación del área intangible y aprovechamiento agrícola del sedimento del reservorio Poechos[14]	14.788	Piura	-	Idea for project
Reduction of deforestation and forest degradation emissions in the protected areas of the Amazon- MACC Selva Central region[15]	2.347.306	Huánuco, Pasco, Ucayali, Junín	CCBA	In Design

For some projects the name in English was not found. The translation of these projects ´names is non-official. The original name of these projects are the following: 1. El manejo forestal sostenible en tres comunidades certificadas como una alternativa a la deforestación y degradación de los bosques en la Amazonía peruana; 2. Evitar la deforestación a través de la gestión forestal en los bosques con certificación FSC de indígenas comunidades en la Amazonía peruana; 3. Proyecto REDD en la Concesión de Conservación Alto Huayabamba – CCAH. Ecosistemas de Jalcas y Yungas. Amazonía Andina Norte del Perú; 4. Área de Conservación Cordillera Escalera; 5. Iniciativa de Conservación Alto Mayo; 6. Manejo Sostenible de Bosques Comunales de Shiringa como alternativa a la deforestación y degradación forestal en la Amazonía peruana; 7. Programa de Gestión del Parque Nacional Yanachaga – Chemillén; 8. Mapeo preliminar de los bosques de Polylepis en las áreas de Conservación Privada en la Cordillera del Vilcanota; 9. La restauración de bosques degradados en la mancomunidad Saywite-Choquequirao-Ampay, Apurímac, Perú; 10. Análisis de viabilidad de la implementación de proyectos REDD+ en el Santuario Histórico Bosques de Pómac; 11. Proyecto de REDD para la Protección del Territorio Indígena Cacataibo y de sus Pueblos en Aislamiento Voluntario; 12. Área Multicomunal de Conservación de la Comunidad de Yacus; 13. Proyecto Acción Climática Selva Central; 14. Reforestación del área intangible y aprovechamiento agrícola del sedimento del reservorio Poechos; 15. Reducción de emisiones derivadas de la deforestación y degradación de los bosques, a través de Áreas Protegidas de la Región Amazónica - MACC Selva Central