

# The Governance of Climate Change:

## Evaluating the Governance Quality of the United Nations' REDD-plus Programme



Tim Cadman  
Sustainable business fellow  
University of Southern Queensland

# Contents

- Evolution of global environmental governance
- Climate change, deforestation and 'REDD-plus' process
- Governance requirements
- Stakeholder evaluation of REDD-plus
- Conclusions

# 'multi-level governance'

- Replaces the 'regime' concept of international relations (IR) theory and top-down, command-control models of state authority:  
(Van Kersbergen & Van Waarden 2004)
  - state and non-state relations that are
  - social-political in nature oriented towards
  - collaborative approaches to problem solving  
(Kooiman 1993)
  - decentralised networks made up of multiple actors functioning at all levels (Haas 2002)
  - Forest management provides one of the best spaces to study new modes of governance (Arts 2006)

# Climate change, deforestation and REDD (-Plus)

- Deforestation and forest degradation account for nearly 20% of global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (UN REDD 2010)
- Developed countries committed USD \$30 billion for the period 2010-2012 for climate change mitigation/adaptation measures including (Bleaney et al 2010)
- United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries
  - maintaining standing forests by encouraging biodiversity conservation and sustainable use through a range of country-level projects (UN REDD 2010)
- As of COP 15 here is no final and binding REDD-plus agreement at present (RECOFT 2010)

# Mechanisms

- There are three principle REDD-plus-related mechanisms:
  - UNFCCC, responsible for the intergovernmental negotiations regarding the content and format of REDD-plus;
  - United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD) supported by UNDP, FAO and UNEP and manages the technical and financial (UN REDD 2010)
  - and The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), which via the World Bank, provides funding (Gordon et al n.d.)
    - Also FIP (Forest Investment Programme)
    - Global Environmental Facility

# Governance

- Ultimately, the success of an international REDD-plus mechanism will depend on governance arrangements that are:
  - Broadly representative of interests (i.e. inclusive)
  - Verifiably responsible (transparency and accountability),
  - Effective in terms of decision-making processes
  - Capable of implementing programmes that deliver emission reductions at scale.

(Charlotte Streck, Luis Gomez-Echeverri; Pablo Gutman; Cyril Loisel; Jacob Werksman, *REDD+ Institutional Options Assessment: Developing an Efficient, Effective, and Equitable Institutional Framework for REDD+ under the UNFCCC*, [http://www.redd-oar.org/links/REDD+IOA\\_en.pdf](http://www.redd-oar.org/links/REDD+IOA_en.pdf), accessed 21/05/2010).

# How to evaluate? Stakeholder analysis

- Analysis of governmental and environmental NGO participants in REDD-plus (UNFCCC negotiations, UN-REDD and FCPF) following hierarchically linked principles, criteria and indicators of governance quality (Lammerts van Beuren and Blom 1997):

## 2 **Principles** (values):

- Meaningful participation
- Productive deliberation

## 4 **Criteria** (categories):

- Interest representation
- Organisational responsibility
- Decision making
- Implementation

## 11 **Indicators**

(Parameters):

<b>Principle</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Indicator</b>
<u>“Meaningful participation”</u>	<i>Interest representation</i>	<b>Inclusiveness</b>
		<b>Equality</b>
		<b>Resources</b>
	<i>Organisational responsibility</i>	<b>Accountability</b>
		<b>Transparency</b>
<u>“Productive deliberation”</u>	<i>Decision making</i>	<b>Democracy</b>
		<b>Agreement</b>
		<b>Dispute settlement</b>
	<i>Implementation</i>	<b>Behavioural change</b>
		<b>Problem solving</b>
		<b>Durability</b>

(Cadman 2009)

**Table 1 Percentage breakdown UNFCCC REDD+ related stakeholders by survey, region and sector (rounded to nearest percentile)**

Survey	Region	Sector						Total number per survey
		Environmental	Social	Economic	Government	Secretariat	Other	
1. November 2009	North	49%	5%	3%	3%	0%	3%	39
	South	13%	0%	0%	13%	0%	3%	
2. March 2009	North	14%	0%	0%	7%	2%	7%	42
	South	40%	2%	0%	23%	0%	2%	
3. September 2010	North	16%	2%	0	16%	0%	6%	50
	South	36%	0%	2%	20%	0%	2%	

Note: i) percentages rounded to nearest whole number; ii) totals include all respondents who attempted the survey (but may not have answered all questions)

# Results

## (Post COP 15)

- Rating (out of 55 points) by governments and environmental NGOs (North and South):
  - UN-REDD: **36.61 points**
  - UNFCCC: **31.99 points**
  - FCPF: **30.52 points**
  - REDD-Plus
  - weighted average: **32.88 points**

**Table 2: REDD-plus 'consensus legitimacy rating' across indicators and sub-institutions as rated by environmental and governmental sectors (global north and south; Post COP-15)**

Principle	1. Meaningful Participation Maximum score: 25; Minimum: 5								2. Productive deliberation Maximum score: 30 Minimum: 6								Total (out of 55)	
	1. Interest representation Maximum score: 15 Minimum: 3				2. Organisational responsibility Maximum score: 10 Minimum: 2				Principle Score	3. Decision-making Maximum score: 15 Minimum: 3				4. Implementation Maximum score: 15 Minimum: 3				Principle Score
Indicator	Inclusiveness	Equality	Resources	Criterion Score	Accountability	Transparency	Criterion Score	Principle Score		Democracy	Agreement	Dispute settlement	Criterion Score	Behavioural change	Problem solving	Durability	Criterion Score	
UNFCCC-REDD-plus 36	3.23	2.76	1.92	7.91	3.23	3.12	6.35		14.26	2.7	2.89	2.53	8.12	3.21	3.1	3.29	9.6	17.73
UN-REDD 18	3.5	3.36	2.95	14.26	3.25	3.17	6.41	16.23	3.28	3.42	3.25	9.95	3.6	3.38	3.44	10.43	20.38	36.61
FCPF 15	3.09	2.67	2.12	7.87	2.85	2.85	5.71	13.58	2.93	2.73	2.49	8.16	2.93	2.79	3.05	8.77	16.93	30.52
Overall weighted averages	3.27	2.90	2.23	9.56	3.15	3.07	6.23	14.63	2.90	2.99	2.71	8.61	3.25	3.11	3.28	9.64	18.25	32.88

## UNFCCC

Before COP 15: 28.16

After COP 15: 31.99

Before COP 16: 36.87

(Environment/Government weighted averages)

## UNFCCC

Before COP 15: 28.0

After COP 15: 32.4

Before COP 16: 36.4

(Global North/South weighted averages)

# Findings - general

- Governments (the main players in global climate change negotiations) generally rated the governance quality of REDD-plus higher than environmental NGOs (especially regarding inclusiveness)
- Higher ratings given by the global South – both governmental *and* environmental NGOs.
  - This might seem to indicate that as an initiative ‘*for*’ the south some of the traditional North/South imbalances are reversed.

# Findings - specific

- Lower ratings for:
  - Resources (to facilitate interest representation): 2.23 points (out of 5) **but note:** Inclusiveness 3.27
  - Dispute settlement (effective decision making): 2.71
  - Transparency (institutional responsibility): 3.07
  - **Present conditions (actual perceptions)**
- Highest ratings for
  - Durability: 3.28
  - Behaviour change: 3.25 (deliver emissions reduction)
  - **Future state (speculation)**

# Conclusions

- Appears to confirm some of the academic concerns re governance arrangements
- **But:**
  - Short-term study, and one with relatively few participants
  - Some insights into the quality of governance of REDD-plus, but not definitive in its own right
  - Longer-term investigation will be necessary to determine if the trends identified here are correct

## **However:**

- Quality-of-governance standards would make it easier for potential participants to determine whether they should engage in a given initiative or not

# Thank you



[tim.cadman@usq.edu.au](mailto:tim.cadman@usq.edu.au)