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STAKEHOLDERS, PARTICIPATION AND ENGAGEMENT

- What is a stakeholder?
- Are there more useful and accurate terms?
- Participation and strategic engagement—stakeholder roles and responsibilities
- Representation and representativeness
**WHAT IS STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND WHY IS IT RELEVANT?**

- **“Stakeholder engagement”** refers to:
  - influencing decision-making over time
  - developing ownership for the implementation of solutions
  - supporting implementation.
  - Can take place at multiple levels for REDD+ (“nested”)

- **Other terms**
  - Stakeholder **Participation** (too often means one-off presence rather than ownership and involvement over time)
  - Stakeholder **Consultation** (listening without considering stakeholder input)

- **Why is stakeholder engagement important?**
  - Human rights, national legal obligations, sustainability dividends (e.g., ownership, avoiding/mitigating negative impacts, conflicts).

**WHO ARE REDD+ STAKEHOLDERS?**

- **Stakeholders, in the REDD+ context, are defined as:**
  
  "...those groups that have a stake/interest/right in the forest and those that will be affected either negatively or positively by REDD+ activities. They include relevant government agencies, formal and informal forest users, private sector entities, Indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities."

- **Rights holders = a subset of stakeholders** with statutory and/or customary rights to land and natural resources that will be potentially affected by a REDD+ program.

- **Stakeholder categories are not homogeneous**
### WHAT ARE YOUR OBJECTIVES? TYPES OF REDD+ STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE A: Socialization and Learning</td>
<td>Stakeholders receive information on concepts and plans and develop capacity for educated dialogue.</td>
<td>Readiness early stages, but done as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE B: Analysis of Problems to Establish Baselines</td>
<td>Stakeholders solicited for information on ecological, socioeconomic, governance/policy issues via open meetings, document reviews and participation in invitational working groups.</td>
<td>Primarily Readiness activities but updates as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE C: Consensus Building and Consent</td>
<td>Stakeholders invited to jointly define problems, solutions, priorities. Governments/projects respect community consent decisions.</td>
<td>Readiness (strategy development, SESA, FPIC, benefit distribution, grievance procedures) and Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE D: Oversight/ Monitoring Roles</td>
<td>Stakeholders invited to serve on committees for oversight/monitoring for insights, transparency and equity</td>
<td>Both readiness and implementation stages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### WHAT HAS BEEN DONE SO FAR?

- Stakeholder analysis
- Engagement practices
- Consent practices (FPIC)
- Engaging specific groups (women, indigenous peoples, other forest-dependent communities)
• What is stakeholder mapping and analysis?
  – Methods to identify stakeholder groups, relative power and relationships across groups, differences/convergences across and within groups, leadership legitimacy and cultural and linguistic influences on interactions.
  – Stakeholder mapping and analysis may make use of existing data, but also need ground-truthing
  – Some countries not yet done REDD+ stakeholder analyses

• Recommendations
  – To avoid stereotyping and identify areas of consensus and conflict, stakeholder analyses should be done early and consistently during REDD+ readiness preparations.
  – Gender analysis should be a consistent element of stakeholder analyses.

### Engagement Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thumbs Up</th>
<th>Thumbs Down</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Poor tracking of women's participation, few gender advocates, too few trained facilitators, trust issues with Forest Dept. &amp; CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A [most common]</td>
<td>Government and civil society providing information/capacity, national/local CSO networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>Socialization ≠ consultation, stakeholder analysis done too late, gender missed in stakeholder analysis, closed-door expert analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>Analyses by civil society, participatory data collection for governance and SESA, uncertain benefits and distribution, unclear grievance procedures, unclear FPIC implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type D</td>
<td>Consensus – SESA and FPIC, note-taking &amp; feedback loops, independent monitoring option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unclear benefits and distribution, unclear grievance procedures, unclear FPIC implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal CSO participation on standing committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENGAGING PRIVATE SECTOR

• Levels of engagement of different groups of private sector appears to vary within and across countries (mostly Type A and D) but real level is unknown due to private (exclusive) meetings.

• Diverse group and views: individual companies, federations and trade associations involved in extractive and productive (e.g., forestry, oil palm production, ranching, large-scale farming), finance.

• Underrepresented: Smallholders without associations, trade unions, agriculture, mining and infrastructure

• Recommendations: More balanced analyses of private sector’s role in drivers of deforestation analyses, more private sector participation in multi-stakeholder processes, concession moratoriums during Readiness planning (trust-building with civil society), engaging business via larger LEDS/Green Economy planning

CONSENT PRACTICES
(FREE, PRIOR, AND INFORMED CONSENT)

• Special case of indigenous consent rights for proposed projects, to be respected by signatories of UN Declaration on Rights of Indigenous People (2008) (and all UN-REDD countries)

• Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)
  – Implementation still nascent (mining, roads experience)
  – Types A, C and D stakeholder engagement for REDD+ FPIC
  – Challenges: Consent without manipulation; the right to refuse consent; consent for Voluntarily Isolated; application to other forest-dependent vulnerable communities.

• Recommendations: government and donor commitment and resources; supportive policies; trained neutral facilitators; information quality; information; adequate time; grievance resolution processes.
• Supportive donors but still underrepresentation of indigenous and other marginalized groups (Types A-D), group differences

• More engagement on socialization/learning, technical inputs (consultation plans, safeguards/FPIC, monitoring) than dialogue about indigenous tenure rights and benefits plans.

• History, culture and legal framework result in different government sensitivities and commitment to indigenous issues and representation for REDD+.

• **Recommendations:** Building relationships and trust, sharing information and building capacity via civil society and government indigenous ministries, better materials, broadening representation.

---

**ENGAGING INDIGENOUS PEOPLES**

---

**GENDER-SENSITIVE STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

**Invite women to the meeting**

- ensure that the invitation reaches the women
- Give adequate advance notice for them to arrange for their other responsibilities (housework, cooking, caregiving)

**Prepare women to effectively participate in the meeting** (via the invitation, small group meetings, house-to-house canvassing)

- inform them of the purpose
- raise their awareness about the importance of their participation

**Prepare men to accept women’s participation and input** (during small group work, through local and religious leaders, via outreach messages)
GENDER-SENSITIVE STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Organize the meeting at a time and place convenient and appropriate for women (travel, accommodations, child care, facilitators)

Conduct the meeting so that women have the opportunity to provide input (plenary introduction, sex-segregated group work, sensitive facilitation of sharing and prioritizing, consensus building)

Don’t waste their time – make sure the meeting covers issues of importance to women as well as men, and that they are not only able to participate, but that their input is valued
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ENGAGING WOMEN

• Societal gender differences and differences between men and women of the same stakeholder group - different stakes, vulnerabilities, interests and rights

• Women (and gender advocates) appear to be under-represented (invitations, presence, participation quality and impact) in Types A-D stakeholder engagement, particularly indigenous women.

• Recommendations: Stakeholder analyses to identify gender issues at various scales and women stakeholders; invitation and facilitation practices; logistical issues; sharing experiences across countries.
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Tools and methodologies for participation and engagement

Session 6 – REDD+ Stakeholder Engagement

Type A
- Stakeholder mapping
- Public hearings & public comment
- Open house
- Listening sessions
- World café methods
- Focus groups
- Surveys
- On-line dialogue blogs

Type B
- Topic/Issue hearings, assemblies
- Invited advisory working groups, task force (permanent or temporary)
- National or community issues forum
- Deliberative planning - charrettes, scenarios, Appreciative Inquiry
- Citizen juries/panels
- Study circles
- Document review

Type C
- Sustained Dialogue
- Search for Common Ground
- Consensus agreement meetings
- Settlement agreements/Negotiations
- Delphi methodology
- FPIC (consent)

Type D
- Permanent REDD+ Oversight Committees (National, sub-national)
- Committees/Teams for monitoring impacts and resolving grievances
- Participatory monitoring
- Independent monitoring
- Partnerships
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CONTINUUM OF PARTICIPATION AND ENGAGEMENT

- Involve experts only/closed door
- Passively inform (Web site)
- Public communications (Radio)
- Targeted communications
- One-off participation
- Participation with follow-up, validation
- Sustained engagement
- Local leadership

MINIMAL PARTICIPATION

ACTIVE ENGAGEMENT
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APPROACH / PHILOSOPHY

- Data mining (it’s where most of us are!)
- Listening
- Frame analysis of cultural, power differentials
- Cogeneration of knowledge
- Action research
- Appreciative/assets based
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• Don’t waste people’s time and don’t overload; use existing venues
• Employ frame analysis
• Use appreciative approach but add value
• Match method to question
• Take care of confidential information
• Return results: validate and verify
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Thanks for your attention!
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