

Beyond “Landscape” in REDD+: The Imperative for “Territory”

MICHAEL K. MCCALL*

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM), Morelia, Mexico

Summary. — This paper problematizes the use of the “landscape” concept as the perspective in forest governance and REDD+ discourse, especially as it affects ownership claims and management of forest space. This study advocates the contrasting concept of “territory” as essential to spatial justice in community-held forest lands and for effectivity in REDD+ projects. Whereas landscape in REDD+ discourse is a basic unit of resolution for biophysical, especially conservationist, analysis; territory refers to spatial units embedded in tenurial entitlements, and thus in governance and the execution of management.

The study critically considers case studies and conceptual approaches in REDD+ and Climate Smart Landscapes projects and their commitment to landscape, or territory, as the spatial governance unit. The review highlights some promising partial steps toward “territorialization” as a good practice, but finds that most do not follow up the implications for governance.

The paper asserts that “landscape” as an analytical understanding of forest peoples’ space contains serious defects—it does not set up the essential architecture and mechanisms for social owning and holistic management of designated (forest) space as territory, it does not address the contestations around “whose territory?”, and a “landscape” discourse can obfuscate the actual practice of REDD+ programs.

“Territorialization” would involve situating legitimate land users’ rights at the core of REDD+ spatial planning and implementation. “Forest landscapes as territories” would legitimize the entitlements of forest peoples to govern their own lands, with the responsibilities and rewards of their experience of effective management. The community and its social territorial space would become the definitive spatial unit for operationalizing REDD+, rather than the ecological unit or watershed, by prioritizing upwardly institutionalized territory over bio-physical spatializations of landscape. A territorial perspective should shift some power away from global and national policy-setters to local actors (not only registered landowners), as central in REDD+ governance.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Key words — REDD+, landscape, territorialization, forest governance, indigenous local communities, Latin America

1. OVERVIEW

Developments in UNFCCC and REDD+¹ forums utilize a set of conceptual and governance positions on *landscape* emanating from the forest conservation side of global climate change discourse. The paper first explores the concept of *landscape* as employed in the REDD+ world, where it is interpreted as shorthand for a multi-sectoral, multi-disciplinary approach to rural resource analysis, and framed as a boundary approach to handle the reality that land spaces are holistic, interconnected, dynamic, complex problem settings (Section 2).

Section 3 critiques significant deficiencies and limitations of the neo-landscape concept as it is intended for holistic planning and integrated forest management in REDD+ programs, and which may render it unfit for purpose. Prominent among these is that the “holistic approaches” in REDD+ landscape units do not accommodate the need to manage and control the land, not just analyze it. This leads into discussion of (collective) ownership and entitlement issues and the proposition that “(forest) people + their landscape = their territory”.

Section 4 introduces the essential need for a territorial spatial unit approach to planning and management, in place of landscape spatial units. The primary argument raised is the epistemological distinctions between “landscape for analysis” and “territory for governance and management”. Beyond this are the issues concerning who has the rights, responsibilities and capacities for effective forest management under REDD+.

Section 5 critically reviews a range of approaches and recommendations developed in the REDD+ landscape discourse toward reconciling “landscape” and “territory” for effective governance in REDD+ programs. Some of these approaches are embodied in the current REDD+ safeguards, while others are still being experimented with in pilot projects and guidelines; they are summarized in Table 2.

The critiques are revisited in Section 6: *landscape* is essential for ecological and social analysis, but it does not yet form a modality of governance for effective holistic management. The architecture needed for that is *territorial*, to recognize ownership and therefore responsibilities. Related contentions are that REDD+ projects can be complicit in appropriation of local territories, and that the language of *landscape* in REDD+ discourse can obfuscate the rights and capacities of forest communities.

2. LANDSCAPE IN REDD+: A DIFFUSE SPACE FOR NEGOTIATING CLIMATE MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION

(a) *The landscape concept in REDD+ and UNFCCC discourse*

Re-visiting the dominant discourse and documentation of REDD+ in the recent Climate Change Conventions in Doha 2012, Warsaw 2013, Lima 2014, and Paris 2015, especially the Global Landscape Forums, provides the context for interrogating *landscape* as a concept, an approach, and a toolbox. The “landscape approaches” found in these framings have been put forward as the stratagem to “end the debate that pits agriculture against forests” (Buizer, Humphreys, & de Jong, 2014; Zwick, 2013; GLF, 2013, 2014a, 2014b). This is not to say that the discourse proponents do not recognize the challenges of the term—for instance, the recognition that while putative landscape frameworks have “. . . led to a wealth of theoretical knowledge, we remain struggling for evidence of

* Financial support from UNAM DGAPA IA300413 is gratefully acknowledged. Final revision accepted: May 2, 2016.

successful landscape interventions on the ground” (GLF, 2014b). Nevertheless the limited evidence alluded to includes intensive/extensive case studies, many from researchers in CIFOR and ICRAF, such as Cotula and Mayers (2009), Larson, Brockhaus, and Sunderlin (2012, chap. 9), Larson *et al.* (2013), Sayer *et al.* (2013), Scherr, Shames, and Friedman (2013), Reed, Deakin, and Sunderland (2015), Naughton-Treves and Wendland (2014), Sunderlin *et al.* (2014), Sills *et al.* (2014), Minang, van Noordwijk, *et al.* (2015), Minang, Duguma, van Noordwijk, Prabhu, and Freeman (2015, chap. 27), and Freeman, Duguma, and Minang (2015). The findings generated in these studies are considered in this paper and highlighted in Table 2.

This approach to working with rural (natural) resources comes out of the very broad consensus that stronger integrated approaches and methodologies are needed for handling the interconnected problems of forest degradation, lower productivity, loss of natural capital, loss of carbon sequestration capacity, etc., and from the experiences of years of generously funded, under-achieving projects. The concept that many agencies see as the delivery system for this approach is “landscapes”, implying the integration of sectors—forests, agriculture, agroforestry, food, biodiversity, environmental conservation, farming systems, settlements, rural services, livelihoods, and of the delivery systems of institutions, funds, policies and programs. Thus, one driver is scientists’ concerns for effective sectoral interaction or integration—or at least better communication and coordination among scientists and policy-makers (e.g., Sayer *et al.*, 2013). There is the recognition that landscapes are multi-actored, multi-purpose, and multi- “nested”-scaled, and usually an assumption of polycentrism, with “no single actor...in charge” (Kusters, 2015, p. 11).

The actual term “*landscape*” was not tightly defined at early UNFCCC meetings, beyond its convenience as a supposedly holistic, integrated approach. *Landscape* is described as aiming to go beyond reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), and even beyond REDD+ (conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and sustainable forest management) by shifting the focus beyond just capturing carbon in trees. *Landscape* is interpreted in REDD discourse as being inclusive and integrative—all actors, all livelihoods, all spaces; or reciprocally as polycentric with no single actor in charge (Duchelle *et al.*, 2014; Kusters, 2015; Nagendra & Ostrom, 2012), thus, multi-actor, multi-purpose, “nested” scales. Any specific location is always part of a mosaic and probably of several landscapes of different scales, and complicating this, there are layers of contemporaneous governance situations. It is defined more by what it is not—i.e., that the “landscape approach” is *not* focused *only* on trees and forests.

The planning argument to support this is that “landscape approaches” are supposed to provide tools and concepts for managing social, economic, and environmental objectives in places where agriculture, mining and other productive land uses compete with the environmental and biodiversity goals. The landscape approach has been recommended to facilitate cross-sector planning in National Adaptation Plans and especially in watersheds (GLF, 2013, pp.10–11; van Noordwijk *et al.*, 2015, chap. 13). The bulk of the landscape discourse in REDD+ however, rarely approaches the fundamental questions of the responsibility, entitlements and government of forest space, i.e., territory. Rather, it focuses on the application of “landscape” as a science-driven tool for analyzing ecosystem and inter-sectoral relationships. As Reed *et al.* (2015) say, “Landscape approaches [in the climate

change/REDD+ discourse] are [still] primarily rooted in conservation and the science of landscape ecology” (p. 2).

In 2015, the term *landscape* continues to be difficult to define succinctly—there are many components to it, though a consensus is developing within the REDD+/climate change sphere. A landscape can be defined as a complex social-ecological system, a mosaic of different land uses but with a characteristic configuration, boundaries can be discrete or fuzzy, there can be multiple overlapping boundaries of polycentric responsibilities related to both social and ecological dimensions, and the landscape itself will be largely context-dependent. (This is adapted from Denier *et al.*, 2015, p. 26; Freeman *et al.*, 2015, p. 26; Kusters, 2015, pp. 10–11; Scherr *et al.*, 2013, p. 2). What is significant to the argument in this paper is the privileging of overlapping fuzzy boundaries and the complexity of disciplines and sectors. These are key to the following critique of landscape vis-à-vis territory as an effectual management tool.

(b) *Landscape as boundary object and analytic tool in REDD+*

Landscape acts as a widely employed “boundary concept” in the forest governance and REDD+ discourse (Clark *et al.*, 2011; Cohen, 2012; Hoppe, Wesselink, & Cairns, 2013). In this manifestation, “landscape” is not tightly defined; thus actors—even though they are contesting other principles—can make use of the fuzzy, encompassing term, *landscape* which is broad enough to satisfy epistemic communities of ecologists, foresters, agriculturalists, and planners, and yet is flexible and plastic enough to be accepted and employed differently by them. A desirable feature of this, as with any boundary object, is its perceptible *visibility*; people—planners, scientists, administrators, politicians—can *see and feel* a landscape, even though they hold different interpretations of the image.

Thus despite its lack of clarity, but with a general accordance not to cause disruptions by defining it—i.e., by exploiting its “constructive ambiguity” (Denier *et al.*, 2015; Freeman *et al.*, 2015; Sayer *et al.*, 2013; van Noordwijk *et al.*, 2015, chap. 13)—it has been widely employed in actual UNFCCC discussions and sessions for the past several years. Early instances in the UNFCCC included Technical Session 2.9: Landscapes—a Holistic Approach to Systems in Climate Change, and Discussion Forum 8: Sustainable Landscapes, Food Security and Adapting to Climate Change (GLF, 2013). Many agencies have been drawn to the general term, e.g., GCP, JICA, ODI, the CFP, UNREDD, Globe International, World Bank, and significantly CIFOR and ICRAF, who are leading efforts to mainstream “landscape” in REDD+ and in environmental management. National agencies also recognize the political benefits of such a boundary term which works with universal acceptables like “stakeholder” or “integrative” (Freeman *et al.*, 2015; Zwick, 2013).

The boundary object nature of the concept is well illustrated when trying to gauge the *size* of a landscape. Although ‘landscapes are always within a *given area*’ (Reed *et al.*, 2015; Sayer *et al.*, 2013), there is no singular “landscape scale”; rather it depends on the nature of the specific objects and interaction processes (Minang, Duguma, Alegami, & van Noordwijk, 2015, chap. 9; Zimmerer, 2006, p. 66). UNFCCC documents do not delimit absolutely the scale of a landscape; nevertheless the CGIAR ‘Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security’ program has proposed it as a fuzzily delimited kilometers-wide area, corresponding to the “human-scale” landscape. This follows closely the field of landscape ecology: a landscape is a more or less well-defined and bordered piece of land that

is larger than a single farm and smaller than a region within which a mosaic of land cover and land use types can occur (Milne *et al.*, 2013; c.f. Antrop, 2000). It is claimed that “the human-scale landscape... seems to coincide well with geographic units such as watersheds and urban regions, as well as spatial domains of human perception (Wu, 2011, chap. 20, p. 303, italics added), (c.f. Sheil *et al.*, 2003). But we discover in the broader REDD+ discourse that defining *landscape* does not exclude any real-world situational scale. The *landscape* concept is usable across all scales—a farm could be a landscape, the Earth the ultimate landscape (GLF, 2013; Minang, Duguma, Alegami, *et al.*, 2015, chap. 9). Landscape spaces should be small enough to maintain a degree of manageability, but large enough to be able to deliver multiple functions to competing stakeholders (Denier *et al.*, 2015, p. 26). Thus, this conceptualization of *landscape* is not being limited by a spatial range, but being defined by its quality of sectoral integratability.

3. DEFICIENCIES AND OBFUSCATIONS IN THE REDD+ LANDSCAPE DISCOURSE

The “integrated landscape approach” is being sold as a new idea, with an expectation that politicians and decision-makers still need to be educated to see that integration is essential in order to handle “wicked problems” (Denier *et al.*, 2015; Kusters, 2015; Minang, Duguma, van Noordwijk, *et al.*, 2015, chap. 27; Minang, van Noordwijk, *et al.*, 2015).

In this section, this review critiques three deficiencies that may render the REDD+ neo landscape approach and its (pilot) projects not fit for purpose for effective forest governance and integrated forest management toward the REDD+ goals.

(a) *The landscape approach in REDD+ and its goals of ‘integration’*

The REDD+ consensus is that “landscape”, as an integrated approach and methodology is needed for handling the individual, interconnected, forest management problems of degradation, lower productivity, and loss of natural capital. But from before the 1970s there has been a paradigm of “integrated resource and development planning and management”.² This includes Integrated Conservation & Development projects (ICDP), Community-based Natural Resource Management (CB-NRM), Integrated Forest Management, Integrated Land Use Planning, IWM (Integrated Watershed Management), Ecosystem approach, and others, all of whose proponents argued convincingly that they were achieving those objectives. These previous incarnations need to be re-visited to re-learn why they were subsequently discarded (e.g., Blom, Sunderland, & Murdiyarto, 2010; Blomquist & Schlager, 2005; Reed *et al.*, 2015; Sunderland, Ehringhaus, & Campbell, 2008). However even though as Blom *et al.* (2010) specifically argue, these earlier exercises in integrated approaches were the same as in the landscape approach, this re-learning has not yet happened in the calls for “integration” in REDD+. But this paper asserts that if anything, using “landscape [areas]” as a term is even more confusing than using “integrated [areas]”, which term had at least a positive intentionality toward process and practice. But it seems that *landscape*—as a word—is found to have a more appealing, warm connotation for most actors than do technocratic terms such as ICDP or IWM Unit.

Thus, the first level of analytical weakness is that the “integrated” ISM approaches failed to achieve their ambitious

targets of integrated decision-making because they lacked overall decision-making authority over their landscapes. The focus in these projects was on the “wicked problems” of inter-connected, complex lands (landscapes), and not on territorial spaces which needed to be managed. The integrated approaches did not place the imperative of a “jurisdictional” setting at the forefront. This state of in-built contradictions, particularly in cases of IWM, has been analyzed by Cohen and colleagues (e.g., Cohen, 2012; Cohen & Bakker, 2014; Cohen & Davidson, 2011), (c.f. Blomquist & Schlager, 2005; Nelson & Weschler, 2001). The challenges identified include: the immediate problems of choosing between alternative spatial boundaries (based on watershed-drainage divides, or eco-regions, or administrative units), setting criteria for hierarchies, and for selecting appropriate scales, and the overriding issues of management and of governance accountability. Most salient is the disjuncture or disconnects between what Cohen *et al.* term “problem sheds” (the hydrological-geographical watershed) vis-à-vis “policy sheds” (the administrative units) which are usually different geographical spaces. To set the “problem sheds” as the units of comprehensively integrated management and control would require radically novel spatial governance units, and could cause disruptive shifts in governance and administrative responsibility (Cohen & Davidson, 2011; Medema, McIntosh, & Jeffrey, 2008). Some ‘landscape approaches’ in REDD+ have partially recognized and addressed this, but not comprehensively, (see Sections 4(a) and 5(b)).

(b) *Claims on landscapes - ownership and management of holistic landscapes*

An existential obstacle in the ISM approaches—which continue into the neo-landscape approach—is grounded in the lack of a defining socio-spatial responsibility, ownership, and entitlements for the management of these holistic spaces (termed as *landscapes* in REDD+ discourse).

Critiques of the ISM approaches found in the REDD+ landscape discourse are targeted against the usual generic suspects of: very weak coordination of actions, lack of cooperation between relevant agencies, and confused and competing interpretations of the term “integrated” in the scientific disciplinary “silos”. But the misunderstood terminology, the existence of silos and inter-agency non-communication in the ISM approaches were not really the fundamental problem, and it is obfuscating to argue (e.g., Reed *et al.*, 2015, p. 2; Scherr *et al.*, 2013) that these caused the lack of success of the integrative approaches. It is, rather, the issues of power and authority and sufficient control over the holistic landscapes and their components. The spaces of interest in ISM (IWM, etc.) approaches should be recognizable as spatial *territories*—a term discussed further below (Section 4(a)), but definable as a geographic space where a society or political entity, shapes, influences, and controls social activities and access to resources (Sack, 1986).

Local (indigenous) people realize their space as territory—the effective and sustained ownership by a community of a landscape is a necessary though not sufficient element in transforming it into their territory. Thus, the second analytical critique of the landscape approach in REDD+ is that the local/indigenous communities were not recognized and valued as the functioning and appropriate holders and managers of the areas. In their important “ten principles for a landscape approach”, Sayer *et al.* (2013) set out ten generalized principles that support the integrative landscape approach, emphasizing i.a., stakeholder involvement and multiple objectives, and they

include “Principle 7: Clarification of rights and responsibilities”. But its main message is not a full endorsement of local/indigenous inhabitants’ land rights, but a milder call that a fair justice system is needed when there are conflicting claims.

The claim for local forest people’s responsibility is based not only on spatial justice, but also pragmatically, on their competence. REDD+ should recognize the historical protection of forests and respect the traditional practices of forest peoples, indigenous and otherwise, such as forest slash-and-burn systems. There is widespread strong empirical evidence that indigenous/ community forest management is positive, not only for the local population, but also for reduced/avoided carbon emissions and resilient ecosystems, and thus for global beneficiaries, for examples: in Panama (Vergara-Asenjo & Potvin, 2014); Ecuador (Holland *et al.*, 2014); Mexico (Ellis & Porter-Bolland, 2008); and for 14 “forest-rich” countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa (Stevens, Winterbottom, Springer, & Reytar, 2014). A significant component of this is women’s roles in management and use of forest landscapes, which are frequently “overlooked” because of the gender inequities in ownership and formal access to land (Fortmann, 1996, chap. 9; Kalibo & Medley, 2007; Nightingale, 2003; Rocheleau & Edmunds, 1997). Women’s roles in forest landscape management are too often “invisible”, though they should be recognized as having significant implications for REDD+ policies

The spatial knowledge and management competence with forest landscapes, especially within indigenous or native peoples is associated with their unique knowledge acquired from long-term occupation and management of ecosystems, and their particularities of identity, economy and territoriality that link to their home environments (Corrigan & Hay-Edie, 2013, p. 7; Feiring, 2013; IPACC, 2010; Wilshusen, Brechin, Fortwangler, & West, 2002). This deep knowledge of the landscape and land features in many cases is the embodiment of indigenous people’s identity; it is a knowledge that is also symbolic, metaphoric, and spiritual. Because this spatial knowledge is associated with a self-identified people, their cultural spaces and specific landscapes, it can become their territory. People’s conceptualizations of their landscape are determined not only by immediate purposes and objectives, but also created by history, culture, mythology and the contexts of the actors (Neumann, 2011; Pfund *et al.*, 2011; Sletto, Bryan, Torrado, Hale, & Barry, 2013; Stoffle, Toupal, & Nieves Zedeño, 2003). Such recognition of landscape as being the on-going construct of both physical and socio-cultural forces is becoming mainstreamed, as seen in the discourse of the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000), and globally, in the declarations on indigenous land rights by the UN and others, (see Section 4(b) below).

(c) *Existential threats to people’s lands*

The third level of critique is generated by, especially indigenous and forest people’s fears that their land will be appropriated. Concerns about REDD+ policies and practices over land are essentially facets of environmental and spatial justice, articulated in terms of people’s entitlements and access to land and resources and claims on territory. Respecting and recognizing the rights of indigenous and forest peoples therefore are an essential pre-condition for REDD+ policies, as recognized by indigenous peoples, activists and much of progressive civil society, (c.f. Cabello & Gilbertson, 2012; Larson *et al.*, 2012, chap. 9, 2013; Ulloa, 2011; van Dam, 2011; Zaffaroni, 2012). The claims specifically to territory are framed as an element of the collective rights to (collective)

management of natural resources on their lands, as well to cultural protection and enhancement, and to autonomy in general.

The general claim is grounded by frequent declarations expressing highly critical positions and concerns about the threats of REDD+, from indigenous peoples, such as: (a) the “Declaración de Iquitos” from REDD Indígena Perú promoting a holistic approach to climate change that links water, forests, soil, living things and cosmovisions within the stewardship of indigenous peoples—“*No hay REDD+ sin Territorios, Derechos y Autonomía de los Pueblos Indígenas*”³ (COICA, 2010); (b) IPCC⁴ Initiative’s consultative forum on REDD in Durban, Nov. 2011, which noted that the current insecure land tenure of mobile and indigenous peoples will lead to further displacements if REDD+ is implemented without the UNDRIP safeguards on indigenous rights (IPCCA, 2011); and (c) the “REDD NO” movement, (c.f. Boas, 2011) that argues that REDD+ policies and projects undermine and violate indigenous territorial governance systems without eliminating the true drivers of forest loss and land grabbing. Such belief sets and therefore the discourses, go beyond ecological concerns into cosmovisions (e.g., Zaffaroni, 2012). Threats from mining projects arouse similar resistance from indigenous peoples with existential fears that the physical disruption to sacred landscapes (territories) will bring about angry responses from the “earth-beings” of mountains and rivers, and we are well-advised not to provoke their wrath—in modernist terms we should be practicing the “precautionary principle” (de la Cadena, 2010). Thus, people’s call for territory is a response to, and an extension of, extant notions of belonging and ownership and responsibilities, but—significantly—embodying the control of space.

Other NGOs and indigenous institutions, though not forcefully antagonistic to REDD+ principles of rewarding sound community forest management, are highly concerned about how REDD+ will actually play out. They argue that without providing indigenous/local communities with legal recognition of their forests and protecting the community rights, they will be vulnerable to deforestation and invasion and therefore also fail in mitigation (Larson *et al.*, 2012, chap. 9, 2013; LCT, 2014; Stevens *et al.*, 2014). They are skeptical of the capacities and current political will behind the REDD+ Safeguards which are supposed to moderate the aggressive charges for territorial control of forest lands and their carbon (see Section 5(a)).

This third critique of the REDD+ approach to landscape (vis-à-vis territory) is illustrated by the perception of a mapping threat from REDD+ projects as experienced by local forest communities/peoples. Mapping of spatial property is a key legal step in land and resource allocation and alienation, and is essential to legitimizing the appropriation of landed property, or, stated more critically, “More territory has been lost to maps than to guns ...” (Nietschmann, 1995), (c.f. Harley, 1988; Offen, 2011; Rundstrom, 1998). There is a clear sequence of items to be mapped for the MRV (monitoring, reporting and verification) requirements in REDD+. Because the landscapes need to be defined, identified, mapped and monitored for REDD+, here conflicts are raised. The practical mapping needs are found in the recommended good practices of the REDD+ MRV procedures (McCall, Skutsch, & van Laake, 2014, chap. 3.4).

The elements required for mapping a REDD+ project appear to be straightforward: (i) “resource mapping” to classify and spatially zone the forest resources and uses of the forest, including the project boundaries and formal land claims essential in REDD+ for defining targets for payments; and (ii) “behavior mapping” of forest/carbon landscape man-

agement types and for understanding interrelationships between people and their forests. “Behavior mapping” is more impositional, because it implies privacy-invasive investigations and mappings of local spaces—the location of forest degradation: illegal logging, grazing, illegal settlements, land sales; areas of encroachment, invasion, leakage, and mapping areas sensitive to the community e.g., sacred lands.

But the concern felt by affected local populations – to whatever degree that is well-founded—is that of a third driver in REDD+ mapping actions. That is (iii) “appropriation mapping”—a hidden step toward the appropriation of local/indigenous territory. The marking out and allocating quality to a land area for a REDD+ project can be interpreted as the preliminaries to alienating community land or, at least to severe limiting restrictions on its use and management (withdrawal and management rights). The land receives a new value—for carbon or other environmental services, and therefore new access and alienation mechanisms based on market values (see e.g., Sletto *et al.*, 2013; Ulloa, 2011).

As people’s perception of the intentionality behind REDD+ mapping processes moves along from (i) to (iii), the conflict sharpens between REDD+’s drivers for landscape spatialization, and the community/people’s interests in mapping their own lands. Communities’ ownership of spatial knowledge—naming, demarcating, and remembering bounded spaces and localities—empowers them in the processes of claiming experienced spaces as *territory*.

4. BEYOND “LANDSCAPE, REDD+ NEEDS “TERRITORY

(a) *Landscape for analysis, territory for management*

Whereas *landscape*—in the REDD+ discourse—is a concept term for geographical understanding, based on pattern, albeit complex and integrated, and this REDD+ neo-landscape becomes a unit of resolution for scientific geo- and biophysical (usually conservationist-driven) understanding and analysis, *territory* is a concept term for management and policy, and thus for people and designated ownership.

Territory is a concept essentially linked to control over a tangible area. It is the locus of local community/indigenous group socio-spatial organization, and at national levels, a locus of public policy and interventions.

Landscapes and territories may coincide, but *territory* refers to “a geographic space where a society, and/or political entity, shapes, influences, and controls social activities and access to resources” (Sack, 1986; Sletto *et al.*, 2013). A landscape can only be controlled by certain actors or groups, if and where and when it is to some extent, though not necessarily exclusively, their territory. Territory has a significant connect with performance because it entails and incorporates, while at the same time it signifies meanings of authority, whether political, legal, customary, cultural, or simple raw power. Thus, *territory* is a political administrative term.

This distinction is illustrated by revisiting a REDD+ theme proposing “an *analytical, rather than administrative*, approach to landscapes” (CIFOR blog 12517, 2013), the stated intention of which is—not to challenge traditional scientific sectors, but to help combine their efforts. The argument behind this approach is to “analyze life at the landscape scale, but not try to govern the landscape”, and it continues, ‘the worst thing is to turn the landscape unit into a new administrative regulatory unit’ (CIFOR blog 12517, 2013), (c.f. Sills *et al.*, 2014; and also, Nelson & Weschler, 2001 and Cohen & Davidson,

2011 re. watersheds). However, the objectives of that approach spark all the contradictions raised in Section 3 above. By neglecting the “administrative unit”, firstly it forgets about the need for a functioning, effective spatial governance unit, secondly it ignores the existential fundamental question of who owns and is responsible for the landscape spaces, and thirdly, such discourse markedly shifts—whether deliberately or not—the outsiders’ gaze away from local peoples’ rights and capacities to govern their territory. Without a participatorily accepted, legitimate, locally based “administrative territorial unit”, there is no governance and thus no effective integrated management.

There are parallels with the debilitating problems of IWM (Cohen & Davidson, 2011). The concept of watershed planning began life as a (very effective) technical analytical tool, but is ineffectual when watershed planning becomes a policy framework without consolidating the essential administrative governance and enforcement instruments. This is reflected in the attempts to turn from analytical “ecosystem space” to “jurisdictional space”, with its attendant necessary rescaling and need for new spatial and “nested” governance (Blomquist & Schlager, 2005; Cohen & Bakker, 2014; Marshall, 2007).

The next sections look at REDD+ demands on territory, and how indigenous/forest community institutions are responding to them. The principal epistemological identifiers that distinguish landscape units and territory units are summarized in Table 1.

(b) *Community territory and collective entitlement in forest governance for REDD+*

Customary and indigenous territorialization, usually communal tenure, is significant to REDD+ implementation, because so many vital (tropical) forest lands are, as of now, formally in the hands of local forest peoples. Indigenous people worldwide have been demanding legal acceptance by external actors of their rights to land, and with that, the recognition of their often multiple generations of sound management of natural resources, ecology and environment (e.g., Cabello & Gilbertson, 2012; Corbera, Estrada, May, Navarro, & Pacheco, 2011; Larson, Cronkleton, & Pulhin, 2015; Ulloa, 2011; van Dam, 2011). Reinforcement for the position of indigenous peoples lies with several international human rights and environmental standards, especially the ILO Convention No. 169 on “Indigenous and Tribal Peoples” (ILO, 1989) which protects tribal people’s rights, ratified by 22 countries, of which 14 are in Latin America,⁵ and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP, 2007) which states that indigenous peoples have collective rights to lands, territories, and resources, and, equally to men and women. Significantly, recent legislation in Philippines, Canada, Australia, and Latin America has recognized indigenous peoples’ rights to land on a large canvass. Van Dam (2011, pp. 396–397) shows that around 60% of the Amazonian lands of Colombia, Venezuela, and Ecuador are indigenous territories. In 2013, over 513 m ha of forests globally were held by indigenous peoples and local communities under some form of statutory community ownership or control. This designation rose from over 21% in 2002 to over 30% in 2013, and in Latin America, to over 39%. Irrespective of political or ideological arguments, the legal actuality is that indigenous/local forest peoples have legal responsibilities over their extensive territories. Though there are skeptical interrogations of this: Hajjar, Kozak, and Innes (2012) for instance, assessed the degree of decision-making power over forest resources “handed over” to communities in Brazil and Mexico, and con-

cluded that the governments maintain significant regulation of extraction, though communities have more control over day-to-day management. Similar doubts are raised by e.g., RRI (2014) that much new forest tenure legislation is not fit for purpose as adequate protection.

Land tenure institutions and policies determine who holds, accesses and uses the land and resources, and under what conditions. They specify the rights, the mechanisms and modalities, and ultimately the rules (Larson *et al.*, 2015; Naughton-Treves & Wendland, 2014). Consider here the whole gamut of the “bundles of rights in property”, that include *access*—the right to enter a defined unit of land; *withdrawal*—the right to obtain (withdraw) or make use of products in a land area; *management*—the right to regulate use patterns internally, and to transform the original resource by e.g., improvements; *exclusion*—the right to determine the access rights and transferal of them; and, *alienation*—the right to sell, lease, etc. the various rights (after: Schlager & Ostrom, 1992). Naughton-Treves and Wendland (2014, pp. 3–4), for Indonesia, identify the rights and the power to *exclude* outsiders as the most vital of these, (c.f. Duchelle *et al.*, 2014). Though some field data appear to show that local communities have had some success at dealing with outside claims, there will be far stronger threats in the future as population land pressures grow (Sunderlin *et al.*, 2014).

Note that the framing of community tenure here is that of *communal property* (*Res Communes*) where the rights and rules for access, use, and exclusion, and the individual or group benefits, are controlled by an identifiable group under appropriate national and local legal and policy commitments. Communal property is not the same as *open access* (*Res Nullius*) which is a free-for-all where rights are not exclusive and are owned by all or none, partly because exclusion costs are too high. The other natural (forest) resource property regimes are *state property* (*Res Publica*) with ownership and exclusion rights held by the state, and *private property* with rights and rules for access that are exclusive (held individually or corporately), although property rules are always sanctioned and supported by the legal system of the state.

In many countries, systems of tenure have generally been moving toward a private property regime through parcelization and privatization of formerly communal pastoral or forest lands, and thus coming in conflict with indigenous peoples’ collective rights to territories and resource management, “intrinsically linked to their self-determination, cultural integrity, and development as distinct peoples” (adapted from: UNDRIP preamble, art. 25; C169 art. 13.1; C107 art. 11 in: Feiring, 2013, p. 76), (c.f. Naughton-Treves & Wendland, 2014; Sunderlin *et al.*, 2014). There are counter-trends though in some forest lands of Latin and North America.

Multiple systems can coexist and may well be contradictory and conflictive, not only due to “modern” *vs.* customary tenures, but also within sub-systems. There are not only the gamut of claims *per se*, but the actual legitimized tenures or access rights are frequently overlapping, whether in harmony or conflictive (Cotula & Mayers, 2009; Denier *et al.*, 2015; Larson *et al.*, 2015; Mahanty, Milne, Dressler, & Filer, 2012; Naughton-Treves & Wendland, 2014; RRI, 2014; Sayer *et al.*, 2013; Sunderlin *et al.*, 2014). For instance, the state itself may be operating multiple tenancy systems because of deficient inter-agency coordination; likewise within customary systems, there can be multiple ethnic groups in the same locality, or the contemporary socio-economics of forest land use are not embodied into traditional tenure. The very deep complexities of customary land and forest tenure are dependent on livelihoods, family relations, seasonality, future

expectations of returns, historical social relations and many complex factors. Grounded studies worldwide demonstrate that traditional tenure is nearly always ambiguous and contested (Mahanty *et al.*, 2012; Milne, 2012; Pfund *et al.*, 2011; Resosudarmo *et al.*, 2014; Sunderlin *et al.*, 2014).

(c) *Community territories need security of tenure rights*

A pre-requisite for confidence in territory is *security of tenure*—shorthand for multiple socio-cultural political factors and drivers influencing whether members of the community *feel safe* with their rights—and it is important to discuss several aspects of this in the REDD+ landscape context. Security of tenure can be independent of the actual tenure system, that is, the status of external legality or not, access and disposability rights, duration, etc., though clearly some tenure settings are more secure than others (Naughton-Treves & Wendland, 2014; Resosudarmo *et al.*, 2014; Sunderlin *et al.*, 2014). It is the perception and the reality setting of trust, with its multiple sources from lived history, ultimately determined by actual and perceived distribution of power. In Sunderlin *et al.’s* (2014) review of four countries, 39 out of 71 villages reported insecurity of tenure, and identified four main causes declared by local respondents, in order—land competition, conflicts and invasion; lack of title, ease of revoking rights, and external restrictions on land use. External reasons outnumbered internal reasons by five to one.

But security does not necessarily lead to greater forest protection; indeed the opposite can easily be the case, a strong legally respected tenure regime and high degree of felt security of tenure can permit forest depletion without concern for repercussions (Naughton-Treves & Wendland, 2014, p.3; c.f. Duchelle *et al.*, 2014; Resosudarmo *et al.*, 2014). REDD+ may thus be the driver of forest land grabbing and the threat to indigenous control over their forests (Cabello & Gilbertson, 2012; Larson *et al.*, 2012, chap. 9, 2013).

Some indigenous territories require security, and management, at a much bigger scale. Population density in indigenous lands is extremely low; for instance, 100,000 people in Bolivia have rights over 7.5 m ha and 15,000 in Brazil own 2.3 m ha (van Dam, 2011, pp. 397–399). This presents enormous problems for effective control and spatial governance for many forest peoples who had developed sustainable forest management systems at a much smaller scale. New REDD+ legislation will set up opportunities attracting invaders who can out-number and out-gun (Blaser & Zabel, 2015; Cavanagh, Vedeld, & Trædal, 2015). Van Dam, 2011, pp. 401–402) argues the need to move from small-scale community forest management to territorial forest management, to reflect the vastly larger areas, growing populations (outsiders not subject to customary rules and norms), and new national regulations on resource management including REDD+. Setting up new forms of territorial management for these newly invented governance spaces (Larson *et al.*, 2015, p. 230) parallels the arguments on ‘rescaling’ in larger scale watershed planning (Blomquist & Schlager, 2005; Catacutan, Muller, Johnson, & Garrity, 2015, chap. 11; Cohen, 2012; Cohen & Bakker, 2014; c.f. Marshall, 2007).

There is a further concern that, even in governance systems where people’s rights to land and forest have been guaranteed though legislation, there could be a different status when it comes to ownership rights to biomass carbon under REDD+, because carbon gets designated as a mineral, or other justifications (Corbera *et al.*, 2011; Cotula & Mayers, 2009; Sunderlin *et al.*, 2014; van Dam, 2011). The GLF (Global Landscapes Forum) has explicitly stated that such threats

are neither the vision nor objective of REDD+ policy. The Forum asserts that REDD+ negotiators should: “Recognize and prioritize the rights, needs and roles of indigenous peoples, peasants, pastoralists and women, and their indigenous territories and community conserved areas, and ensure the implementation of rights-based approaches to land management.” (GLF, 2013, p. 14). But this promise, despite a specific reference to “indigenous territory” and “rights-based approaches”, still remains operationally vague and peripheral; it is one Recommendation out of 13 without a specific priority. An extensive survey by Larson *et al.* (2012, chap. 9) of land tenure in 23 specifically REDD+ projects in six countries concluded that there has been very little progress, “. . . there is little reason to believe REDD+ strategies are making significant changes to the status quo” (p. 160). It is mainly rhetoric, and so ‘business as usual’ continues, with some exceptions like Brazil, (c.f. Sayer *et al.*, 2015).

Tenure systems fundamentally influence which people become involved in projects in REDD+ and improved forest management (Naughton-Treves & Wendland, 2014; Resosudarmo *et al.*, 2014; Sunderlin *et al.*, 2014). The

REDD+ landscape discourse frequently refers to tenurial arrangements as significant, but frames them as but one of many components of good design in a landscape approach, or as a potential spoiler factor (e.g., Denier *et al.*, 2015). But the discourse rarely identifies them as the core existential factor, as is felt by forest communities. In addition to struggles over legally constituted ownership rights, indigenous and local community critics warn that REDD+ will “lock up” forests by blocking access and customary use of forest lands by indigenous peoples and local communities. This is certainly the case with restricted access to forest resources wrought by most Protected Area legislation and regulations, and there is considerable apprehension that the same can happen with REDD+ projects—a case of creeping territorial appropriation “justified” by global climate change mitigation needs.

Table 1 summarizes into a simplified binary the epistemological and governance positions above on the complex frames of ‘landscape units’ vis-à-vis “territory units”. The basic principle behind the binary concerns competencies in dealing with forest governance, policy and management, particularly in the REDD+ discourse.

Table 1. *Landscape or territory? Spatial units as epistemological objects of policy and management—with relevance to forest and REDD+ governance*

Identifiers—attributes and characteristics	Landscape units	Territory units
<i>Conceptual setting</i>		
Representative definitions (see Section 2)	Complex social-ecological system, mosaic of different land uses, boundaries discrete or fuzzy, maybe multiple overlapping boundaries (based on Buizer; GLF; Zwick, Minang, and others)	A geographic space where a society or political entity, shapes, influences, and controls social activities and access to resources (based on Sack, Feiring, van Dam, Larson, and others)
Ontological themes and elements	Holistic “Natural” factors dominate	Holistic, history and culture “Social” factors dominate
Epistemological purpose	Understanding and analysis (of landscape systems)	Governance and management Ownership, entitlements rights
Epistemic communities	Physical and environmental scientists	Social scientists, political activists, NGOs
<i>Action spaces</i>		
Core elements	Biophysical, hydrology, soils, topography, land cover, ecosystems	Legal and administrative—land use, land management systems, internal and external social relations
Definitivity of spatial units	Useful as a boundary classification object because units are broad but slippery	Tend to be pre-determined, fixed spatial objects
Boundaries and spatial units	Differently determined by principles of different scientific fields. More likely determined by “purpose” of the delineation/classification system	Socially/culturally/politically Identified—although may be changeable and fluid. Usually hierarchical, Unlikely to be overlapping in principle, but often disputed
Who sets the boundaries?	Set by scientific knowledge	Communities’ perception and history (though may be externally enforced)
Scale	Any, —farm to global	Limited by controlling agents. Nested scales
<i>Power and accountability</i>		
The global vision of “forest” & forest carbon	A “global good”, a resource with global environmental value	A local resource with local and global environmental value
Accountability	Subsets of accountability to landscape “managers”, —individuals or local producer/user groups	To territorial governance unit
Controlling actions and actors	Control is difficult, achieved through consensus. Hidden power	Exclusion, rules, regulations, “tradition”. Visible power
Management agents	Collaboration, coordination of multiple agents (e.g., “platforms”)	Single “owner”—Private, state, cooperative, OR community
Purpose of participation	Participation for efficiency and effectiveness	Participation for empowerment and capacity
Implications for governance	Very difficult to find consensus and coordinate or “integrate” without overriding authority	Easier to control and manage—known & recognized agents
Resistances to change of status—resistance from whom?	Users who lose from change of status; professionals	Property owners, entitlees, claimants

5. APPROACHES TO RECONCILE “LANDSCAPE AND TERRITORY IN THE REDD+ GOVERNANCE DISCOURSE

The next section reviews the directions that REDD+ landscape governance approaches are taking toward reconciling contradictions between landscape and territories as spatial units. Firstly it reconsiders the REDD+ *safeguards* as they are currently being developed, tested and re-formulated; and then, the range of proposed ameliorations and interventions which are being generated in case studies and conceptualizations in REDD+ landscape discourse.

Consider the three primary concerns raised in Sections 3 and 4 by the distinctions between landscape and territory.

- (i) Territorial space—a forest governance system for REDD+ interventions based on territory, not landscape;
- (ii) whose space?—spatial justice in entitlements and management of the territories;
- (iii) issues of appropriation, alienation, and representation.

Table 2 in Section 5 summarizes these exercises from the REDD+ forestry governance discourse that are recognizing the dilemmas of the landscape-territory distinction, and are championing (partial) ameliorations. Main advocates of these approaches are listed.

(a) Contesting the REDD+ safeguards

After strong lobbying from indigenous peoples and NGOs, the REDD+ Cancun Agreement and the Warsaw Framework for REDD+ included a number of social and environmental safeguards (Arhin, 2014; Peskett & Todd, 2013; UN-REDD, 2012). For the argument here, the “social safeguards” are the most significant, that is: “transparent and effective national forest governance structures”: “full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities”; and especially, “respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities”.⁶ With an international political foundation in UNDRIP (2007), the Cancun Agreement stipulates a safeguard of respect for the rights and traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and native communities, and sets a framework for indigenous peoples to engage with key actors in REDD+ procedures in forest land tenure issues and benefit-sharing.

Some current safeguards on the negotiation table are interpretable as co-benefits, especially the safeguards on biodiversity status and ecosystem services. But some social safeguards, especially emphasizing land tenure, and recognition for local indigenous knowledge, can be interpreted as “threatening” by aggressive REDD+ project promoters. The concern is that external stakeholders expecting to benefit from REDD+ activities will focus attention on the “co-benefit safeguards”, and sideline the “threat safeguards” (Arhin, 2014; Venter & Koh, 2011).

(b) Jurisdictions—landscape or territory as the REDD+ spatial unit

REDD+ discourses on definitions and identities of landscapes (Section 2) in the main depend primarily on bio-physical factors and criteria, and do not respond to the challenge that landscapes are created, developed, and defended by social communities.

An exception to this generalization in the discourse was a supposition to emphasize the central role of institutions, by

formulating *landscape* specifically as “a place with governance in place”, where, (i) *place*, implies a landscape as a geographical area; and (ii) *governance in place*, means that there exist formal or informal institutions whose function is to set priority options for landscape management. This was formulated by CIFOR (CIFOR, 2013), and could be related to Antrop (2000), Nelson and Weschler (2001), Zwick (2013), Ulloa (2011), and, Beunen and Opdam (2011). This valuable alternative definition of *landscape* however has not found much traction. The important “Ten principles for a landscape approach” of Sayer *et al.* (2013) mentions neither “territory” nor “tenure”, and though there is a Principle entitled “Clarification of Rights and Responsibilities”, it does not provide for the basic principle of ownership tenure by the forest peoples. Only six out of 23 REDD+ projects reviewed in the Sills *et al.* (2014) collection were jurisdictional, (meaning projects aimed at a land unit/landscape within an administrative boundary). Moreover, generally the Climate-Smart Landscape frame of ICRAF and others (Denier *et al.*, 2015; Minang, van Noordwijk, *et al.*, 2015) have given slight regard to the central need for the effective architecture and mechanisms for territorial governance and control. Sayer *et al.*'s (2015) review of seven “landscape” initiatives judges that the outcomes to date demonstrated multiple and non-transparent rationalities, and depended on “muddling through”. In the comprehensive overview of 191 “landscape” approaches in Africa and Latin America (Hart *et al.*, 2015, chap. 7, pp. 98–99) for example, there is no concern for institutional governable territorial space, save a finding that a pervasive challenge always was ‘coordinating stakeholder groups’ and the frequent need for *creating new* platforms (c.f. Kusters, 2015, pp. 45–49).

There are a few REDD+ commentators who argue for setting the REDD+ projects within existing matured jurisdictional structures (rather than creating new structures). We can see that very few interventions toward “integrated approaches” are actually trying to work in terms of peoples’ territories. Exceptions are two socio-cultural-institutional regions where there is distinctive recognition of the landscape-territory symbiosis, the *hutan desa* of Indonesia (Resosudarmo *et al.*, 2014; Sills *et al.*, 2014) and the *gestion de terroirs* of Mali, etc. in Francophone West Africa (Bernard, 2015, chap. 4). The *terroir* is an administrative governance unit, at the same time as representing a ‘natural’ landscape unit and a local socio-ecological-cultural area. It is usually a small area, but significantly it has a community territorial dimension with institutional governance which is missing from most watershed and landscape spatialization exercises (Bernard, 2015, chap. 4; Sedogo & Groten, 2000); thus here, political units and boundaries dominate. CATIE’s version of the Climate-Smart Landscapes, known as CST, includes “territorial management”—defined as “strengthening local capacities to define and achieve common goals and to implement strategies concerted among multiple stakeholders within a clearly defined space” (Louman *et al.*, 2015, chap. 6, p. 77). But CST does not specifically discuss territorial ownership by a local community; it opts instead for less-political terminology and modalities such as “integrated landscape management” using “stakeholder platforms”, (c.f. Denier *et al.*, 2015; Scherr *et al.*, 2013). Significantly they found that the implementation of scaling up CST practices ran into problems,—“... a slower process than anticipated”, due to “conflicting land uses” (Louman *et al.*, 2015, chap. 6, p. 79); which should be re-interpreted more straightforwardly as ‘conflicting *land claims*’ (not just *uses*) due to unequal powers.

Table 2. *Approaches, mechanisms, actions toward reconciling “landscape” and “territory”—recognized in the forest governance and REDD+ discourses*

Approaches, methods, actions	Representative advocacy (all references are in this paper)	Notes
Specific proposals for REDD+ project design and implementation		
<i>Actions on tenure</i>		
Strengthening land and resource tenure security	Resosudarmo <i>et al.</i> (2014), Duchelle <i>et al.</i> (2014), Sunderlin <i>et al.</i> (2014), Naughton-Treves and Wendland (2014), Cabello and Gilbertson (2012), Bernard (2015), Larson <i>et al.</i> (2012, 2013)	Reiterated in most UNFCCC guides, and in Safeguards
National legislative actions on tenure	Sunderlin <i>et al.</i> (2014), Larson <i>et al.</i> (2012, 2013), Duchelle <i>et al.</i> (2014), Bernard (2015)	Much rhetoric in most countries, very little action in programs (Larson <i>et al.</i> , 2012)
Negotiate agreements between national government and local communities	Naughton-Treves and Wendland (2014), Minang, Duguma, van Noordwijk <i>et al.</i> (2015, chap. 27), Minang, van Noordwijk, <i>et al.</i> (2015)	But this is imbalanced power.
<i>Operationalizing actions on tenure</i>		
Strengthening exclusion rights and capacities	Feiring (2013), Naughton-Treves and Wendland (2014), Sunderlin <i>et al.</i> (2014), Larson <i>et al.</i> (2012)	Significant recognition of the necessity of territorialization
Recognizing customary cultural sacred land rights	Resosudarmo <i>et al.</i> (2014), Bernard (2015), Feiring (2013), Wilshusen <i>et al.</i> (2002)	Cultural, spiritual and sacred lands as a focus of territorialization
Mechanisms for dealing with conflicting claims	Scherr <i>et al.</i> (2013), Sayer <i>et al.</i> (2013), (2015), Kusters (2015, pp. 32–33), Minang, van Noordwijk, <i>et al.</i> (2015)	Cooperative “platforms”, or legal procedures
<i>New forms of governance at local level</i>		
Stakeholder platforms for communication and coordination	Scherr <i>et al.</i> (2013), Louman <i>et al.</i> (2015) Minang, Duguma, Alegami, <i>et al.</i> (2015, chap. 9), Minang, Duguma, van Noordwijk <i>et al.</i> (2015, chap. 27), Hart <i>et al.</i> (2015), Cohen and Davidson (2011), Cohen (2012), Kusters (2015), Denier <i>et al.</i> (2015)	Relying on discussion and consensus. Need for creating “new coordination/hybrid platforms”
“Landscape democracy” collaborative participation	Minang, Duguma, Alegami, <i>et al.</i> (2015, chap. 9), Minang, Duguma, van Noordwijk <i>et al.</i> (2015, chap. 27), Freeman <i>et al.</i> (2015), Resosudarmo <i>et al.</i> (2012)	Including social learning
Equity in any benefits	Resosudarmo <i>et al.</i> (2012, 2014), Minang, van Noordwijk, <i>et al.</i> (2015)	Not taken as a high priority
<i>Improving participation</i>		
Highlighting gender in management and governance	Minang, Duguma, Alegami, <i>et al.</i> (2015, chap. 9), Minang, Duguma, van Noordwijk <i>et al.</i> (2015, chap. 27), Villamor <i>et al.</i> (2015), Rocheleau and Edmunds (1997), Nightingale (2003), Kalibo and Medley (2007), GLF (2013)	Not only for equity, also for capacities and focussed knowledge
Recognition of and Valuing local (spatial) knowledge	Corrigan and Hay-Edie (2013), Feiring (2013), Ellis and Porter-Bolland (2008), Vergara-Asenjo and Potvin (2014), Holland <i>et al.</i> (2014), Stevens <i>et al.</i> (2014)	As input to REDD+ project selection and design
Participatory survey and mapping. Participatory land use planning	Larson <i>et al.</i> (2012), McCall <i>et al.</i> (2014), Corrigan and Hay-Edie (2013), Minang, Duguma, Alegami, <i>et al.</i> (2015, chap. 9)	For local spatial and historical/cultural knowledge
FPIC—Free, Prior and Informed Consent	Larson <i>et al.</i> (2012), Fontana and Grugel (2016), UN-REDD (2013), Sunderlin <i>et al.</i> (2014)	Supposedly a pre-requisite, but often skipped
Identifying and supporting legitimate representatives	Larson <i>et al.</i> 2015, Ribot <i>et al.</i> (2008), Milne (2012), Pfund <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Identification is problematic and contested
<i>Recognizing & privileging local interests</i>		
REDD+ projects aimed at local livelihood enhancements	Resosudarmo <i>et al.</i> (2012, 2014), Bernard (2015), Hart <i>et al.</i> (2015), Zwick (2013), Pfund <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Given as priority by villagers. Carbon payments are not enough
<i>Generic forest governance & planning values</i>		
Dissemination of information and transparent debate about REDD+	Sunderlin <i>et al.</i> (2014), Fontana and Grugel (2016), UN-REDD (2013), Milne (2012), Resosudarmo <i>et al.</i> (2012)	e.g., Villagers ask for more information
Flexibility in planning, visioning, etc. Iterative, slow processes.	Sunderlin <i>et al.</i> (2014), Freeman <i>et al.</i> (2015), Medema <i>et al.</i> (2008)	“Iterative process to address the inherent complexity within the system”
Creating adaptive capacity	Freeman <i>et al.</i> (2015), Kusters (2015)	Benefits from using <i>landscape</i> as a boundary term
Transdisciplinarity/cross-sectoral approaches, “new hybrid platforms”	Freeman <i>et al.</i> (2015), Kusters (2015)	
Multi-scalar, new institutional spaces	Cohen and Davidson (2011), Cohen (2012), Cohen and Bakker (2014), Marshall (2007), Nagendra and Ostrom (2012), Sayer <i>et al.</i> (2013), Kusters (2015), Minang, Duguma, Alegami, <i>et al.</i> (2015, chap. 9)	Approaches to the scale problem—as with watersheds

(c) *REDD+ for recognition of land rights—a potential unfulfilled*

Consider the counter-assertion that REDD+ has a potential for strengthening people’s land rights with carbon forestry projects that try to tackle the land priority rights issue and reforms (Arhin, 2014; Duchelle *et al.*, 2014; Sunderlin *et al.*, 2014). Some governments and national actors are open to dialog on forest land rights.

Critics, including organizations such as IWGIA (2014) and LCT (2014), speaking for indigenous and local communities, are skeptical about the extensive discourse on safeguards in the REDD+ concept (c.f. Arhin, 2014; Krause & Nielsen, 2014). Despite some serious efforts to develop these safeguards and give them teeth, so far they have not achieved an effective mainstreaming in government policies. The World Bank’s ESSs (Environmental and Social Safeguards), though not specific to REDD+, are another relevant approach toward developing a consensus on safeguards. But the “alternative approach” proposed in ESS 7 Indigenous Peoples, Para. 7 (World Bank, 2014, 2014-15) allows that if a country is concerned that identifying culturally distinct groups (i.e., local/indigenous groups) would create a serious risk of exacerbating ethnic tension, then it can pass over this safeguard and use other ESSs to address indigenous peoples’ interests. International NGOs and representatives of indigenous nations (such as IWGIA, 2014; LCT, 2014; Stevens *et al.*, 2014) are agitated about this and consider it threatening in countries whose constitutions are likely to subordinate indigenous land rights, though this is less likely in Latin America.

Larson *et al.* (2012, chap. 9, 2013) in their comparative study of 23 REDD+ projects in six countries recognized the real and potential opportunities for REDD+ to actually enhance local land rights “in most cases” (c.f. Blom *et al.*, 2010; Buizer *et al.*, 2014; Mahanty *et al.*, 2012). Therefore, REDD+ can be interpreted as a window of opportunity to promote indigenous peoples’ rights as a necessary (though not sufficient) condition for the strengthening of best management and forest governance practices (e.g., Duchelle *et al.*, 2014; Naughton-Treves & Wendland, 2014, p. 4; RRI, 2014). Feiring (2013, p. 77) determined the necessary steps—beyond the resolution of issues of ownership—as being the recognition and support of (local) knowledge about sustainable forest management and indigenous peoples’ way of life and spiritual beliefs.

Negotiations with local communities must always happen in good faith with an effective FPIC (Free, Prior and Informed Consent) process; see UN-REDD (2013), and ESS 7, para. 19–22 of the World Bank draft Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) (World Bank, 2014). This is picked up in some literature, as in Larson *et al.* (2012, chap. 9), and, Fontana and Grugel (2016). However, Sunderlin *et al.*’s (2014) overview of five countries discovered that many actual REDD+ projects have not supported proper education about the projects to the local population, nor have started an FPIC ‘process’ while simultaneously postponing the education.

(d) *Enhancing participation in the REDD+ landscapes approach*

Who should participate? Who are most appropriate? When landscape rather than territory is foregrounded as the spatial unit, the *who* questions (- who owns the land, who is entitled, who has grounded responsibility for sound land management) are by-passed. A frame for “participation” is essential to the arguments here, because policy assumptions on “participation” require a more critical, political perspective on participation in territorial resource management, angled

toward the objective of local empowerment. But most of the REDD+ landscape literature, as in the Sections above, and summarized by Freeman *et al.* (2015, pp. 29–30), tends toward participation simply as a means to get people together as if they are all equivalently empowered stakeholders, which is highly contestable.

A theme in the REDD+ discourse is how to deal with conflicting village claims for land ownership and resource rights - which are of course exacerbated (and often enough were previously dormant) by the potential arrival of a REDD+ project. For example, the arguments for a fair justice system have been made by Sayer *et al.* (2013, 2015), (c.f. Kusters, 2015, pp. 32–33; Minang, Duguma, van Noordwijk, *et al.*, 2015, chap. 27). But more than that is needed—the interrogation of: “who is entitled to participate”, “who is invited to participate”, “why they do”, and, “why is participation being pushed from outside”. Identifying and supporting legitimate representatives in the communities is recognized as a crucial issue in some studies. Not only is the methodology of participant identification complex and subjective, but it raises very many contestations of the legitimacy not only of the community leadership, but also of the rights of the REDD+ project to intervene (Fontana & Grugel, 2016; Larson *et al.*, 2015; McCall & Dunn, 2012; Milne, 2012; Minang, Duguma, van Noordwijk, *et al.*, 2015, chap. 27; Pfund *et al.*, 2011; Ribot, Chhatre, & Lankina, 2008).

A common manifestation of this is in the gender relations in the community—in rights to land, access to land, having voice in community decision-making, etc. Gender inequities and their negative impacts on development are by no means unique to REDD+ and landscape analysis. But land, resource entitlements, and gender inequity are always intertwined, so it ought to be a fundamental consideration in designing and improving actions for projects in REDD+ territories. It is not only for equity considerations *per se*, but also for women’s significant management capacities and focused knowledge fields. However gender concerns are not well addressed in the REDD+ landscape discourse, although see GLF (2013), Minang, Duguma, van Noordwijk, *et al.* (2015, chap. 27), or Villamor *et al.* (2015). There are of course many discussions of significance of gender in environmental management in general, e.g., Fortmann (1996, chap. 9), Rocheleau and Edmunds (1997), Nightingale (2003), and, Kalibo and Medley (2007).

Equity in general, as a target and objective, also has not been taken as a high priority in recommendations for good practice in REDD+ approaches, though identified as essential to good governance both of the REDD+ projects and of their landscapes (Minang, Duguma, Alegami, *et al.*, 2015, chap. 9; Resosudarmo, Duchelle, Ekaputri, & Sunderlin, 2012, chap. 11; Resosudarmo *et al.*, 2014).

Concerning the profound relationships between communities’ local spatial knowledge and territoriality, there are studies recognizing this and how significant these technical skills are for sound sustainable management of forest lands, and thus for REDD+ objectives—among them are: Ellis and Porter-Bolland (2008), Vergara-Asenjo and Potvin (2014), Holland *et al.* (2014), and Stevens *et al.* (2014). But beyond the technical competencies, the unique local knowledge of forest landscapes, especially within indigenous or native peoples, is acquired from their long-term occupation and management of ecosystems, and the identity, livelihoods and territoriality that link them to their home environments (Feiring, 2013; IPACC, 2010; Wilshusen *et al.*, 2002). “. . . a well-defined people or community possesses a close and profound relation with a well-defined site (territory, area, or habitat), . . . embedded in local culture, sense of identity and/or dependence for

livelihood” (Corrigan & Hay-Edie, 2013, p. 8), —though this does not explicitly include ownership.

This deep knowledge of the landscape in many cases is the embodiment of indigenous people’s identity. It is a knowledge that is symbolic, metaphoric and visionary, especially related with land features. Because this spiritual, spatial knowledge is associated with a self-identified people and their cultural spaces and with specific landscapes, the landscape can become their territory.

If the REDD+ approach were transformed toward “territories” as the socio-political institutional units, there would be more focus on communities’ articulations of priority interests and local livelihoods. Notwithstanding, this is already a strong component in some REDD+ landscape discourse in case studies and good practices. The literature shows many calls from local communities and NGOs that REDD+ policies should not one-sidedly hinder local forest-based livelihoods by prioritizing external interests in carbon stocks or biodiversity etc., but should pro-actively develop better livelihoods, e.g., in Resosudarmo *et al.* (2012, chap. 11). This is where, in many cases, REDD+ pilot interventions are already collaborating with community-based initiatives in agroforestry, alternative agriculture, reduced grazing livestock systems, off-farm productive activities, etc., and it is recognized in many recommendations for good practice, (c.f. Bernard, 2015, chap. 4; Hart *et al.*, 2015, chap. 7; Minang, van Noordwijk, *et al.*, 2015; Pfund *et al.*, 2011).

(e) Representation and appropriation of lands

The third critical concern about the REDD+ landscape approach—the existential threat to local lands and community territories is addressed in Sections 3(c) and 4, and is revisited in the conclusions. But before that, it is important to consider social and institutional realities of who is speaking and acting on behalf of communities in the struggles over REDD+.

Communities are not homogeneous, and leaderships are not always legitimate or inclusive. REDD+ principles are to identify the rights holders and map their spatial claims—but who determines who they are? REDD+ projects should not equate traditional customary authorities automatically with legitimacy—legitimacy cannot be taken for granted—neither should customary rights be conflated with customary authority (Larson *et al.*, 2015; Milne, 2012; Ribot *et al.*, 2008). There will be discrepancies between the individual and the collective responses about values and priorities relating to interventions like REDD+ (Blom *et al.*, 2010; Fontana & Grugel, 2016; Kusters, 2015; Larson *et al.*, 2015; Pfund *et al.*, 2011). Related contentions are: who legitimately represents the community, and, who puts themselves forward to represent, among the competing interests and individuals. The process of formalizing a claimed collective territory in REDD+ includes essential steps of constituting the local authority and recognizing individuals as representing the collective, and this brings forth competing interests and individuals. Sunderlin *et al.* (2014) point out that although (REDD+) forest projects demarcate village boundaries, they lack the competence and authority to sort out many intra- or inter-community land conflicts.

The situation on the ground is complicated by declarations from some representatives of indigenous groups appearing to argue that local peoples need guidance in exercising their autonomy. “The right of self-determination of Indigenous Peoples should not be used to justify the destruction of our territories”, and, “Indigenous peoples should not commit themselves to a process that does not respect them” (IPCCA, 2011). In response to the “...tendency to romanticize the

‘customary’” (Larson *et al.*, 2015, p. 228), these normative declarations deserve critical questioning of who is committing what?, and on whose behalf? By the same criterion, it is important to understand whose voice is being heard in the well-publicized resistances as seen in Section 4. This stance raises the moral enigma of rights and entitlements to territory, if ancestral rights of the Principle of First Occupancy are based simply on the premise that the current forest occupants are the descendants of earlier inhabitants. Can culture-membership, or rather, ancestry—by itself—be the moral legitimizer of ownership of land? But, in legislation and in law, as in social polity, localness and prior claims are normally considered key in territorializing space.

Table 2 summarizes this section by pinpointing cases from the REDD+ governance discourse that have recognized the landscape-territory distinctions, and have identified and promoted a range of (partial) approaches and actions.

6. CREDIBILITY FOR REDD+ NEEDS TERRITORY

In as much as *landscape* is given specific interpretation in the REDD+ literature, (but mostly it is notably vague), it is a shorthand for a holistic, multi-sectoral approach to rural resource management and planning. It is significant that very little of the general and scientific discourse, and thus of the policy and programmatic documentation in REDD+ discourse refers to people’s *territories*.

“Are conservationists trying to appropriate territory by calling it *landscape*?” There is a non-trivial concern from local actors that the focus on landscape in REDD+ agency discourse is a threat to the actuality of local/indigenous territory. When the discourse of conservationists and REDD+ proponents call a “bounded space” by the term *landscape*, it is changing the problem-focus to an ecological issue, and thereby blurring the image and the questions of forest and carbon ownership. By focusing excessively on the “concept” of landscape of REDD+ or forests, the REDD+ community of scientists, practitioners and policy-makers can take political consciousness and discourse away from the recognition that these forests (with their biomass carbon) are the territories of specific peoples.

The cultural safeguards of REDD+, couched as they are in terms of communities, not territories, are not sufficient here. The policy declarations and Safeguards discourse are primarily about the *cultural* rights and entitlements of (indigenous) communities, so this discourse easily obscures people’s demands for actual material control over land as territory. The reality of peoples’ demands for their “territory” is being overridden by the sanitizing terms of “cultural integrity and community conservation” (van Dam, 2011). But beyond that, people’s struggles for territorial control are being subsumed into a discourse employing the concept of a universal archetypal quality called “landscape”. By calling the space a landscape, conservationists and REDD+ carbon programs can make the space appear to be less defined and less “owned”, and more universal as a piece of the global commons. Forests as landscapes have an image of a global good that provides global environmental services for all, whereas territories are implied as parochial and grubbily political and self-serving. This is significant for native and local communities resisting what they interpret as the efforts of national actors and international policies to alienate and appropriate their forest territories away from the local owners/managers, using a language of “a global protector”, (c.f. Carter, 2010 on “Heritage landscapes” superseding Aboriginal cultural landscape). In an ideological critique, employing *landscape* in place of *territory*

can be interpreted as equivalent to the colonial processes of appropriating lands by renaming toponyms, making “maps without history” which show “neutral” spatial patterns, but not the social and ownership processes, (c.f. Carter, 2010; Sletto *et al.*, 2013; Ulloa, 2011).

The evident alternative is to employ the community and its territorial space as the definitive and effective spatial unit for operationalizing *landscape approaches* in REDD+. That is, the model spatial unit for the landscape approach into REDD+ should precisely be the *territory* of the social community land rather than the ecological unit or watershed. These could be the village territorial lands, whether as *comunidades* (Mexico), *gram sabha* (India), ancestral lands (Philippines), *hutan desa* (Indonesia), or *terroirs* (West Africa). This implies of course the prioritization of matured, upwardly legitimized and -institutionalized territory over the bio-physical specializations of landscape. But this is the territory of the legitimate, responsible, and effective institutions of local people.

Landscape is essential for ecological and social analysis, but it does not yet form a modality of governance necessary for effective holistic management. The architecture needed for that is *territorial*, aimed at recognizing entitlement and ownership, and therefore responsibilities. A ‘territorialization’ of REDD+ involves situating land rights and entitlements, legitimate land users’ interests, and conflicts across multiple social actors in a concrete delineated spatial setting, at the center of REDD+ planning and implementation. A territorial view would shift power and decisions away from global and national policy planners to local actors—not only the formally land-entitled and land users—who should become central rather than peripheral actors in REDD+ governance systems. We should conclude that such a view and its inherent governance considerations are critical to make REDD+ an effective and legitimate endeavor, and one that it is sensitive to local land rights and spatial/social justice.

NOTES

1. UNFCCC: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. REDD: Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries. REDD+: Based on official UNFCCC documentation, REDD+ comprises local up to global actions to reduce emissions and to enhance carbon stocks. It includes results-based or conditional payments/compensation for: (i) reducing emissions from deforestation, or (ii) from degradation; (iii) conservation of, or (iv) enhanced, forest carbon stocks; and (v) sustainable management of forests. The term REDD+ may refer to more than the actions—to the overall concept and its objectives, the set of policies to achieve the objectives, measurable outcomes, or to processes involving all of these.
2. For convenience and brevity, the rest of this paper uses the acronym ISM (Integrated Spatial Resource Management) for all these approaches such as IWM, CB-NRM, ICDP.
3. There is (“There can be”) no REDD+ without the Territories, Rights and Autonomy of the Indigenous Peoples.
4. IPCCA has representatives of some indigenous groups from Ecuador, Panama, Nicaragua, Peru, India, and Samoa.
5. ILO Convention 169 has set the terms for subsequent declarations and conventions, not least the terms of not defining “indigenous people”, but providing a number of “elements”, and relying mainly on “self-identification”.
6. Arhin’s (2014) Table 2 lists five international documents that legitimize this latter safeguard as: “supporting tenure and resource rights of communities”.

REFERENCES

- Antrop, M. (2000). Background concepts for integrated landscape analysis. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 77(1), 17–28.
- Arhin, A. A. (2014). Safeguards and Dangers: A framework for unpacking the black box of safeguards for REDD+. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 45, 24–41.
- Bernard, F. (2015). What can climate-smart agricultural landscapes learn from the gestion de terroirs approach?. In P. A. Minang *et al.* (Eds.), *Climate-smart landscapes: Multifunctionality in practice* (pp. 51–60). Nairobi: WAC/ICRAF.
- Beunen, R., & Opdam, P. (2011). When landscape planning becomes landscape governance, what happens to the science?. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 100(4), 324–326.
- Blaser, J., & Zabel, A. (2015). Forest crime in the tropics. In *Tropical forestry handbook*. Heidelberg: Springer, <http://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-3-642-41554-8_302-1>.
- Blom, B., Sunderland, T., & Murdiyarso, D. (2010). Getting REDD to work locally: Lessons learned from integrated conservation and development projects. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 13(2), 164–172.
- Blomquist, W., & Schlager, E. (2005). Political pitfalls of integrated watershed management. *Society and Natural Resources*, 18(2), 101–117.
- Boas, H. (2011). *No REDD papers* (Vol. 1) Portland, OR: Charles Overbeck/Eberhardt Press, Indigenous Environmental Network and Carbon Trade Watch, <<http://www.ienearth.org/docs/No-Redd-Papers.pdf>>.
- Buizer, M., Humphreys, D., & de Jong, W. (2014). Climate change and deforestation: The evolution of an intersecting policy domain. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 35, 1–11, <<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1462901113001287>>.
- Cabello, J., & Gilbertson, T. (2012). A colonial mechanism to enclose lands: A critical review of two REDD+-focused special issues. *Ephemera*, 12(1/2), 162–180, <<http://www.ephemerajournal.org/contribution/colonial-mechanism-enclose-lands-critical-review-two-redd-focused-special-issues>>.
- Carter, J. (2010). Displacing indigenous cultural landscapes: The naturalistic gaze at Fraser Island World Heritage Area. *Geographical Research*, 48(4), 398–410.
- Catacutan, D., Muller, C., Johnson, M., & Garrity, D. (2015). Landcare – A landscape approach at scale. In P. A. Minang, *et al.* (Eds.), *Climate-smart landscapes: Multifunctionality in practice* (pp. 151–160). Nairobi: WAC/ICRAF.
- Cavanagh, C. J., Vedeld, P. O., & Trædal, L. T. (2015). Securitizing REDD+? Problematising the emerging illegal timber trade and forest carbon interface in East Africa. *Geoforum*, 60, 72–82.
- CIFOR (2013). CIFOR DG Peter Holmgren asks: How do we measure the performance of our landscapes? Retrieved from <www.landscapes.org/cifor-dg-peter-holmgren-asks-measure-performance-landscapes/>.
- CIFOR (2013). Landscapes for sustainable development Retrieved from <<http://blog.cifor.org/12517/landscapes-for-sustainable-development/>>.
- Clark, W. C., Tomich, T. P., van Noordwijk, M., Gustond, D., Catacutane, D., Dickson, N. M., *et al.* (2011). Boundary work for sustainable development: Natural resource management at the CGIAR. *PNAS Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, <www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0900231108> 0900231108.

- Cohen, A. (2012). Rescaling environmental governance: Watersheds as boundary objects at the intersection of science, neoliberalism, and participation. *Environment and Planning A*, 44, 2207–2224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1068/a44265>.
- Cohen, A., & Bakker, K. (2014). The eco-scalar fix: Rescaling environmental governance and the politics of ecological boundaries in Alberta, Canada. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 32(1), 128–146.
- Cohen, A., & Davidson, S. (2011). The watershed approach: Challenges, antecedents, and the transition from technical tool to governance unit. *Water Alternatives*, 4(1), 1–14.
- COICA (2010). *Posicion politica de COICA sobre REDD+*. Quito: COICA, Retrieved from <www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/sites/forestcarbonpartnership.org/files/Documents/PDF/Nov2010/Posicion%20Politico%20de%20COICA%20Sobre%20REDDplus.pdf>.
- Corbera, E., Estrada, M., May, P., Navarro, G., & Pacheco, P. (2011). Rights to land, forests and carbon in REDD+: Insights from Mexico, Brazil and Costa Rica. *Forests*, 2, 301–342.
- Corrigan, C., & Hay-Edie, T. (2013). *A toolkit to support conservation by indigenous peoples and local communities: Building capacity and sharing knowledge for indigenous peoples' and community conserved territories and areas (ICCAS)*. Cambridge: UNEP-WCMC.
- Cotula, L., & Mayers, J. (2009). *Tenure in REDD – Start-point or afterthought?*. London: IIED, International Institute for Environment and Development, Natural Resource Issues No. 15.
- Council of Europe (2000). *European landscape convention, Florence, 20. X.2000*. <<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm>>.
- de la Cadena, M. (2010). Indigenous cosmopolitics in the Andes: Conceptual reflections beyond “politics”. *Cultural Anthropology*, 25(2), 334–370.
- Denier, L., Scherr, S., Shanes, S., Chatterton, P., Hovani, L., & Stam, N. (2015). *The little sustainable landscapes book*. Oxford: Global Canopy Programme, <http://globalcanopy.org/sites/default/files/documents/resources/GCP_Little_Sustainable_LB_DEC15.pdf>.
- Duchelle, A. E., Cromberg, M., Gebara, M. F., Guerra, R., Melo, T., Larson, A., et al. (2014). Linking forest tenure reform, environmental compliance, and incentives: Lessons from REDD+ initiatives in the Brazilian Amazon. *World Development*, 55, 53–67.
- Ellis, E., & Porter-Bolland, L. (2008). Is community-based forest management more effective than Protected Areas? A comparison of land use/land cover change in two neighbouring study areas of the central Yucatan peninsula, Mexico. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 25(6), 1971–1983.
- Feiring, B. (2013). *Indigenous peoples' rights to lands, territories and resources*. Rome: ILC (International Land Coalition), <www.landcoalition.org/sites/default/files/publication/1615/IndigenousPeoplesRightsLandTerritoriesResources.pdf>.
- Fontana, L. B., & Grugel, J. (2016). The politics of indigenous participation through “Free Prior Informed Consent”: Reflections from the Bolivian case. *World Development*, 77, 249–261.
- Fortmann, L. (1996). Gendered knowledge: Rights and spaces in two Zimbabwe villages: Reflections on methods and findings. In D. Rocheleau et al. (Eds.), *Feminist political ecology* (pp. 211–223). London: Routledge.
- Freeman, O. E., Duguma, L. A., & Minang, P. A. (2015). Operationalizing the integrated landscape approach in practice. *Ecology and Society*, 20(1), 24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-07175-200124>.
- GLF (2013). Global Landscapes Forum executive summary Retrieved from <www.landscapes.org/executive-summary-key-messages-global-landscapes-forum>.
- GLF (2014a). 2014 Global Landscapes Forum outcome statement Retrieved from <<http://www.landscapes.org/publication/2014-global-landscapes-forum-outcome-statement/>>.
- GLF (2014b). Global Landscapes Forum background brief: Implementation of integrated landscape approaches Retrieved from <<http://www.landscapes.org/publication/background-brief-implementation-integrated-landscape-approaches/>>.
- Hajjar, R. F., Kozak, R. A., & Innes, J. L. (2012). Is decentralization leading to “real” decision-making power for forest-dependent communities? Case studies from Mexico and Brazil. *Ecology and Society*, 17(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-04570-170112>.
- Harley, J. B. (1988). Maps, knowledge and power. In D. Cosgrove, & S. Daniels (Eds.), *The iconography of landscape: Essays on the symbolic representation, design and use of past environment* (pp. 277–312). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hart, A. K., Milder, J. C., Estrada-Carmona, N., DeClerck, F. A. J., Harvey, C. A., & Dobie, P. (2015). Integrated landscape initiatives in practice: Assessing experiences from 191 landscapes in Africa and Latin America. In P. A. Minang, et al. (Eds.), *Climate-smart landscapes: Multifunctionality in practice* (pp. 89–101). Nairobi: WAC/ICRAF.
- Holland, M. B., De Koning, F., Morales, M., Naughton-Treves, L., Robinson, B. E., & Suárez, L. (2014). Complex tenure and deforestation: Implications for conservation incentives in the Ecuadorian Amazon. *World Development*, 55, 21–36.
- Hoppe, R., Wesselink, A., & Cairns, R. (2013). Lost in the problem: The role of boundary organizations in the governance of climate change. *WIREs Climate Change*, 4, 283–300. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/wcc.225>.
- ILO (1989). *ILO convention no. 169. Indigenous and tribal peoples*. Geneva: ILO, <<http://www.ilo.int/indigenous/Conventions/no169/lang-en/index.htm>>.
- IPACC (2010). Indigenous Peoples of Africa Co-ordinating Committee Website <<http://www.ipacc.org.za/eng/default.asp>>.
- IPCCA (Indigenous Peoples' Biocultural Climate Change Assessment) (2011). *Declaration of members of the Indigenous Peoples' Biocultural Climate Change Assessment Initiative* Durban, November 26th 2011. Retrieved from <<http://ipcca.info/docs/2011-declaration-of-the-members-of-ipcca-on-the-un-redd-program.pdf>>.
- IWGIA (international Work Group for Indigenous Peoples Affairs) (2014). Serious concerns over revision of World Bank Safeguard Policies Retrieved from <http://www.iwgia.org/iwgia_files_news_files/1075_IGIA20letter20to20orld20Bank.pdf>.
- Kalibo, H. W., & Medley, K. E. (2007). Participatory resource mapping for adaptive collaborative management at Mt. Kasigau, Kenya. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 82(3), 145–158.
- Krause, T., & Nielsen, T. D. (2014). The legitimacy of incentive-based conservation and a critical account of social safeguards. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 41, 44–51.
- Kusters, K. (2015). *Climate-smart landscapes and the landscape approach – An exploration of the concepts and their practical implications*. Wageningen: Tropenbos International.
- Larson, A. M., Brockhaus, M., & Sunderlin, W. D. (2012). Tenure matters in REDD+: Lessons from the field. In A. Angelsen, M. Brockhaus, W. D. Sunderlin, & L. V. Verchot (Eds.), *Analysing REDD+: Challenges and choices* (pp. 153–175). Bogor: CIFOR.
- Larson, A. M., Brockhaus, M., Sunderlin, W. D., Duchelle, A., Babon, A., Dokken, T., ... Huyn, T.-B. (2013). Land tenure and REDD+: The good, the bad and the ugly. *Global Environmental Change*, 23, 678–689.
- Larson, A. M., Cronkleton, P. J., & Pulhin, J. M. (2015). Formalizing indigenous commons: The role of ‘authority’ in the formation of territories in Nicaragua, Bolivia, and the Philippines. *World Development*, 70, 228–238.
- LCT (Lawyers for Community Tenure) (2014). *Community tenure, climate change, and the World Bank safeguards, Joint Opinion Brief* Retrieved from <<http://www.rightsandresources.org/wp-content/uploads/LCT-Joint-Opinion-PDF.pdf>>.
- Louman, B., Campos-Arce, J. J., Mercado, L., Imbach, P., Bouroncle, C., Finegan, B., ... Padilla, D. (2015). Climate Smart Territories (CST): An integrated approach to food security, ecosystem services, and climate change in rural areas. In P. A. Minang et al. (Eds.), *Climate-smart landscapes: Multifunctionality in practice* (pp. 75–86). Nairobi: WAC/ICRAF.
- Mahanty, S., Milne, S., Dressler, W., & Filer, C. (2012). The social life of forest carbon: Property and politics in the production of a new commodity. *Human Ecology*, 40, 661–664.
- Marshall, G. (2007). Nesting, subsidiarity, and community-based environmental governance beyond the local scale. *International Journal of the Commons*, 2(1), 75–97.
- McCall, M. K., & Dunn, C. E. (2012). Geo-information tools for participatory spatial planning: Fulfilling the criteria for ‘good’ governance?. *Geoforum*, 43(1), 81–94.
- McCall, M. K., Skutsch, M., & van Laake, P. (2014). Community forest monitoring. In GOFCC-GOLD (Ed.), *A sourcebook of methods and procedures for monitoring and reporting anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions and removals* (pp. 216–233). Wageningen: Wageningen University, GOFCC-GOLD Report version COP 20. <<http://www.gofcc-gold.wur.nl/redd/>>.

- Medema, W., McIntosh, B. S., & Jeffrey, P. J. (2008). From premise to practice: A critical assessment of integrated water resources management and adaptive management approaches in the water sector. *Ecology and Society*, 13(2), 29–47. <<http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss2/art2>>.
- Milne, S. (2012). Grounding forest carbon: Property relations and avoided deforestation in Cambodia. *Human Ecology*, 40, 693–706.
- Milne, E., Neufeldt, H., Rosenstock, T., Smalligan, M., Cerri, C. E., Malin, D., ... Pearson, T. (2013). Methods for the quantification of GHG emissions at the landscape level for developing countries in smallholder contexts. *Environmental Research Letters*, 8(1), 15–19.
- Minang, P. A., Duguma, L. A., Alegami, D., & van Noordwijk, M. (2015). Scale considerations on landscape approaches. In P. A. Minang, et al. (Eds.), *Climate-smart landscapes: Multifunctionality in practice* (pp. 121–133). Nairobi: WAC/ICRAF.
- Minang, P. A., Duguma, L. A., van Noordwijk, M., Prabhu, R., & Freeman, O. E. (2015). Enhancing multifunctionality through system improvement and landscape democracy processes: A synthesis. In P. A. Minang, et al. (Eds.), *Climate-smart landscapes: Multifunctionality in practice* (pp. 389–404). Nairobi: WAC/ICRAF.
- Minang, P. A., van Noordwijk, M., Freeman, O. E., Mbow, C., de Leeuw, J., & Catacutan, D. (Eds.). (2015). *Climate-smart landscapes: Multifunctionality in practice*. Nairobi: WAC/ICRAF.
- Nagendra, H., & Ostrom, E. (2012). Polycentric governance of multifunctional forested landscapes. *International Journal of the Commons*, 6(2), 104–133. <<http://doi.org/10.18352/ijc.321>>.
- Naughton-Treves, L., & Wendland, K. (2014). Land tenure and tropical forest carbon management. *World Development*, 55, 1–6.
- Nelson, L. S., & Weschler, L. F. (2001). The watershed as a focus for public administration: Conventional and bioregional approaches. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 23(1), 10–24.
- Neumann, R. P. (2011). Political ecology III: Theorizing landscape. *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(6), 843–850.
- Nietschmann, B. (1995). Defending the Miskito reefs with maps and GPS. Mapping with sail, scuba, and satellite. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, 18(4), 34–37.
- Nightingale, A. (2003). A feminist in the forest: Situated knowledges and mixing methods in natural resource management. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 2(1), 77–90.
- Offen, K. H. (2011). The territorial turn: Making Black territories in Pacific Colombia. *Journal of Latin American Geography*, 2(2), 43–73.
- Peskett, L., & Todd, K. (2013). *Putting REDD+ safeguards and safeguard information systems into practice*. Geneva: UN-REDD Programme, Policy Brief No.3. <<http://theredddesk.org/resources/putting-redd-safeguards-and-safeguard-information-systems-practice>>.
- Pfund, J.-L., Watts, J. D., Boissiere, M., Boucard, A., Bullock, R. M., Ekadinata, A., ... Sunderland, T. C. H. (2011). Understanding and integrating local perceptions of trees and forests into incentives for sustainable landscape management. *Environmental Management*, 48(2), 334–349.
- Reed, J., Deakin, L., & Sunderland, T. (2015). What are ‘Integrated Landscape Approaches’ and how effectively have they been implemented in the tropics? A systematic map protocol. *Environmental Evidence*, 4, 2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/2047-2382-4-2>, <<http://www.environmentalevidencejournal.org/content/4/1/2>>.
- Resosudarmo, I. A. P., Atmadja, S., Desita, A. E., Intarini, D., Indriatmoko, Y., & Astri, P. (2014). Does tenure security lead to REDD+ project effectiveness? Reflections from five emerging sites in Indonesia. *World Development*, 55, 68–83.
- Resosudarmo, I. A. P., Duchelle, A. E., Ekaputri, A. D., & Sunderlin, W. D. (2012). Local hopes and worries about REDD+ projects. In A. Angelsen, M. Brockhaus, W. D. Sunderlin, & L. V. Verchot (Eds.), *Analysing REDD+: Challenges and choices* (pp. 193–208). Bogor: CIFOR.
- Ribot, J. C., Chhatre, A., & Lankina, T. (2008). Introduction: Institutional choice and recognition in the formation and consolidation of local democracy. *Conservation and Society*, 6(1), 1.
- Rocheleau, D., & Edmunds, D. (1997). Women, men and trees: Gender, power and property in forest and agrarian landscapes. *World Development*, 25(8), 1351–1371.
- RRI (Rights and Resources Initiative) (2014). *Lots of words, little action: Will the private sector tip the scales for community land rights?*. Washington, DC: Rights and Resources Initiative.
- Rundstrom, R. A. (1998). Mapping, the white man’s burden. *The Common Property Resource Digest*, 45, 1–9.
- Sack, R. D. (1986). *Human territoriality: Its theory and history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sayer, J., Margules, C., Boedhihartono, A. K., Dale, A., Sunderland, T., Supriatna, J., et al. (2015). Landscape approaches; what are the pre-conditions for success?. *Sustainability Science*, 10(2), 345–355.
- Sayer, J., Sunderland, T., Ghazoul, J., Pfund, J.-L., Sheil, D., Meijaard, E., ... Buck, L. E. (2013). Ten principles for a landscape approach to reconciling agriculture, conservation, and other competing land uses. *PNAS Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(21), 8349–8356.
- Scherr, S. J., Shames, S., & Friedman, R. (2013). *Defining integrated landscape management for policy makers* (p. 10). Washington, DC: Ecoagriculture, Policy focus no. 10.
- Schlager, E., & Ostrom, E. (1992). Property-rights regimes and natural resources: A conceptual analysis. *Land Economics*, 68(3), 249–262. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3146375?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents>.
- Sedogo, L. G., & Groten, S. M. E. (2000). Definition of land management units for GIS support to participatory planning: A case study on participatory land management in Burkina Faso. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 21, 523–542.
- Sheil, D., Puri, R. K., Basuki, I., van Heist, M., Wan, M., Liswanti, N., ... Wijaya, A. (2003). *Exploring biological diversity, environment and local people’s perspective in forest landscapes. Methods for a multidisciplinary landscape assessment*. 979-8764-88-9. Bogor: CIFOR.
- Sills, E. O., Atmadja, S. S., de Sassi, C., Duchelle, A. E., Kweka, D. L., Resosudarmo, I. A. P., & Sunderlin, W. D. (Eds.). (2014). *REDD+ on the ground: A case book of subnational initiatives across the globe*. Bogor: CIFOR.
- Sletto, B. I., Bryan, J., Torrado, M., Hale, C., & Barry, D. (2013). Territorialidad, mapeo participativo y política sobre los recursos naturales: la experiencia de América Latina. *Cuadernos de Geografía - Revista Colombiana de Geografía*, 22(2), 193–209.
- Stevens, C., Winterbottom, R., Springer, J., & Reynter, K. (2014). *Securing rights, combatting climate change: How strengthening community forest rights mitigates climate change*. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute/Rights and Resources.
- Stoffle, R. W., Toupal, R. S., & Nieves Zedeño, M. (2003). Landscape, nature, and culture: A diachronic model of human-nature adaptations. In H. Selin (Ed.), *Nature across cultures: Views of nature and the environment in non-western cultures* (pp. 97–114). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Sunderland, T. C., Ehringhaus, H. C., & Campbell, B. M. (2008). Conservation and development in tropical forest landscapes: A time to face the trade-offs. *Environmental Conservation*, 34, 276–279.
- Sunderlin, W. D., Larson, A. M., Duchelle, A. E., Resosudarmo, I. A. P., Huynh, T. B., Awono, A., et al. (2014). How are REDD+ proponents addressing tenure problems? Evidence from Brazil, Cameroon, Tanzania, Indonesia, and Vietnam. *World Development*, 55, 37–52.
- Ulloa, A. (2011). Políticas globales del cambio climático: nuevas geopolíticas del conocimiento y sus efectos en territorios indígenas. In A. Ulloa (Ed.), *Perspectivas culturales del clima* (pp. 477–494). Bogotá: UNC and Instituto Latinoamericano para una Sociedad y un Derecho Alternativos (ILSA).
- UNDRIP (2007). *United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples*. New York, NY: UN, <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf>. Adopted by UN, 13 September 2007.
- UN-REDD (2012). *REDD+ beyond carbon: Supporting decisions on safeguards and multiple benefits*. Geneva: UN-REDD Programme, Policy brief no. 2. <http://www.un-redd.org/aboutunreddprogramme/globalactivities/new_multiple_benefits/tabid/1016/default.aspx#Updates>.
- UN-REDD (2013). *Guidelines on free, prior and informed consent*. Geneva: UN-REDD Programme, <http://www.un-redd.org/Launch_of_FPIC_Guidelines/tabid/105976/Default.aspx>.
- van Dam, C. (2011). Indigenous territories and REDD in Latin America: opportunity or threat?. *Forests*, 2, 394–414.
- van Noordwijk, M., Leimona, B., Xing, M., Tanika, L., Namirembe, S., & Suprayogo, D. (2015). Water-focused landscape management. In P. A. Minang, et al. (Eds.), *Climate-smart landscapes: Multifunctionality in practice* (pp. 179–192). Nairobi: WAC/ICRAF.
- Venter, O., & Koh, L. P. (2011). Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+): Game changer or just another quick fix?. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1249(1), 137–150. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06306.x>.

- Vergara-Asenjo, G., & Potvin, C. (2014). Forest protection and tenure status: The key role of indigenous peoples and protected areas in Panama. *Global Environmental Change*, 28, 205–215, <www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378014001289>.
- Villamor, G. B., Dah-gbeto, P. A., Bell, A., Pradhan, U., & van Noordwijk, M. (2015). Gender-specific spatial perspectives and scenario building approaches for understanding gender equity and sustainability in climate-smart landscapes. In P. A. Minang, et al. (Eds.), *Climate-smart landscapes: Multifunctionality in practice* (pp. 211–224). Nairobi: WAC/ICRAF.
- Wilshusen, P. R., Brechin, S. R., Fortwangler, C. L., & West, P. C. (2002). Reinventing a square wheel: Critique of a resurgent “protection paradigm” in international biodiversity conservation. *Society and Natural Resources*, 5(1), 17–40.
- World Bank (2014). *Environmental and Social Framework setting standards for sustainable development First draft for consultation July 30, 2014. (The content of the draft is for consultation purposes and has not been endorsed by the Board of Executive Directors of IBRD/IDA)*. Washington, DC: World Bank, <http://consultations.worldbank.org/Data/hub/files/consultation-template/review-and-update-world-bank-safeguard-policies/en/materials/first_draft_framework_july_30_2014_0.pdf>.
- World Bank (2015). *Review and update of the World Bank safeguard policies*. Washington, DC: World Bank, <<http://consultations.worldbank.org/consultation/review-and-update-world-bank-safeguard-policies>>.
- Wu, J. (2011). Integrating nature and culture in landscape ecology. In S.-K. Hong, J.-E. Kim, J. Wu, & N. Nakagoshi (Eds.), *Landscape ecology in Asian cultures* (pp. 301–321). Springer, Ecological Research Monographs.
- Zaffaroni, R. (2012). *La pachamama y el humano*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Colihue.
- Zimmerer, K. S. (2006). Cultural ecology: At the interface with political ecology – The new geographies of environmental conservation and globalization. *Progress in Human Geography*, 30(1), 63–78.
- Zwick, S. (2013). *Unpacking Warsaw, Part Two: Recognizing the landscape reality*. Katoomba: Ecosystem Marketplace, <http://www.ecosystem-marketplace.com/pages/dynamic/article.page.php?page_id=10089§ion=news_articles&eod=1>.

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect