



REDD versus people

The impact of REDD and other market mechanisms on women

(REDD = Reducing Emissions from Deforestation in Developing Countries)

What are 'market mechanisms' and 'REDD'?

- **Market forces currently favoured to drive biodiversity conservation** because:

- Relatively cheap and easy for governments
- Work with the profit motive and corporations rather than against
- But, significant negative impacts (see below)

- **Market-oriented mechanisms include** certification, ecotourism, biopiracy/gene trade, agrofuels, carbon offsetting and trade, and now REDD.

- **REDD – 'positive incentives' not to deforest**, as 18% anthropogenic GHGs. UNFCCC. Not necessarily carbon markets, but many do wish to fund REDD through carbon markets.

What sort of 'positive incentives' are we talking about?

Very significant ones. Large sums of money being discussed and potential profit driving negotiations forward fast:

- Stern US\$5-10 billion/yr for main 8 countries
- World Bank US\$20 billion/yr, 20% reduction
- Ebeling & Yasue US\$11.5-67.5 billion/yr, 50% reduction
- **World Bank – Forest Carbon Partnership Facility** (\$300 million) and **Forest Investment Fund** (US\$ 1 billion), specifically to promote carbon markets option, conflicts with UNFCCC.

So, what's wrong with market mechanisms, and how are women impacted?

To 'use' markets, the environment has to be 'made' into marketable products. It has to be:

- **Commodified** (there has to be a discrete saleable 'product' eg creating rights to emit GHGs; Paraguay & PES)
- **Privatised** (there has to be an owner to sell the product, eg giving GHG rights to companies, EU ETS \$44billion market)
- **Commercialised** (there has to be demand to buy the product, eg creating new markets for carbon or biodiversity)

All steps - significant equity and gender dimensions...

...market mechanisms exacerbate existing inequalities

Women earn less, own less, have fewer capital assets, less land and fewer inheritance rights. This means they:

- **have less to sell and are less likely to be compensated** for environmental services
- **are already more reliant on free access to biodiversity** (for food, medicines) which may be denied after deforestation / privatisation. No money to buy previously free environmental services, like water, forest/biodiversity products

...market mechanisms exacerbate existing inequalities

Women are also:

- **less able to provide the economies of scale** that large companies and the World Bank are looking for, as they tend to be engaged in small-scale farming and sustainable forestry projects
- **unlikely to be able to afford to participate in certification processes**, such as FSC

...market mechanisms demand skills and education

Women also have less access to formal education than men and thus fewer formally acquired skills (eg languages), making it much harder for them to:

- **engage in technical and legal negotiations**, often in a language other than their own eg on PES
- **have sufficient education to benefit significantly** from projects that demand educated staff, such as ecotourism. eg Kenya ecotourism, 27 permanent jobs

Women on REDD alert!

These gender inequalities all loom large in REDD:

- **REDD explicitly aims to pay the polluter** (not women)
- **REDD will be biased against women** (land rights, economies of scale, ability to engage in the market, displacement)
- **Decisions about REDD may affect community governance** – who makes decisions about forests/land
- **There is no mention of women in key documents from the UNFCCC and the World Bank**

So is REDD good or bad for biodiversity conservation?

Looks good superficially ('co-benefit') but...

- **Bad if it excludes the knowledge and skills of women**
- **Bad if promotes plantations** instead of primary forest
- **Bad as long as it continues to pay / encourage the polluter** (eg DR Congo)
- **Bad because it has serious methodological flaws and leakage issues**, meaning emissions could be increased and deforestation can move elsewhere (project, country, N-S).
- **Bad if carbon density of forests is prioritised over biodiversity value** in markets or elsewhere.

So REDD's not as good as it sounds then?

No! A range of potential dangers...

- **It discourages real solutions to climate change and biodiversity**
- **It's almost impossible to measure whether governments are successful**
- **Funds uncertain and unstable** if carbon markets used
- **Uncertain who will get the money on the basis of current documents**, but clearly unlikely to be women or Indigenous Peoples



What are the alternatives?

- **CDB already instructs rich Northern countries to cover the incremental costs** of biodiversity protection (GEF).
- **Funds can be raised to stop deforestation without relying on aid or carbon markets.** eg taxing oil consumption in N, taxing air travel, switching energy subsidies (US\$250 billion per year)
- **BUT may be better – esp for women - to opt for range of cheaper alternatives that do not increase value of forests,** inc:
 - address drivers such as consumption, fuel poverty
 - moratoria / bans on deforestation
 - community-led reforestation programmes
 - change UN definition of forests



...and for women?

- **Reward women for their biodiversity stewardship** – especially re saving seeds and nurturing trees - through targeted and effective public governance measures.
- **Ensure the effective enforcement of CEDAW**, the UN Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.
- **Implement UNDRIPS**, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
- **Retain free access to biodiversity and the environment** and keep environmental services and forests out of carbon and other markets.



Global Forest Coalition

