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Abstract
The success of efforts of Climate change mitigation and REDD+ governance responsibilities hinges upon the important role of forests in carbon cycle, political actors’ interests, international and national institutions in the management of forests to offset emissions. We analyze these public and private discourses by examining the experiences of forest sector and other climate change institutions in Kenya. The interviews of experts and multifactors show that institutional interests are systematically linked to variations in national political actors’ interests and investment decisions in the forest sector. Furthermore, we find that national political participation integration that transfers very limited decision making powers to local actors tends to shift the overall policy against local interests in organizing incentives and resource for REDD+ activities.
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1. Introduction
In the Climate change regime and mitigation efforts, policymakers across the globe increasingly recognize that forests ecosystems through REDD+ can contribute to a range of policy goals. REDD+ is a scheme developed to provide incentives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by decreasing degradation to forests, adopting a sustainable forest management approach and increasing the roles of conservation and carbon stocks from forests in developing countries (UNFCCC 2010 COP16). The contributions to policy goals are improvement of socially desirable benefits, such as stronger governance, improved livelihoods from carbon payments and clarification of land tenure may also arise from implementing REDD+. The important role of forests in the carbon cycle, (Houghton,1997; Pena and Grunbaum 2001) suggest that management of forests might be used to offset emissions associated fossil-fuel use and reduce atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide. These facts are reckoned in Article 3.3 and 3.4 of the Kyoto Protocol (IPCC, 2000)

Nevertheless, a high level political support among actors to back implementing REDD+ can be maintained if REDD+ is clearly linked to wider environmental and societal benefits, with a wider sustainable development goals. It is widely recognized that REDD+ has certain implications on societal risks. Several of these risks are addressed by the UNFCCC’s Cancun Safeguards and the related measures adopted by multilateral and other REDD+ initiatives. Mitigation of these relay on, a political and social support to secure forest ecosystem benefits beyond Carbon trade. Kenya tends to view REDD+ governance as a top-down affair to maximize economic development. But given the perceived failure of these top-down forestry participatory policies, participatory, has become a highly touted response to the difficulties of the role of forest management where the states and other actors could respond if there is prove for more benefits flow from implementing REDD+ which will contribute to national and local priorities.

The logic of REDD+ governance reforms implementation show that, Kenya can formulate more appropriate policies familiar with the local national priorities and actor needs when it comes to defining work area priorities and ecosystem benefits sharing. Though focusing on experts, official reports and publications, our approach indirectly recognized that, other actors-such as special interest groups have influence in political pressure and financial benefits through formation of coalitions. The results indicate that there is considerable variation in the political (actors’) priority that the respondents placed in the forest sector regarding REDD+. We find that the coercive power held by forest and climate change institutions, regarding REDD+ is centralized or partially decentralized. Furthermore, the state has significantly more interest in REDD+ implementation and is keen on role of forest ecosystem management and conservation than other political players. We link this outcome to greater coercive power exercised by the government.

---

2 Coercive power: Refers to power element from legislation and policies of any governing institution or states' law and regulations.
1.1. REDD+ Country profile

Kenya has 56.9 million hectares of land (See Table 1 below) of which 3.47 million hectares are covered with forests, equivalent to 5.6% of the country (FAO, 2010), the annual rate of forest cover loss decreased from 0.35% to the rate of 0.31% for the period 2005-2010 (FAO, 2010). Kenya's National REDD+ Programme critical elements are reference levels and a national forest monitoring system, as requested by the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC, the country has been developing a roadmap for the design and implementation through a consultative process with other actors. Kenya became a UN-REDD Programme partner country in February 2010, and it's also a country participant of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF). In addition there are several REDD+ initiatives in Kenya that are supported by development partners such as Japan, Finland and Australia. Kenya's Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) to the FCPF.

Table 1: Kenya’s REDD+ Country Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile item</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>582,650km²</td>
<td>Non</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>38 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on Agriculture</td>
<td>70% of population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Cover</td>
<td>3.6 million Ha</td>
<td>5.9%, 36% is closed canopy located in high population density areas, 50,000 ha lost per year through deforestation degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Energy</td>
<td>Over demand 70%</td>
<td>national energy Sourced from unsustainable sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source KFS National REDD+ Strategy 2012)

2.0 REDD+ institutional context in Kenya

The coordination of environmental and climate change policies at the highest level is the responsibility of the Office of the Prime Minister and the Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources (MEMR). The Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife is responsible for the coordination of forest conservation and management (KFS, 2011). The National Climate Change Response Strategy (NCCRS) outlines country wide coordination efforts to holistically address climate change challenges. The National REDD+ Management has a bottom-up decision making process and is proposed to consist of a National REDD+ Steering Committee (RSC), the REDD+ Technical Working Group (TWG) and the National REDD+ Coordination Office (NRCO). The NRCo will coordinate with the REDD+ Component Task Forces and the REDD+ Officer of each Local Forest Conservancy (KFS, 2010). Both the Task forces and the REDD+ officers will report to the NRCo, which will collate results and strategies and forward proposals to the TWG for evaluation who will then advise the multi-sectoral and inter-ministerial RSC, where final decisions will be taken (KFS, 2010).

2.1. Rights and tenure

Establishment of forest carbon ownership is critical for the successful trade in forest carbon (Heal, 2000). Assigning property rights to forest carbon allows the atmospheric benefits provided by the forest to be sold separately from the forest and the land itself. 39% of forests are publicly owned and 61% of forests are under private ownership, inclusive of individual, business and
local community ownership, in Kenya (FAO, 2010). There is a National Land Policy in the country that seeks to among others address the critical issues of tenure, land administration, access to land, land use planning and the restitution of historical injustices associated with land ownership. Carbon ownership legislation is also required to establish liability in the event of carbon loss. Kenya, land ownership also means having ownership rights over the trees of the land (FAO, 2010). There is currently no framework for allocating carbon rights, although in some cases, the Kenyan Forest Service (KFS) offloaded all carbon rights to communities who have invested in management and conservation of specific forest blocks with climate change mitigation as an added benefit (KFS, 2010).

2.2. Safeguards
Social and Environmental Safeguards Assessment (SESA) are being developed as part of Kenya’s REDD Readiness Proposal (R-PP) Implementation Phase. The SESA is intended to be a participatory and closely linked to the Consultation and Participation Plan (C&P Plan) of the R-PP. The SESA will also draw on previous lessons from the Strategic Environment Assessment of the Forests Act by the World Bank (2007) and on the social and environmental safeguards of the Sustainable Forests Management Criteria and Indicators by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) (KFS, 2010). Four projects have been validated under the Climate Community and Biodiversity Standards (CCBS) and two projects by the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS), demonstrating they meet the set social and environmental safeguard standard requirements.

3.0. Data collection and analysis
A combine qualitative interviews and an interest based data analysis with experienced experts and key bureaucrats of the major forest- and climate-institutions and actors contributions to the ongoing preparatory REDD+ activity programme was done. REDD+ preparatory sites such as high-carbon forest, natural forest or important areas for biodiversity and ecosystem services, were identify by maps. The respondents (out of total N=43) in national level and another (out of N=11) within local county level in Oct-November 2012. Selection of conservancies was systematic according to forest type of which respondents were drawn from. In each selected conservancies who held office during period of REDD+ preparedness. The study tool (structured questionnaires) was filled to elicit information regarding REDD+ political actors and forest policy priorities.
4.0. Results and discussions

4.1. Analysing the national politics of REDD+
We approach the role of forest management in REDD+ implementation from the perspective of political decision-making processes, which rarely produced optimal outcomes in this study. The processes are not only controlled by political and administrative coalitions, rather, the process of public policy is embedded in a decentralized network of well or less-well organized interests and actors at multilevel, both governmental and nongovernmental (Mayntz 1993; Schneider 2003). We view REDD+ as a reality in national politics to be fragmented and the agreements to include it on climate change regime negotiations are far yet to be reached. Our approach build on the scholars’ work of new institutionalism school of political economy, according (Bates, 1998; Knight 1992; North, 1990; Ostrom 1990) who examine the impact of institutions on political (actors’) behavior. An approach that focuses on actor power in role of forest and climate change institutions to hold explicitly political coalitions and influences that may overwhelm the dictates of sustainable economic development in REDD+ implementation. Explaining national actors’ interests in undertaking such policies needs the incentives Policy making is not always solution oriented or evidence based. Policy making around REDD+ is no exception, whether internationally or nationally, and will not always lead to the most effective, efficient and equitable REDD+ policy decisions. Challenges and concerns among experts interviewed with respect to an international REDD+ mechanism varied from the possible negative impacts on economic growth and loss of national sovereignty, to being left out of future.

4.2. Political Partnership Integration among actors (PPI)
We explored a variety of discursive arguments about political interests and actions in the context of political partnership integration (PPI) involving different actors, with different political levels of influence and power on REDD+ preparedness, who come together to implement policy. Development of forest politics are often considered a failure according to (Dimitrov, 2005 et al), We identified one way of implementing multilevel, multiactor governance is by political partnership integration (PPI) among actors; according (Arts, Bas 2003) political modernization in the global forest domain shifts in discourses, coalitions or power relations affecting global forest policy arrangements. Common property scholarship is particularly useful for classifying the many factors that affect the success of participatory outcomes (Ostrom 1990, 2009; Agrawal 2001). It is now widely demonstrated that PPI is fast evolving and they resembled orthodox public–private partnerships. New shifting relationships between the state, markets, and civil society actors in the political domains of REDD+ was evident due to its unstable fragmented position.

The PPI and inclusion of the public or citizens in shaping the objectives of REDD+ programme is a critical need. Indeed, according to (Tahmina and Gain 2002), ‘By creating partnerships, we also are trying to encourage greater equality and to promote values such as social justice’ where as (Biermann et al. 2007) argues that this will eventually address three ‘policy deficits’: the regulatory deficit of influencing non-state actors; the implementation deficit of allowing different stakeholders to carry out policy; and the participation deficit of increasing the representation of less powerful actors, such as local forest users, compounding that PPI can address both horizontal and vertical integration in REDD+ mechanism as an international regime.
4.3. Actor Participation positions and interests.

4.3.1. Actors

Actors who have different objectives and different degrees of political influence may be connected by horizontal links. REDD+, for example, involves several government ministries or agencies, such as those concerned with forests agriculture or land use. According to (Arts. B 2003); actors in the international arena increasingly ask questions about the linkages between in broader global governance. The interplay between international, national and subnational actors is an increasingly important issue. While discussions about the fragmented REDD+ at the national level are, far less mature, many of the same actors are involved and the same drivers appear to dominate the emerging discourses.

Evidence from the study show that public discourse at the national level express relative emphasis on REDD+ benefits visa vie co-benefits, in particular poverty alleviation and sustainable development. According to (Arts Bas 1998); these areas of contention have emerged because the main actors in the debate of government civil society , international organisations, NGOs, the private sector and local and indigenous groups who have different stands. Their positions reflect interests and goals that stretch far beyond climate goals, and they influence the key debates on the REDD+ potential outcomes, for instance the direct economic benefits of participating in REDD+, concerns about cost efficiency and environmental integrity, national sovereignty, perceptions of fairness and social justice, and public relations and relationship with political constituencies. Nonetheless, these complexities need to be understood for how they may affect successful implementation. Actors’ coalitions such as governments are particularly important. They cannot be categorized in isolation, but rather as a set of different actors with individual interests and an individual mix of drivers for their involvement in REDD+.

4.3.2. State and non state actors’ trust

The discussions on political positioning between state and non state actors reflected conflict of interests, the main concerns were from NGOs & civil society organizations on element of power trust, in terms of managing benefits. The state dominance of the REDD+ processes tend to draw back the decentralization efforts and trade more on centralized government decision making and conflict of interest positions.

4.3.3. State and private sector

The national government and county government level positions may pose challenges of entry of new private sector actors to the political arena; different specific approaches may be adopted at different government levels giving way to new debates. For example interview with the private sector representative showed that the debate on market system approach is more prominent among private sector, due to realistic practical ongoing demonstrations of profits and benefits accrued in the long term.
4.3.4. Role of Indigenous people on REDD+

Participation and rights, particularly of Ogieks indigenous peoples and local forest communities, are among the most prominent issues raised by civil society representatives. Concerns that exist on efforts to preserve and conserve forests will not be recognized in REDD+ national organization, since the state may retain financial benefits for themselves or, worse, that new risks will be introduced elites as drivers of REDD+ e.g., incentives for much more heavy-handed forest protection related to REDD+ introduced to sideline the minor groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Actor Positions, Priorities &amp; Interests in the REDD+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political stand and Actor interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem Economic benefits(Carbon trade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice and fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem integrity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source; Field interview Oct-Nov 2012)

4.4. Political actors’ Interests

Similarly, agreement on REDD+ can only be achieved when different actors have a common understanding of its objectives, or are willing to accept compatible forms of REDD+ alongside each other. Different actors are likely to place different values on REDD+ and on forest and land use in general. Forestry and agriculture departments, for example, are likely to value tree crops that maximize timber production, conservation forestry or export crops.

Many private investors are likely to take into account how investing in REDD+ might enhance their corporate image. Smallholder agriculturalists, however, are likely to value food security and livelihoods. REDD+ projects based on differing interests are likely to fail unless participants can come to a shared understanding of what kind of landscape is desirable, or reach an agreement about multiple forms of land use (Griffiths 2008). The Movement advocates for balancing the different interests in production and conservation, rather than seeing forests only in terms of maximizing timber production or carbon sequestration. Balancing these interests can boost equity in the use of forests, or ‘equity plus co-benefits’, such as biodiversity and better livelihoods for forest users.
5.0. Linking institution, plans and policies

As policy success is interpreted a long institutional links, the question is whether, how and what extend-discursive institutions which are responsive to new paradigm shifts deliberate and change in the present emerging or designs (Schanz 2002). International agreements being drivers for new policies put Kenya as a state actor, She (Kenya) is a signatory to various international conventions including the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), as well as a signatory to the Ministerial Declaration on African Forest Law Enforcement and Governance, however had abstained to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). In addition, Kenya is a member of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF)

According to (Schmidt 2005) discursive shifts brings up the schism of materialism Vs idealism, more often the role of ideas and discourses is emphasized in institutional theory. The core of this perceptive are the new ideas and discourses existing institutions hence Kenya’s is developing a multi sectoral institution i.e. National REDD+ Strategy under UNFCCC being the main drive in the REDD+ process, particularly in relation to Forest Carbon Partnership Facility. (See Table 2 below)

Table 2: REDD+ Institutions in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Legal framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Forest Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forest Act 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Forestry and wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National REDD+ Steering Committee</td>
<td>Policy guidance</td>
<td>Trusts Lands Act Water Act, Environmental Management and Coordination Act Charcoal Policy Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RSC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD+ Technical Working Group</td>
<td>R-PP implementation, MVR the Strategic Environmental and social Assessment Advisory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TWG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National REDD+ Coordination office</td>
<td>Operationalize R-PP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society, Greenbelt movement,</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Forest Working Group, Forest</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Network, Community Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs; IUCN,WWF</td>
<td>Advocacy, Capacity development, implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: National REDD+ Strategy Report 2009)
6.0. REDD+ Multilevel governance

Multilevel governance involves building inclusion and participation into new policies, it engenders trust and acceptance by different actors, which reduces the risks of conflict or failure of REDD+ projects. According to (Arts Bas 1994) the emergence of new governance discourses, of private and mix rule system of coalitions and new power relations between public and private actors pushes a new agenda on the interest balance and transparency in sustainable use of resource. The study observed a recent centralization or reoccurrence of state and general enforcement of public control. This may be positive in enforcement of REDD+ governance but on the other it may disadvantage the local communities due to minimum involvement in decision making process.

Multi actor governance in this case, implies collaboration among different actors to achieve public policy objectives in a hybrid or mixed governance and government evolving. Multilevel governance is the implementation of public policy across diverse spatial scales and by actors who have dissimilar influence and values. Both forms of governance observed are considered more inclusive, coherent and participatory, than ‘top-down’ governance, such as legislation. Preparedness for strong governance and effective mechanisms for the distribution of benefits are yet to be fully instituted in preparedness processes in REDD+ Kenya, decisions about what are legitimate governance principles and distribution of responsibilities, and how the tradeoffs involved are yet to addresses according to the interviewees.

The public and private interviews showed that an institutional structure delivering cost-efficient results in terms of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions may not deliver well on other important goals, such as poverty reduction, alternative livelihoods or biodiversity preservation. Secondly, areas of reform include clarifying and securing land tenure rights and strengthening the institutional capacity of national, regional and local institutions. The full participation of forest communities will make reforms more likely to succeed and benefit the poor. However some options on capacity building and demonstration activities to test these approaches will be needed.

Promotion of transparency, to manage carbon revenues through a special fund and report on the policies and measures they put in place to reduce deforestation. Thirdly, strongly influence in the handling of such tradeoffs and will give overall outcomes where, resources and risk creating perverse outcomes for forest-dependent people, forest ecosystems and the global climate.

(See table 3 below)

---

3 Governance: ‘Good’ governance is a form of political decision making that emphasizes legality (rules to resolve conflicts), legitimacy (acceptance and trust by the public that create accountability) and participation (inclusiveness within decision making).

5 Public discourse: Interview with Professor Oguge Environmental policy and law University of Nairobi
**Table 3: Participation integration and coordination for institutional options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political legitimacy</td>
<td>Integrated horizontally and vertically of government departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to broader reforms</td>
<td>Need for changes in basic societal structures, e.g., property rights structures and systems for participation potential as a catalyst for reforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good governance</td>
<td>Clarity, transparency, accountability, equity of power and benefits, improvement of rights, responsibilities and participation, incentives, measures to control corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination capacity</td>
<td>Across sectors government with the private sector and civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-benefits</td>
<td>Poverty reduction; alternative livelihoods biodiversity, protection and improvement of rights climate change adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Equitable sharing of REDD+ financial flows and any REDD+ rents (benefit sharing) channeling resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Ability to target low-cost REDD+ actions setting distribution of REDD+ resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Ability to target the key drivers of deforestation and degradation Capacity to handle new challenges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source (Indufor consultancy Report 2011)*

---

6 Legitimacy is defined as three dimensions: power distribution, responsibility and accountability

7 This criterion can be use in two opposite ways: REDD+ can be used as a vehicle to generate such changes, e.g., forest tenure reforms, but it can also be used as an argument against certain options if those options require large societal changes to be successful.
Conclusion
REDD+ governance could be a significant tool of political reform, preliminary findings on forest and climate institutional arrangements, for actor partnership indicated, that rules that are easy to understand and enforce are country specific, subnational or county jurisdictions. They are locally designed and accepted, taking into account different types of actors, interests and officials accountable are most likely to lead to effective forest conservation. REDD+ governance remain a troubling global issue, fragmented and far from efficiency was observed during the discussions with the experts. Partially we could summarize that REDD+ governance according to the experts interviewed in the political arena is termed as near failure, reckoning policy impacts are rare or lack at the local level, nationally no policy actions or policy outcomes can be quantified as formulated in the current UNFCCC negotiations.

Therefore, a vital prerequisite for developing clear national REDD+ policy impact and sustainable resource utilization in the long run is to be instituted. Many national policies either do not recognize the role that local institutions can play, or are difficult to understand, and use ‘one size fits all’ approaches. Local political actors play increasingly critical governance role since they conform to citizens demands and decide what extend forests are protected. It is also worth noting, that success on the ground for REDD+ initiatives efforts can be secured only partly by design; actual outcomes will also depend in part on realities that policies and the role of forest management which cannot easily change in the short run. Indeed, this consideration makes it all the more important that governments seek political partnership integration (PPI) with wider actor network and local communities as active and willing partners to ensure the success of REDD+ activities within the climate change regime, thus a clear need to reform national forest policies and legislation so REDD+ initiatives can be integrated within a context of political partnership integration context.

The discourses showed that private sector interests are highly driven by contextual factors as market institutions which tend to influence what happens to forests as new exchange instruments for REDD+ governance. Indeed, the role of the state and regulatory instruments is critical to the success of PPI, evidence in strategic plans showed the government is in the process of launching policy initiatives, henceforth making conclusive summary statements is most difficult currently for the implementation of REDD+ is fragmented within climate change regime and is still under international negotiation, this implies that REDD+ decision makers in Kenya can use a multilevel knowledge about exogenous success factors to improve the chances of success of REDD+ projects relying on scientific substantial literatures from success of different scholars across sectors.
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