Bringing gender back in to REDD+ decision processes: A case from Vietnam

Pham ThuThuy, Moira Moeliono and Mai Hoang Yen

CIFOR

Outline

- Background

- Research questions

- Methods

- Findings

- Recommendations

©PhotoMediaService

CIFOR

Center for International Forestry Research

Research questions

- How have participation and gender been addressed in REDD policies and legal frameworks in Vietnam

- What are the opportunities and constraints to mainstreaming gender into REDD

CIFOR

Methods

- *Literature review*

- *Policy content analysis* (e.g. related REDD and PES policies, Gender Law, National Socio-Economic Development Plan and Strategy, National Poverty Reduction Strategy)

- *Interviews with 86 Key informant/stakeholder representing 54 organizations* (national and sub-national; international and national NGOs, private sectors, policy makers, academics, media and civil society organisations)

- *2 National consultation workshops* (July 2010, May 2012)

Background

- Gender equity is supported by most national laws and strategies: The Constitution of Viet Nam. Law on Gender Equality (2006); National Forest Strategy; National REDD Strategy.

- The Gender Inequality Index score is 0.305. Vietnam's Global Gender Gap Index rating for 2011 is 0.6732, putting it in 79th place (out of a total of 135 countries).

Background (2)

- Specific targets of the national strategy:
  - 25% women involved in Party organizations by 2020 term
  - women representation is 25 percent for trained rural workers under 45 years old by 2015 and 50 percent by 2020.
- Current Status:
  - Land allocation: in 2002 Women accounted for 10-12%
  - Representation in national parliament in 2010: 24.4% of (target = 30%)
  - Leadership at provincial and district: 20-24%
  - Leadership at communal and village level: 1-4%

Findings: Policy Framework

- Gender equity mentioned as essential for the success of REDD and forest management, protection and development in formal policies

- Policies include gender dimension (e.g. benefit sharing arrangements)

- Detailed requirements and guidance on how gender mainstreaming should be carried out both at national and sub-national levels is still limited

Findings: Representation

- All 5 REDD technical working groups are chaired by one men and one women

- Token representation

- Limited involvement and participation of women in REDD decision making process

CIFOR

Center for International Forestry Research

Finding: Implementation

- Out of 54 organisations interviewed, only 2 have a gender expert in their REDD team

- Donor driven

- Only one international NGO has internalized gender issues in its procedures (e.g. manual and training)

- Unexpected consequences: HH headed by women receive a higher level of REDD payment creating new social conflicts

CIFOR

Center for International Forestry Research

Finding: Capacity

Both men and women have limited understanding of gender and REDD at all level; shortage of staff trained in ways to integrate gender into forestry activities

Women in ethnic minority groups in the Central Highlands lack capacity to take advantage of options provided by the land allocation policy

Challenges

- Paper policy

- no evidence of effective collaboration between local authorities and women in communities.

- women are rarely appointed to 'powerful' leadership positions

- Women groups are not homogenous: 4-5 ethnic groups co-inhabit with each other

- Current benefit sharing mechanism have not looked at women's needs to design appropriate in-kind payment (Women health care clinic, etc.)

CIFOR

Recommendations

- Guidelines on how to implement and mainstream gender in land use planning, forest land allocation and implementation of REDD,

- Capacity building for district, commune and village staff

- Empower (formal and informal) women representatives

- Adapt benefit sharing mechanisms to local culture

CIFOR

But?

- How to select the "right representative"

- How to change perception of youth groups on the role of men and women

- How to ensure gender mainstreaming should be "process oriented" rather than merely "tick boxes"

CIFOR

THANK YOu

CIFOR

Center for International Forestry Research