Conserving carbon and gender relations?

Gender perspectives on REDD+ and global climate policy

Lisa Westholm
Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development
Uppsala

Doctoral thesis
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Uppsala 2017

Acta Universitatis agriculturae Sueciae
2017:74

Cover: Women helping each other climb a tree to pick néré fruits in Gallo, Burkina Faso (photo: Lisa Westholm, 2015)

ISSN 1652-6880
ISBN (print version) 978-91-7760-034-3
ISBN (electronic version) 978-91-7760-035-0

Print: SLU Service/Repro, Uppsala 2017

Conserving carbon and gender relations? Gender perspectives on REDD+ and global climate policy

Abstract

REDD+ (Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) is an instrument under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) aimed at conserving tropical forests and the carbon stored in them. Respect for local communities, poverty reduction and gender sensitivity are explicit ambitions of the program. In this thesis I examine global policies and governance relating to REDD+. I inquire into the potential for drawing on these policies to promote a transformation of unequal gender relations.

The study is based on analysis of documents relating to global REDD+ policy, and to women's organisations advocating for gender to be taken into account in REDD+ policymaking. It also includes a case study of Burkina Faso's national REDD+ program comprising analysis of documents, interviews with policy makers and villagers involved in REDD+ policy making and implementation, as well as participation in national and local REDD+ meetings. Based on this, I examine the formulation of problems and the solutions proposed in relation to gender, in the official discourses on gender in REDD+ and climate policy, as well as in attempts at challenging the mainstream discourse.

Drawing on the concepts of social and natural reproduction, I show how market-based discourses risk contributing to the displacement of responsibilities for reproductive work in the household and in the forest, from rich to poor, from North to South, and from men to women. To characterize this transfer of responsibilities I introduce the concept of "global environmental care chains", which sheds light on the global linkages of rights and responsibilities involved in REDD+.

I show that internal resistance within policy-making institutions as well as the disciplining effects of discourses make it difficult for women's organisations to challenge the mainstream discourses in REDD+ policy making and propose alternative solutions or subject positions. Even when international institutions are influenced by the language of women's organisations, their policy proposals risk perpetuating stereotypes about what men and women do in the forest, and conserving inequalities. Gender advocates thus have an important role to play in calling for policymakers to take responsibility for the changes they are aiming to effect in the daily use of natural resources of a large number of people, by implementing REDD+ at global scale, across the global South.

Keywords: REDD+, gender, climate policy, discourse analysis, non-timber forest products, NTFP, social reproduction, Burkina Faso

Author's address: Lisa Westholm, SLU, Department of Urban and Rural Development, P.O. Box 7012, SE-750 07 Uppsala, Sweden.

Conserving carbon and gender relations? Gender perspectives on REDD+ and global climate policy

Sammanfattning

REDD+ (Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) är ett instrument inom FNs klimatkonvention (UNFCCC) med syfte att bevara tropiska skogar och det kol som lagras i dem. Hänsyn till berörda människor och samhällen, fattigdomsbekämpning och ett genusperspektiv är uttalade ambitioner i programmet. I den här avhandlingen undersöker jag global politik och styrning gällande REDD+ och möjligheterna för programmet att främja en verklig omvandling av ojämlika genusrelationer.

Studien bygger på analys av dokument relaterade till global REDD+-politik och till kvinnoorganisationer som arbetar för att stärka genusperspektivet i REDD+. I analysen ingår även en fallstudie av Burkina Fasos nationella REDD+-program, inklusive dokumentanalys, intervjuer med tjänstemän, civilsamhälle och byinvånare involverade i REDD+-processen, samt deltagande vid nationella och lokala REDD+-möten. Jag undersöker problemformuleringar och föreslagna lösningar i fråga om genus och jämställdhet, i den officiella diskursen kring genus i REDD+ och klimatpolitik, liksom i olika försök att utmana allmänt vedertagna perspektiv.

Utifrån begreppen social och naturlig reproduktion visar jag hur marknadsbaserade diskurser riskerar att bidra till en omfördelning av ansvar för reproduktivt arbete i hemmet liksom i skogen, från rik till fattig, från Nord till Syd, och från män till kvinnor. För att karakterisera den omfördelningen introducerar jag begreppet "globala miljö-omvårdnadskedjor", som visar hur rättigheter och skyldigheter länkas samman i det globala system som REDD+ utgör.

Jag visar att internt motstånd inom politiska institutioner och diskursens disciplinerande effekter gör det svårt för kvinnoorganisationer att utmana rådande perspektiv inom REDD+ och föreslå alternativa lösningar och subjektspositioner. Även när internationella institutioner influeras av kvinnoorganisationers språkbruk riskerar deras politiska lösningar att cementera stereotyper om vad män och kvinnor gör i skogen och rentav konservera ojämställdhet. Förkämpar för en verklig förändring har därför en viktig roll att spela i att utkräva ansvar av politiker för de förändringar i människors dagliga användning av naturresurser som de strävar efter att åstadkomma genom att implementera REDD+ i länder i Syd.

Keywords: REDD+, genus, klimatpolitik, diskursanalys, non-timber forest products, NTFP, social reproduction, Burkina Faso

Author's address: Lisa Westholm, SLU, Institutionen för stad och land,
Box 7012, 750 07 Uppsala, Sverige

Dedication

Till Stefan, Ruth och Aron. Oumbärliga uppmuntrare.

Contents

List of publications

This thesis is based on the work contained in the following papers, referred to by Roman numerals in the text:

I Westholm, Lisa* and Arora-Jonsson, Seema (2015). Defining solutions, finding problems: Deforestation, gender and REDD+ in Burkina Faso. *Conservation & Society*, 13 (2), pp. 189-199.

II Westholm, Lisa* (2016). Fruits from the forest and the fields: Forest conservation policies and intersecting social inequalities in Burkina Faso's REDD+ program. *International Forestry Review*, 18 (4), pp. 511-521.

III Westholm, Lisa* and Arora-Jonsson, Seema. What room for politics and change in global climate governance? Addressing gender in co-benefits and safeguards. (submitted/under review for *Environmental Politics*)

* Corresponding author.

The contribution of Lisa Westholm to the papers included in this thesis was as follows:

I The research idea and framework was developed by Arora-Jonsson. Westholm conducted interviews and document analysis. Westholm and Arora-Jonsson wrote the text in collaboration.

II Westholm is single author of paper, and collected the data, analysed it and wrote paper.

III Westholm developed the research idea and framework in discussion with Arora-Jonsson. Westholm collected the material and analysed it. Westholm wrote main part of the text in discussion with Arora-Jonsson.

List of tables

Abbreviations

AfDB	African Development Bank
AMIFOB	L'Amicale des forestières au Burkina
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CIF	Climate Investment Funds
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
COP	Conference of the Parties of the UNFCCC
DGM	Dedicated Grant Mechanism
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FIP	Forest Investment Program
Focali	Forest, Climate and Livelihoods research network
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GGCA	Global Gender and Climate Alliance
GGF	Groupement de Gestion Forestière
IGO	Intergovernmental Institutions or Organisations
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MEDD	Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable
MRV	Measuring, Reporting and Verification
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NTFP	Non-Timber Forest Products
PES	Payments for Ecosystem Services
PGFC	Projet de Gestion Participative des Forêts Classées
RECOFTC	Centre for People and Forests
REDD+	Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation

REDD+ SES	REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards
REFACOF	Réseau des Femmes Africaines pour la Gestion Communautaire des Forêts
UN	United Nations
UN-REDD	United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WEDO	Women's Environment and Development Organization
WOCAN	Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management
WPR	What's the Problem Represented to be? (Approach to policy analysis)

1 Introducing gender in REDD+ and climate policy

1.1 Point of departure

REDD+ (Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) is an instrument under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) aimed at conserving tropical forests and the carbon stored in them. The overarching aim of this thesis is to investigate whether REDD+ policies also risk conserving gender relations, or whether there might be potential instead for drawing on them to promote a transformation of gender relations towards greater equality, as argued for by its proponents.

For over two decades an overwhelming majority of the world's countries have been negotiating the policy frameworks for concerted actions on climate change. These negotiations, while troubled and often criticised for being ineffective, have resulted in multilateral agreements, national and regional policies, and a wide range of projects, not least projects in developing countries under the facilitation of intergovernmental organisations such as the World Bank and various bodies of the United Nations (UN). The ambition of creating global instruments for fighting climate change, where all countries participate in mitigation efforts, has been justified by discourses of climate change as a global problem, affecting all people equally, regardless of nationality, wealth, or class (cf. Catney & Doyle, 2011; MacGregor, 2014). While this global vision has been useful in mobilising political momentum for dealing with climate change, it has also been criticised for the way it tends to gloss over differences in responsibility for climate change, and possibilities to deal with its impacts. This criticism has come not least from feminist researchers and activists, highlighting how gendered power relations that shape women's position in society at large play an important part also in the experience of climate change and the way it is governed (eg. Terry, 2009; MacGregor, 2014; Sultana, 2014).

Gender was only acknowledged at a late stage in the texts of the UNFCCC. Alston (2014) notes that for a long time, scientific debate about the extent of anthropogenic causes of climate change, and focus on scientific and technological solutions took precedence over social analysis in the climate negotiations. The seventh Conference of the Parties (COP) of the UNFCCC held in Marrakesh in 2001, decided to improve the participation of women in the representation of parties to the convention (UNFCCC, 2002). Since 2012, 'gender and climate change' is a stand-alone item on the agenda of the UNFCCC COP (UNFCCC, 2014a). Focus under this agenda item lies on two goals: improving gender balance and women's participation in the UNFCCC processes, and increasing support to and awareness of gender-responsive climate policy. In the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), only a few references to gender are found, particularly in relation to adaptation to the impacts of climate change and vulnerability to its effects (Adger *et al.*, 2007: 729-30), whereas mitigation of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions is described as not having an impact on empowerment/gender (IPCC, 2007: 477).

In this thesis, I turn to the mitigation of climate change, specifically the policies on REDD+, which aim to reduce the emissions of carbon from tropical deforestation. I argue that in order to avoid that policies perpetuate, or exacerbate, existing inequalities gender must be considered as a matter of social relations of power that is relevant at all levels of policy making, global as well as local. In an effort to understand the social and political impacts of REDD+ interventions, I ask how gender has been integrated into the global policies and governance of climate change mitigation and REDD+. In order to do this, I examine a wide range of policy documents. I complement the document analysis with data from interviews with policy makers, policy meetings, and rural fieldwork. Analysing policies, and specifically the documents where they are described and justified, provides an opportunity for examining how specific policy problems are constructed, and thereby, to understand why certain policy solutions are preferred over others (Bacchi, 2012). I am interested in how the problem of gender in REDD+ and climate policy is constructed at the international level, and what type of policy proposals these problem representations result in. This analysis can provide insights into what interests are promoted by certain problem representations and policy proposals, and shed light on power effects of policy making in REDD+, and climate policy more broadly. For example, I analyse the proposals for reducing gender inequality through women's economic empowerment and commercialisation of forest products, and what this says about the way gender inequalities and deforestation are conceptualised in policy making. I show how the focus on economic

empowerment risks further marginalising already marginalised voices in natural resource management, and increase women's burden of responsibility for reproductive work. In order to examine how the global discourses are concretised in national and local REDD+ programs and policies, I draw on a case study from Burkina Faso, and its World Bank funded REDD+ program. The analysis does not stop at the dominant discourses of global policy making, but I also examine the possibilities for challenging the mainstream discourses on gender in REDD+ and climate mitigation policy. This is done by analysing the documents of women's non-governmental organisations (NGOs) advocating for a gender perspective in climate policy, and initiatives by women's organisations promoting an enhanced gender perspective in REDD+ policy making and implementation.

1.2 Aim and research questions

The aim of this thesis is to examine global REDD+ and climate policy and governance from a gender perspective, in order to inquire into the potential for drawing on these policies to promote a transformation of gender relations, or whether these policies risk conserving inequalities. I do this by analysing the formulation of problems and the solutions proposed in relation to gender, in the official discourses on gender in REDD+ and climate policy, as well as in attempts at challenging the mainstream discourse. In the analysis I pose two overarching research questions:

1. In what way is gender discussed in the documents and programs framing REDD+ and climate mitigation policy?
2. What are the possibilities for challenging the mainstream discourses on gender in international REDD+ policy?

1.3 Structure of the thesis

In order to provide a background to the policies analysed in this thesis, the next chapter (Chapter 2) introduces REDD+ and key concepts and debates in REDD+ policy making and implementation, including an overview of the existing literature on applied research on gender in REDD+. This is followed by a chapter on method and methodology, which presents my methodological approach, as well as the methods for data collection, including documents, interviews, and observation at meetings, and the framework of analysis, which draws largely on Bacchi's (1999, 2009) framework for studying the discourses embedded in problem representations and policy proposals.

Next, (Chapter 4) I present the main theories and literature which underpin my analysis. I discuss the literature on gender in climate change and environmental governance, with a focus on policy. I draw on literature not only from the field of environmental governance and interventions, but also development studies, in order to show how gender has been brought in by the international institutions responsible for REDD+ policy making and implementation. I then turn to a discussion on feminist critique of the discourses dominating the work of these institutions, specifically discourses on economic empowerment. I also discuss feminist writings on the role of reproduction and care, as a way of better understanding the gendered effects of REDD+. Finally, I engage with some feminist debates about how best to effect change in the work of international institutions and bureaucracies, in order to discuss my second research question.

Chapter 5 is a chapter of analysis, where I attempt to answer the two research questions, drawing on the three papers as well as additional analysis of documents, both from the international institutions working on REDD+, and women's organisations and NGOs advocating consideration of gender in REDD+ policy formulation and implementation. This is followed by a summary of the three papers which comprise the main part of this compilation thesis. In Chapter 7, finally, I summarise my conclusions and point ahead to some questions for further research.

2 Climate policy and REDD+

This chapter provides a background to the questions examined, introducing REDD+ and its key features, as well as some of the ideas and concepts upon which it is based. I introduce some important debates relating to REDD+, and provide an overview of the literature available on gender in REDD+, and clarify my own contribution to the literature.

2.1 Avoided deforestation as climate change mitigation

Since 1992 the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) has provided a legal framework for achieving "stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system" (United Nations, 1992: 9). A longstanding critique in international climate change discussions has been that the differentiated responsibility for causing climate change should result in differentiated responsibility for solving the problems it causes and reducing emissions (Agarwal & Narain, 1991). This view is formalised in the UNFCCC texts in what is known as the principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities" (United Nations, 1992: 2). Nevertheless, tropical deforestation has been identified as a substantial source of greenhouse gas emissions (IPCC, 2007), and reducing these emissions was initially expected to be a cheap mitigation option. As part of these efforts, the thirteenth COP negotiated a mechanism to compensate developing countries for reducing emissions related to tropical and sub-tropical deforestation (UNFCCC, 2008). It was initially known as REDD - Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation, later REDD+ when the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon sinks were added to the package of activities. It was promoted with the expectations that it would allow countries in the global North to offset their emissions by paying for

REDD+ interventions in the global South, in what has been described as a large-scale, carbon-centred Payments for Environmental Services (PES) scheme (Karsenty *et al.*, 2014). Critics noted that this would allow for reducing emissions without people in the global North having to compromise their own standards of living, with responsibility for taking action against climate change falling upon people in the global South (Gupta, 2012).

As a response to the negotiations on REDD+ in the UNFCCC, multilateral institutions such as the UN and the World Bank designed pilot schemes aimed at preparing countries for REDD+ and testing methods for implementation. In 2007 the World Bank, together with the NGO the Nature Conservancy, developed the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), which was officially launched the following year. Through the FCPF the World Bank has taken a lead role in the preparation of national plans and strategies for REDD+, by supporting 47 countries in the preparation of so-called "REDD+ readiness plans". In 2008, the UN-REDD Programme, a collaborative effort by Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), was created for the purpose of piloting REDD+ in a limited number of countries. The World Bank, through the Climate Investment Funds (CIF), also led the creation of the Forest Investment Program (FIP), established in 2009. The FIP initially set out to support eight countries with substantial funding, in order to "initiate […] transformational change in developing countries' forest sector related policies and practices" (CIF, 2009: 4). Funding for the pilot schemes came primarily from government donors, notably Norway, the UK, USA, Australia and the Netherlands. About 45 countries to date have received support from these funds for developing national REDD+ programmes or strategies and initiating pilot activities at local level. These pilot schemes have thereby played in important part in the formulation and development of REDD+ at international and national level. Their documents therefore comprise a substantial source of material for the analysis in this thesis of discourses on gender in REDD+ policy making.

As REDD+ evolved from the initial overarching framework adopted in 2007, to practical policy formulation and implementation, it became increasingly clear that the PES approach to REDD+, whereby a provider of environmental service receives payments from a service buyer, needed to be combined with national policies and institutional reforms (Angelsen & McNeill, 2012). Thus, policies aimed e.g. at strengthening local institutions, agricultural intensification, land use planning and tenure reform have all become part of REDD+ programs.

A foundation of the REDD+ scheme is results-based payments, or results-based finance which are outlined under the UNFCCC (UNFCCC, 2016; UN-REDD, 2017). The payments are meant to be based upon measured, reported

and verified actions, generally referred to as MRV (Measuring, Reporting and Verification). MRV includes the establishment of baselines against which to measure changes in deforestation levels, as well as the creation of a national forest monitoring system (UN-REDD, 2017). In addition, a system should be put in place for reporting on compliance with the social and environmental safeguards adopted in Cancún (more on this in Section 2.3 below). MRV systems are a central part of REDD+ because they are meant to provide guarantees that REDD+ projects are actually reducing emissions and conserving forests. The regulations around MRV systems and the kind of information they report on defines what information is considered relevant, and what information is considered irrelevant, thereby setting the boundaries for the central concepts of REDD+, and for how the problem of deforestation is defined (cf. Hajer, 1995; Bacchi, 2009, see also Chapter 3).

The UN-REDD Programme (2015) describes REDD+ as "an effort to create financial value for the carbon stored in forests, offering incentives for developing countries to reduce emissions from forested lands and invest in low-carbon paths to sustainable development". Negotiations on REDD+ within the UNFCCC have not settled to what extent financing should be fund-based[1] or market-based[2], but rather state that finance "may come from a variety of sources, public and private, bilateral and multilateral" (UNFCCC, 2014b: 24). Nevertheless, the realisation of the 'financial value for carbon' through carbon markets is favoured by many actors working on REDD+. Anticipating future decisions in this regard, the FCPF Carbon Fund was designed to pilot a market mechanism for the distribution of REDD+ funds, testing methods for benefit sharing, and nineteen countries are currently developing programs to be financed through the fund (FCPF, 2015; UN-REDD, 2017).

2.2 Debating the carbon market

While initial actions on REDD+ have been funded by aid money, and largely through development institutions, the expectation from donors and implementing agencies has been that it will develop into a large-scale, and multilevel Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) scheme, or carbon-trading mechanism. Nevertheless, as Angelsen (2014) notes, the creation of such a scheme was much more complicated than anticipated. According to Fischer et al. (2016), in a study of 329 REDD+ projects across the globe, only 21% were

1. Fund-based financing of REDD+ means that funding is provided from the Green Climate Fund (GCF) to which countries in the global North donate

2. Market-based financing means that funding is provided from a carbon market where carbon credits are traded

engaged in commercial carbon transactions, while over half were expecting to sell carbon credits in the future. The bulk of funding however, is still coming from grants and loans.

The practical issues impeding the development of a market for REDD+ credits remain largely unresolved, and include the risk that carbon credits from REDD+ would flood the carbon market, pushing down the price on carbon and crowding out mitigation efforts in other sectors, instead of providing additional mitigation (Angelsen, 2014). Another issue concerns how to set baselines for calculating emission reductions and how to avoid regional or international leakage of deforestation activities. In addition, the uncertainties, particularly relating to the permanence of forest conservation within REDD+, due to weak governance and corruption, as well as natural factors including climate change and bush fires, are difficult to overcome. From a theoretical environmental economics perspective, if these issues are solved, the market approach would provide incentives to the relevant actors to protect forests, and result in the global resources available for emissions reduction being used where they achieve the most emissions reductions per money spent. Extensive criticism has been directed at this argument.

Angelsen (2014: 299) notes that this means that actors would be compensated for their actual costs, including opportunity costs, transaction costs, and implementation costs, but it would not leave a rent to be distributed as economic benefits. More fundamental critique has also been raised against carbon markets and market-based REDD+ approaches. As McAfee (2016: 344) writes, "any version of REDD+ in which funds are raised by for-profit carbon trading and in which funds are allocated by market-efficiency criteria cannot prioritize payments to the poor". McAfee (2012) has further observed that underlying the assumption that REDD+ could be a relatively cheap option for climate change mitigation are the low opportunity costs of compensating poor people for not cutting down their forests. Nevertheless, these opportunity costs are low only as long as people remain poor, and reducing their poverty would therefore go against the economic rationality of REDD+.

Lohmann (2012) has also criticised the logic of opportunity costs on the grounds that it leads REDD+ project developers to favour projects on lands controlled by the poorest people, who then risk being displaced, which comes at a human cost not included in the calculations. Critics have also warned of the potentially perverse incentives, rent-seeking, or 'moral hazard' that REDD+ carbon credits might encourage, which could lead to land grabbing, corruption, and inflated deforestation baselines aimed to maximise REDD+ payments (Karsenty & Ongolo, 2012; Lohmann, 2012; Lang, 2016; McAfee, 2016).

The critique of REDD+ in general, and the market approach in particular, is extensive. The issue of land, forest, and carbon tenure is one main area of debate. REDD+ interventions are often planned in areas where tenure is weak, contested, and/or insecure (Sunderlin *et al.*, 2014). In many areas governments hold formal ownership over areas where indigenous peoples and local communities have customary claims to land. This has prompted debates over how to ensure that REDD+ does not result in local people losing access to, or control over land, or are excluded from sharing the benefits accruing from REDD+ payments.

Another critique relates to the North/South relations embedded in a market approach allowing for trade in emission offsets and carbon. REDD+ has been criticised for diverting attention from the disproportionally large role countries in the global North have played in causing climate change, and their responsibility for reducing emissions (Gupta, 2012). Instead, offsetting emissions in the North allows for the continuation of business as usual, while constraining behaviour and opportunities in the South (McAfee, 2012). These unequal relationships are concealed by the purported neutrality of the transaction, which presents carbon as interchangeable units. The de-contextualisation inherent in carbon accounting approaches is central for understanding how gender is treated in REDD+. Based on this perspective I investigate, in Paper II and the overall analysis (Section 5.3), what the focus on standardised solutions defined at international and national level means for implementation of local level REDD+ interventions. Further, in Paper III, I discuss attempts by women's organisations at overcoming the decontextualisation and depoliticising effects of REDD+ programs.

Another important piece of the puzzle for understanding the role of gender issues in REDD+ is the way social and environmental issues beyond carbon have been brought in as separate issues, or add-ons, in the form of co-benefits or safeguards. This is discussed further in Paper III. In the next section I introduce how the need to present REDD+ as a "win-win" solution has shaped policy proposals.

2.3 Win-win expectations/looking beyond carbon

An important factor in understanding REDD+ are the additional benefits - sometimes described as automatic co-benefits, sometimes seen as additional objectives – that REDD+ projects are meant to provide in terms of, for example, poverty reduction, biodiversity conservation, and improved gender equality in local forest management. The win-win expectations provided a momentum for REDD+, attracting donors such as Norway, pledging around 500 USD per year for the coming five years, arguing (in the words of the Minister of Environment

and International Development) that "if designed properly, REDD may produce a triple dividend – gains for the climate, for biodiversity and for sustainable development" (Solheim, 2008). The FCPF website states that "stopping deforestation and forest degradation and supporting sustainable forest management conserves water resources and prevents flooding, reduces run-off, controls soil erosion, reduces river siltation, protects fisheries and investments in hydropower facilities, preserves biodiversity and preserves cultures and traditions" (FCPF, 2015). In the same spirit Burkina Faso's REDD+ program is described as a "triple win" expected to promote climate change mitigation, adaptation and poverty reduction (see Paper II).

This win-win approach, and the notion of co-benefits – a term examined more closely in Paper III – initially provided legitimacy to REDD proposals (den Besten *et al.*, 2014). The push for including biodiversity, development and poverty reduction goals in REDD+ UNFCCC texts and project design and implementation, came partly from international conservation NGOs and development NGOs (Angelsen & McNeill, 2012). In addition, much of the funding for REDD+ pilot initiatives was drawn from aid budgets, which are bound to development and poverty reduction objectives (ibid.). At the COP16 held in Cancún in 2010, a number of safeguards, aimed at avoiding negative or adverse environmental or social effects of REDD+ were adopted (UNFCCC, 2011). These safeguards include respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples, full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, and conservation of biodiversity.

Bee and Sijapati Basnett (2016) have drawn on feminist debates around participation in forest governance and participatory development to consider how gender could be addressed in REDD+ safeguards. Based on previous literature they conclude that participatory approaches need to be carefully designed, paying attention to social relation within communities, based not only on gender, but also other social differences based on age, class, caste, ethnicity, and religion among others, in order to avoid perpetuating exiting inequalities. They further emphasise that gender risks being rendered technical[3] as it is institutionalised in REDD+ safeguards, but also flag an opportunity for early action initiatives to consider the complexity of gender, and the specificity of each context, due to the lack of clear guidance on how safeguards should be designed, reported and monitored (ibid.: 12). In Paper III one such initiative, by the Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO) in collaboration with the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (REDD+

3. "Rendering technical" is a term used by Tania Murray Li (Li, 2007) to describe the practices concerned with representing a policy domain as clearly bounded and intelligible, and possible to deal with through specific techniques and interventions which will produce predictable results.

SES), to promote greater consideration of gender in implementation of REDD+ safeguards, is analysed.

The importance of poverty reduction and development as additional objectives of REDD+ has meant that community forestry projects, with support to local forest management groups, are often the focus of REDD+ programs, although deforestation is often caused by external factors, such as international demand for agricultural products, timber, and fibre for pulp and paper (e.g. Abood *et al.*, 2015; Rodrigues Faria & Nunes Almeida, 2016). Weatherly-Singh and Gupta (2015) have found that REDD+ projects are generally unable to respond to drivers of deforestation related to international demand for timber and agricultural commodities, and often these are not even identified as relevant driving forces of deforestation in project documents. Others have also pointed to this inability of REDD+ to address global deforestation drivers (Gupta, 2012). Instead, focus lies on local people's activities in the forest, despite the narratives on poor people's fuelwood demand and shifting cultivation as the main causes of deforestation in Africa having been widely discussed and disputed (Fairhead & Leach, 1995; Ribot, 1999; Ickowitz, 2006).

Thus, REDD+ projects, although also dealing with legal and institutional reform, have largely come to focus attention on local projects and creation of alternative incomes for local people, in line with the win-win approach, which makes international demand for land invisible. As Thompson et al. (2011: 102) argue, in the conceptualisation of REDD+ the causality of deforestation is oversimplified, and a disproportionately large portion of the blame assigned to local communities. Arora-Jonsson et al. (2016) analyse the way REDD+ assigns new, global responsibilities for forest conservation to people in the global South. I draw on similar arguments in the analysis of this thesis, and Papers I and II, to show how these responsibilities risk falling disproportionately upon women.

2.4 Case studies of gender in REDD+

Studies of gender in REDD+ so far clearly point to a lack of women's voices in policy formulation as well as project development and implementation. Instead, gender is often brought in as a bureaucratic obligation, without commitment to achieving real change, or in solutions which are based on preconceived notions of what women do, and what their interests are. At the level of the UNFCCC, gender has played a minimal role in REDD+ texts. Gender was first mentioned in the UNFCCC texts on REDD+ in the agreement from Cancún, which requests countries to address gender considerations when developing their national strategies on REDD+ (UNFCCC, 2011: 13). Following this request, and in line with their gender mainstreaming commitments (see Section 4.2), international

organisations working with REDD+ implementation, such as the UN and the World Bank, developed guidelines on how to include gender issues in REDD+ implementation (UN-REDD, 2011, 2013; CIF, 2014).

The lack of attention to, and knowledge of, gender issues is a recurring theme in the literature, which consists primarily of local and national case studies of REDD+ programs and projects. One of the earliest studies of gender in REDD+ was conducted by Peach Brown in the Congo Basin (Peach Brown, 2011). She showed that gender issues were not addressed in the early REDD+ process of Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Central African Republic and when they were eventually included, it remained unclear whether enough was done to actually address the complexities of gender in resource governance at the local level. Khadka et al. (2014) concluded in their study of the Nepalese REDD+ program that the government and other project implementers lack the capacity for ensuring gender sensitivity in project implementation. A national level study of the Indonesian REDD+ program, found that with a few exceptions, policy documents demonstrated a limited understanding of gender issues (Wornell *et al.*, 2015). Similarly in the government agencies implementing REDD+ in Vietnam the knowledge of gender issues has been found wanting and concern for gender limited (Pham *et al.*, 2016).

Like Paper I of this thesis, Wornell et al's (2015) study is a document analysis of a REDD+ program. While Paper I comprises an analysis of the REDD+ process, and includes analysis of interviews with policy makers and policy meetings, Wornell's study is a content analysis with emphasis on quantitative analysis, and focused on gender mainstreaming. They found that less than 4% of over 400 analysed documents incorporated gender mainstreaming principles, indicating a failure to truly mainstream gender in the program.

Studies of gender in local-level REDD+ implementation have drawn similar conclusions of lacking or failing approaches. In a comparative study of women's participation and voice in community forestry groups in REDD+ sites in six countries in Latin America, Africa and Asia, Larson et al. (2015) observed that men were more involved in the decision to implement REDD+, and even when women were involved their role was less active than that of men in the same village. Women were also found to be less informed about REDD+ projects in their village than men, a finding that concurs with that of Khatun et al. (2015) in Tanzania, and Krause et al. (2013) in Ecuador. In their study of women's participation in REDD+ in the DRC Stiem and Krause (2016) concluded that the failure to promote full and effective participation of women risks marginalising them further.

The focus of this thesis is on the global discourses relating to gender in REDD+. In the next section I introduce the methodology and methods of analysis.

3 Analysing gender in climate policy

In order to analyse the discourses on gender in climate policy, and specifically REDD+, I have analysed policy documents and interviews with policy makers, complemented with fieldwork in two REDD+ villages in Burkina Faso. This chapter introduces the methodological points of departure, data and methods of analysis used in the thesis. I present the reasoning behind the choices of material and methods, as well as the limitations of the chosen methods. I also reflect on my own background and positionality in order to increase the transparency of the research process.

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 Analysing policy discourses

Discourses in policy documents and texts can be studied in many different ways. In this thesis, I draw on Hajer's definition of discourse as a set of ideas, concepts, categories and representations, produced and reproduced in a particular set of practices, and through which meaning is given to physical and social realities (Hajer, 1995: 45). The concepts and categorisations of a discourse limit what is considered meaningful in a specific historical, institutional and cultural context, and thereby what can be thought, said, or imagined.

Analysis of policy documents provides an opportunity to examine how policy problems are constructed and to understand why specific policy solutions are favoured over others (Bacchi, 2012). The policy documents which are the focus of my analysis are the key instrument for making and shaping REDD+ policy at the international level. I also analyse the documents of women's and environmental NGOs working to influence REDD+ policy making in relation to gender. These documents provide information about how these organisations are trying to position themselves and the issue by publishing reports, lessons

learned, and case studies, and by engaging with the institutions leading the formulation of REDD+ as consultants and advocates.

By shaping the formulation of policies, discourses produce material impacts. Bacchi (1999: 45) identifies three categories of material effects from discourses: the constitution of subjects and subjectivities; the effects following the limits on what can be said; and the 'lived effects' of discourse. The constitution of subjects is of particular interest in feminist and gender analysis. Through policy discourses, certain subject positions or subjectivities are constructed (Bacchi & Eveline, 2010). These are not imposed or determined, but they restrict what social identities or subject positions can be imagined. In relation to climate change and gender, for example, certain way of thinking and talking about women in relation to the environment – e.g. as vulnerable or virtuous (cf. Arora-Jonsson, 2011) – may limit their scope for action beyond those stereotypes.

However, the plurality of discourses ensures a plurality of subject positions, thereby providing an opening to constant redefinition. Individuals construct their identities drawing on such subject positions, often from multiple, competing discourses (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Such positioning is also an act of power, because it produces and reproduces discursive categories of inclusion and exclusion which constitute and produce social relations (Howarth, 2010: 310). Bacchi (1999) notes that the subject positions assigned to groups through policy making may have disempowering effects on those groups, restricting their agency. Understanding the role of policy formulation and implementation in constituting subject positions and subjectivities is central to the study of how policy is gendered and gendering, thus serving as an important point of departure for this thesis.

Analysis of policy discourses can include statements and utterances of policy-makers, policy documents including laws, plans and strategies, as well as policy practice and action (Sharp & Richardson, 2001). While some approaches place their emphasis on linguistic and textual elements, such as the critical discourse analysis of Van Dijk and Fairclough (Wetherell *et al.*, 2001), others take a broader perspective, seeing language as one important aspect but placing more emphasis of social and historical context for example. In my analysis, I have drawn on approaches emphasising interpretation of implicit assumptions, creation of subject positions, and institutional contexts, rather than focusing on linguistic elements, although language is not unimportant in these types of analysis either.

One approach to policy analysis, which I have used extensively in the overall analysis of the thesis and in the papers, is Bacchi's (1999, 2009) 'What's the problem represented to be' (WPR) approach. Bacchi (2012) relies on a social constructivist perspective, seeing policies and policy proposals as prescriptive

texts that rely on particular representations of a problem, or problematisations. She proposes that by asking how a policy problem is represented it is possible to gauge the assumptions about what needs to change and what constitutes the 'problem', underlying these representations. To use an example from my analysis, the proposition in Burkina Faso's REDD+ program that investing in women's commercial activities related to non-timber forest products (NTFPs) could improve their social status, seems to imply that women's subordinated position is caused by their poverty. In Paper I we analysed how problem representations were used to bring actors together under a specific policy program. The WPR approach also encourages asking how problems could be represented differently by different actors, as I do in my second research question, and as we do in Paper III.

Specifically, the WPR approach relies on a set of questions to be asked to the research material, presented in Table 1. In my analysis for the different papers, and for the overall analysis of the thesis, I have drawn on these questions to varying extent, as I will show in Section 3.2 below. Bacchi (2009) also proposes a seventh step of reflexivity in the analysis, where the researcher asks the same six questions to their own problematisations. I apply this approach in Section 3.5.

Table 1. *Bacchi's What's the problem represented to be (WPR) approach.*

Question	Notes
Q1. What's the problem represented to be in a specific policy?	Read from the proposed policy what is the implied 'problem'
Q2. What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the 'problem'?	Identify underlying concepts, binaries, categories (Foucauldian archaeology)
Q3. How has this representation of the 'problem' come about?	Focus on processes and practices that led to the dominance of a certain problem representation (Foucauldian genealogy)
Q4. What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the 'problem' be though about differently?	Draw on cross-cultural comparisons/comparisons of problem representations over time
Q5. What effects are produced by this representation of the 'problem'?	Discursive effects, subjectification effects, lived effects. Look for who is likely to benefit/be harmed
Q6. How/where has this representation of the 'problem' been produced, disseminated and defended? How could it be questioned, disrupted and replaced?	Consider past and current challenges to this prepresentation of the 'problem' and the discursive resources available for re-problematisation

In feminist policy studies, and policy studies relating to gender issues, Bacchi (1999, 2009) has been ground-breaking with her WPR approach, which

highlights the role of knowledge practices and power relations in policy formulation. This approach has been used in policy analysis in a range of research fields, including policies on domestic violence (Murray & Powell, 2009), policy debates on domestic services (Kvist & Peterson, 2010), and forest policy relating to climate change and gender (Holmgren & Arora-Jonsson, 2015) to mention a few. In relation to gender mainstreaming, a number of studies have drawn on Bacchi's approach to develop a *critical frame analysis* which analyses discourses as 'policy frames' serving as organising principles that give meaning to and shape the understanding of reality, resulting in particular policy proposals (Verloo, 2005; Verloo & Lombardo, 2007; Elias, 2013).

In the field of environmental policy, discourse analysis has been a prominent approach since the early 1990s (e.g. Liftin, 1994; Hajer, 1995; Dryzek, 1997, 2005; Humphreys, 2009). Hajer and Versteeg (2005: 176) argue that the appeal of the social constructionist approach in the study of environmental policy lies in the opportunity it offers to analyse the struggles over meaning, interpretation and implementation of the complex policy processes relating to the environment. The role of science and knowledge has often been in the spotlight in such analysis, for example in Liftin's (1994) examination of in the negotiations of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. Liftin (1994: 194) emphasised that environmental problems are not merely a matter of scientific knowledge, and discourses "offer alternative interpretive lenses through which problems can be viewed, lenses that lend themselves to certain policy solutions". This way, discourse analysis can highlight the role of power and politics in policy processes. Dryzek (2005: 11) holds that language, and what is said or stated in policy texts, matters, because the way environmental problems are constructed, interpreted, discussed and analysed has consequences. For example, in Paper I of this thesis I analyse how the deforestation discourse dominating the REDD+ program of Burkina Faso leads to specific solutions and narratives about who is part of the problem.

Bäckstrand and Lövbrand (2006: 52) write that policies are products of discursive struggles, favouring certain descriptions of reality, and empowering certain actors while marginalising others. Because discourses discipline the way human agencies think, speak, and act, power is an integral part of discourses (Arts & Buizer, 2009). Although discourses are not necessarily produced intentionally by specific political actors, recognising that they are located in an institutional context can draw attention to the differential power of actors in their creation (Bacchi, 1999: 43). This makes discourse analysis a useful tool for analysing power in policy processes such as REDD+, asking whose interests are promoted by a specific discourse, or who may be disadvantaged. In my analysis I draw on this perspective for example in the discussion about resource use and

access at the local level (Paper II), but also in the analysis of actors, and who is included or excluded in the policy processes at national and international level (Section 5.2).

Both Dryzek (2005) and Hajer and Versteeg (2005) emphasise that while power is embedded in discourses, and not easily located, understanding the role of different actors and interests is crucial in discursive policy analysis. Actors draw on different discourses or discursive categories to position themselves and exercise power (Hajer & Versteeg, 2005). The analysis of discourse in policy texts and documents must therefore also pay attention to the actors or agents involved in their formulation. The overall analysis of the thesis included attention to who was involved in writing what documents, how different institutions relate to each other in the process of formulating policy documents, and how certain policies forward specific interests. Actors are also present in the analysis of women's organisations efforts to increase attention to gender in REDD+ policy. In Paper I actors are also included through interviews with policy makers and attendance at policy meetings, and by bringing into the analysis the interests of different actors. In Paper II the actors and agents also play a prominent part through the analysis of interviews and REDD+ meetings (see Section 3.2). In Paper III, I use the attempts at challenging dominant discourses on gender in REDD+ by two women's groups, WEDO and Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (WOCAN), to bring the role of different actors in policy processes into clearer view.

I consider as dominant, the discourses that are shared among policy makers and which shape how policies are formulated and problems defined in policy documents. I also refer to mainstream discourses, meaning those discourses that are predominant in the documents. Because discourses produce meaning, it may be difficult also for the researcher to take an outside position and analyse them from a distance (Bergström & Boréus, 2013: 402). However, as Dryzek (2005) emphasises, at any given time, there is not just one, but several discourses. Therefore, by drawing on comparisons between different policy documents, other policy fields, or how similar problems have been dealt with in other contexts it may be possible to identify discourses (Bacchi, 2009). For example, I turn to the areas of development and environmental management, and literature analysing policy in these fields, to facilitate the identification of discourses on gender in REDD+ policy. In addition, although at any given moment a specific discourse may be hegemonic[4], the existence of competing meanings and

4. Hegemonic discourses can be defined as those discourses which, at a moment in time, are accepted as true, appearing as natural aspects of reality, while excluding other meaning potentials (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002).

discourses suggests that there is space for contestation (Bacchi & Eveline, 2010: 6).

3.1.2 Gender as an analytical category

Throughout the thesis I use gender as an analytical category, to show how the implications of climate policies are structured by power relations. I regard men/women as discursive categories whose meaning, far from being stable, is contingent on the social, political and cultural context in which they are used. In addition, gender intersects in myriad ways with other social identities e.g. race, class, ethnicity, and it is impossible to single out one dimension and isolate the effects from other dimensions (McCall, 2005). I consider the *intersectional* perspective, which takes into account a range of social identities, as an integral part of gender analysis. Crenshaw (1991) pioneered intersectional theory in her work on the invisibility of black women in political projects on domestic violence which ignored difference within the group of women. An intersectional perspective can shed light on the power effects of categorising people. The intersectional perspective is most explicit in Paper II. However, a point of departure in all analysis of subject positions and subjectification effects has been that social relations are structured by more than gender, and nationality, ethnicity, class, and level of education among other aspects, have been important additional analytical categories throughout the analysis.

Gender and other social categories like ethnicity, class, and "race", cannot be taken to have a fixed or universal meaning. They must be analysed in a specific context. This is important to take into account in the formulation of policy, such as REDD+. If gender relations are taken to mean the same thing or play out identically across contexts, even policies attempting to take gender relations into account risk failing, or having adverse effects. The emphasis on the contingency and context dependence of social relations, and the multitude of social identities, risks being taken as a reason to focus on individuals rather than groups. Therefore, feminist scholars have emphasised the need for contextual and systematic gender analysis, which recognises that social identities and differentiated experiences are group-based, not individual, although the groups are multiple and the boundaries may be fluid (Hill Collins, 2004; Walby *et al.*, 2012).

3.2 Method of analysis

The discourse analysis of REDD+ and climate policies and project documents was the primary method of this thesis. It has provided insights into how gender

issues are brought into, and dealt with, in REDD+ policy debates, policy formulation and project design. The fieldwork served as an important complement to this, contextualising and grounding the discourses in a material reality.

The policy documents were read several times, both in complete readings, and by using search functions to find key concepts and terms in the documents. The focus of the analysis of documents and interviews was on gender – how women/men/different groups are described in project proposals, the subject positions they are assigned, what the problem of gender equality was represented to be, and what measures are proposed for including women and/or dealing with gender inequalities. In addition to explicit statements about gender and women, discourses with implications for the way gender issues are treated were identified.

The identification of discourses was done drawing on existing literature on gendered discourses in global governance and environmental policy. This included discourses which have been identified as gendered or masculinist in previous literature, such as ecological modernization, technocratic/managerial policy discourse, marketization, and depoliticisation of REDD+ (cf. Kurian, 2000; MacGregor, 2010; Bee *et al.*, 2015). More on these discourses and literature can be found in Chapter 4 and the papers. Based on the reading of the documents, I identified a number of recurring problematisations, policy solutions and characterisations of gender relations which could be coupled to these discourses (see Table 2).

Table 2. *Problematisations and solutions identified in texts*

Rationale for inclusion of gender in climate policies	
Success	Women's inclusion, or gender sensitivity, is a means to achieve greater success in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, or sustainability of activities
Equity	Gender equality is a right, and an objective in its own
No-harm	Gender sensitivity is necessary to avoid increasing inequalities
Co-benefits	Gender equality will be a co-benefit from climate change activities
Solutions	
Indicators	Application and/or development of gender-sensitive indicators in project development, implementation, and evaluation
Data-collection	Collection of sex-disaggregated data to support project development
Safeguards	Application of safeguards and participatory approaches
Mainstreaming	Gender mainstreaming
Capacity building	Capacity building at all levels, and integration of gender expertise
Characterisation of gender relations	
Roles	Women and men have specific roles, responsibilities and rights in relation to natural resource management and the environment

Rationale for inclusion of gender in climate policies	
Knowledge	Women have particular knowledge or perspectives based on their specific experiences, that can/should be taken into account
Vulnerability	Women are particularly vulnerable to climate change and have less adaptive capacity
Virtue	Women as more environmentally friendly, willing to take action, potential agents of change
Disadvantage	Women lack education, access to resources etc. compared to men

Texts often contain contradictions or tensions. It is important to handle these contradictions with care in the analysis, and acknowledge them clearly when they are apparent (Bacchi, 2009: 20). I strived to recognise contradictions, and highlight them when they were important to the analysis. For example, gender strategies and plans often struggle with the tension between gender as a matter of equity or as a matter of efficiency, and both perspectives may be present in the same document, although one often takes precedence (e.g. the UN-REDD report 'The business case for mainstreaming gender in REDD+' (2011), see Section 5.1).

For the analysis of the three papers, the questions I ask the material and data largely draw on Bacchi's WPR approach (see Table 1). In Paper I, I study the problematisations, trying to understand how, in a national REDD+ program such as Burkina Faso's, the global discourses on gender and deforestation shape policy formulation. I also examine the subjectification effects (cf. Bacchi, 2009) of these problematisations, i.e. what subject positions different actors were assigned, and how blame and responsibility are assigned.

In Paper II, I continue the analysis of problematisations, and put these in relation to the data collected in the fieldwork, as a comparison between the reality described, or conceived in the policies, and the reality described and conceived in conversation with the villagers, or subjects of policies and projects. The fieldwork, although limited, provides insights into the way policy makers related to the subjects of the REDD+ program, and examples of the assumptions made in policy formulation and their discrepancy with what was happening in the villages. I identify significant blind spots and exclusions in the REDD+ policies and projects of Burkina Faso, thereby emphasising the limitations, and the force of preconceived assumptions in policy discourses.

I also study subjectification effects (Bacchi, 2009), analysing how people are categorised and described in the policies. I relate this to how interviewees in the villages identified themselves, and to the way social relations and identities matter in resource use in the villages. For example, ethnicity plays an important role in regulating who has access to NTFPs in ways that remain unacknowledged in the policy documents. The intersectional analysis draws on categories

identified as relevant in advance, through literature, my pre-existing knowledge, and conversations with other researchers who are familiar with the context. These main categories are ethnicity, gender, age and migrant status. The way these categories are treated in the analysis however, is based on the meaning they were given in the villages and by informants, as I try to be open to the fluidity of social categories, but also pin them down sufficiently to enable analysis (cf. McCall, 2005; Walby *et al.*, 2012).

Paper III poses the kind of queries prompted by Bacchi's (2009) sixth question, relating to the possibilities for questioning dominant discourses. In order to do this, I conduct a discourse analysis of two initiatives by women's organisations to bring a gender perspective into REDD+ programs and projects. The aim of this analysis is to understand how the two initiatives relate to dominant discourses on gender in REDD+, such as efficiency and market discourses, and thereby investigate their strategies and potential for bringing about change. I analyse websites of the organisations as well as their projects, documents outlining the projects and their methods, and descriptions of actions taken so far. The questions posed to the material include how they relate to mainstream discourses on gender in climate policy and REDD+, what subject positions they offer to women and marginalised groups, and if/what alternative discourses they present. Drawing on literature on feminist strategies and resistance in relation to policy processes, I also inquire into the organisations themselves, how they identify themselves in relation to the REDD+ process (activists/outsiders/insiders), and what relation they have to official institutions and REDD+ processes.

Paper III also includes an analysis of the historical development of the concepts of co-benefits and safeguards, and how their use and meaning in REDD+ came into being and has evolved. I inquire into how these concepts have been used by different actors and how their meaning has changed. This inquiry highlights the way concepts and the meaning they are given, change over time, although within the context of a certain discourse they may appear to be stable. For example, I show how safeguards have served as tools for financial institutions such as the World Bank to appease critique against negative social and environmental impacts of their investments. In the context of REDD+, however, safeguards have been advocated by NGOs in order to ensure the participation of indigenous people and local communities in decision making.

In the overall analysis of the thesis, I draw on the results from the three papers, as well as analysis of additional material, in order to answer the two research questions. Drawing on Bacchi's framework, I inquire into the discourses on gender in REDD+, the actors that are active in producing and reproducing these discourses, and the impacts of these discourses. Finally, I

examine efforts at challenging mainstream policy discourses on gender in REDD+, and the opportunities and obstacles relating to these efforts. This analysis is presented in Chapter 5.

3.3 Material

The material analysed for this thesis consists primarily of policy documents relating to gender and REDD+. The document analysis is complemented with data from interviews with policy makers, observations from participation in policy meetings, and rural fieldwork.

3.3.1 Documents

I have analysed a range of documents issued by government agencies, donors, international institutions such as the World Bank and various UN bodies, and NGOs. All documents were available online, at the website of the respective organisations and programs. I have looked for documents at website, using their search functions and by searching through their document repositories. I have also looked in reference lists of documents and reports. I have searched for documents repeatedly during the course of my PhD studies (starting in 2012). As I describe in Section 3.4, I started working with REDD+ and reading policy documents already in 2009, while working as a research assistant.

In order to get an understanding of policy discourses, in this case related to REDD+, it has been useful to examine not only the specific policies, but also related texts and statements (Bacchi, 2009). In addition to documents related specifically to REDD+, also institutional guidelines, action plans, or gender evaluations are included in the analysis. In order to broaden my understanding of which discourses dominate in REDD+ policy making and projects design in relation to gender, I review a number of case studies issued by various NGOs, discussing how gender issues have been taken into account in REDD+ projects and programs. An overview of the types of documents analysed, and the time span they cover, is provided in Table 3. Each document type is described and discussed more in detail below, and the full list of documents is included in Appendix 1.

Table 3. *Analysed documents*

Document type	No of docs	Time span	Authors/issuing institutions
UNFCCC agreements	9	2007-2015	UNFCCC
IPCC reports	2	2007, 2014	IPCC
REDD+ pilot programs	20	2009-2017	UN-REDD, FCPF, FIP, CIF
Institutional documents	12	1996-2016	World Bank, UN bodies, UNFCCC and related institutions, EU, GEF
National REDD+ documents	21	2011-2016	Governments, ministries, funding institutions
Reports and policy briefs	28	2006-2016	NGOs, aid agencies, consultancies, research institutes, intergovernmental institutions
NGO project documents and websites	14	2013-2016	NGOs

UNFCCC agreements

The UNFCCC agreements contain the decisions taken on REDD+ within the framework of the convention. As legal documents, they constitute an institutionalisation of the discourse on REDD+ (cf. Bergström & Boréus, 2013: 407), and the foundation for the activities on REDD+ taking place across the world. The first decisions on REDD+ were made at the 13th COP in Bali in 2007, and the last is from the Paris Agreement in 2015. These texts are brief, and mainly outline the frameworks for REDD+ programs, and the technical aspects of monitoring and reporting. Therefore it is necessary to look beyond the UNFCCC agreements to understand what discourses dominate in REDD+.

IPCC reports

In climate change, an environmental problem coupled with great uncertainties relating to causes, processes, and impacts, policy makers are constantly turning to scientists for knowledge upon which to base policy solutions. In this context, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has come to play a powerful role. The IPCC reports are meant to synthesise the most recent science and knowledge on climate change and climate policy in order to provide a scientific basis for policy makers (IPCC, 2017). For my analysis I focus on the periodic assessment reports of Working Group III of the IPCC, i.e. the working group assessing options for mitigating climate change. My analysis includes the assessment reports from 2007 and 2014. I look for references to gender and women in the reports. For Paper III, I also draw on the IPCC reports in my analysis of the use and development of the concept of co-benefits to show how its meaning has changed over time.

REDD+ pilot program documents

While the negotiation of REDD+ within the UNFCCC were still ongoing, a number of pilot schemes were set up to test different ways of designing REDD+ programs, and to prepare countries for implementation. These pilot programs – the FCPF, UN-REDD, and FIP (introduced above in Section 2.1) – were funded primarily with aid money from northern donor countries, notably Norway, the UK and Australia among the early donors. The documents of these pilot programs include program design documents, websites, templates for the development of national REDD+ programs, and guidelines on implementation of social and environmental safeguards and gender sensitive programs. It is in these documents that the policies on REDD+ are outlined in more detail, and therefore they are key to analysing gender in REDD+.

The majority of the documents were published between 2011 and 2013, which is when they were being developed and designed. I also include some technical reports produced by the UN-REDD Programme at later stages. The UN-REDD Programme, which is a joint collaboration between the FAO, UNEP and UNDP, has been active in disseminating information about REDD+ and producing reports and briefs on different topics relating to REDD+, while the FCPF and the FIP have focused more on the development of national REDD+ projects in collaboration with governments.

Documents of intergovernmental institutions

These documents are not specifically related to REDD+, but they guide the work on gender within institutions involved in REDD+. These include gender policies/strategies/action plans, assessments of gender work within the institutions, and gender mainstreaming policies specifically related to climate work. The issuing institutions include the World Bank, REDD+ pilot programs (UN-REDD, FCPF, FIP), UNFCCC and the related Adaptation Fund and Green Climate Fund (GCF), the European Union, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and UN Women. Again, a complete list of documents is available in Appendix 1. The authors of these documents are often (not always) unidentified.

National REDD+ plans and strategies

Burkina Faso serves as a case study of national REDD+ policy formulation in the thesis. I analyse the documents relating to Burkina Faso's Forest Investment Program (FIP), particularly those produced between 2011 and 2014. These were the years when the national REDD+ strategy was being developed, and before implementation started. The documents were written by government

representatives and staff at the Ministry of environment, in collaboration with the funding and implementing institutions of the program, i.e. the World Bank and the African Development Bank. Some documents were also written by consultants.

In addition to the documents from Burkina, I also include documents from other national programs, namely Tanzania, Mexico and the Democratic Republic of Congo in my analysis, to use as a comparison. These are primarily used to look for particular differences or similarities, for example in relation to what they say about NTFPs.

Reports and policy briefs on gender in REDD+

During the first years of negotiations on REDD+ in the UNFCCC, a range of actors participated in the discussions and debate about how REDD+ should be designed. NGOs and consultancies working on forests, environment, or indigenous peoples' rights, sometimes in collaboration with, or with funding from, aid agencies or international institutions such as the UN, published reports debating different approaches. A leading voice in REDD+ development and debate has be the Centre for International Forestry Research – CIFOR. Since 2007 and onwards, CIFOR has received large amounts of funding, in particular from the Norwegian government, for conducting research and publishing reports on different options for REDD+. Also the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and WOCAN have published a number of reports with case studies and/or recommendations for REDD+ design and implementation.

As REDD+ implementation has advanced across the globe, implementing and funding institutions have also published case studies and reports with experiences, recommendations, and lessons learned. My analysis focuses on case studies relating to gender issues, and the inclusion of women in REDD+.

NGO project documents and websites

For Paper III, I undertake an analysis of the women's organisations WEDO and WOCAN, and their efforts to promote awareness of gender issues in REDD+ implementations. I analyse texts on their websites and project design documents for WEDO's collaboration with the REDD+ SES in developing approaches for including gender issues in work on REDD+ safeguards, and WOCAN's W+ standards certification scheme for empowerment work in carbon projects (see also Paper III).

In the work with the overall thesis this is also complemented with documents from other NGOs working with gender issues in REDD+. The aim of this analysis was to identify in what ways the mainstream discourses on gender in

REDD+ are being challenged, and examine the potential for inserting alternative perspectives.

3.3.2 Interviews and meetings

In addition to document analysis, I interviewed actors involved in Burkina Faso's REDD+ process. This provided an opportunity to analyse how different policy-makers related to the documents, and to pose questions in order to better understand the arguments they draw upon. In particular, it also made it possible to analyse differences in emphasis between different actors, and look for different voices that did not come across in the policy documents. For example, it provided insights into the difference in emphasis on climate change mitigation or poverty reduction between the donors and the governmental agents.

The fifteen interviewees included officials from government branches, notably different bureaus of the Ministry of Environment which is responsible for the REDD+ process, World Bank staff, donor agents, as well as civil society representatives involved in Burkina Faso's REDD+ program. In addition I had informal conversations about the FIP process with an official of the African Development Bank. The interviews were conducted in Burkina Faso in October 2011, and February and November 2012.

The interviewees were chosen strategically, based on their role in the FIP/REDD+ process. In my work as a research assistance in a Sida funded research network on forests and climate (Focali – Forests, climate and livelihoods research network), I was invited to participate in a so called Joint Mission between the World Bank, African Development Bank and the Burkina Faso government, through contacts with Swedish embassy staff. This provided the opportunity to book interviews with key persons involved in the process. In conjunction with the Joint Mission, a stakeholder workshop was organised, where I met NGO representatives. The participation at the Joint Mission and the stakeholder workshop provided an opportunity to observe and listen to the discussions, as well as have informal conversations.

I have been in email contact with one of the World Bank officials, based in Washington, responsible for supervising the FIP process in Burkina. This way, I receive updates on the REDD+ process in Burkina Faso which are not always published on the FIP website, some project documentation, as well as comments on Papers I and II after they were published. Some of the comments and information provided in these emails are referred in the analysis as personal communication

I also attended four village meetings hosted by the FIP/REDD+ secretariat in the village of Gallo on March 26, 2015. The primary purpose was to discuss how

information about the FIP projects can be communicated to villagers. The meetings were with woodcutters, cattle breeders, women and hunter/fishers respectively, and had between 8 and 50 participants. Attendance at these meetings, and the conversations I had with the FIP staff in conjunction with them, provided insights into how the FIP/REDD+ administration approaches communities, and it contributed to the analysis of Paper II.

In addition to the case study, in October 2012, at the beginning of my PhD studies, when at the University of Gothenburg, I travelled to Tanzania to scope the possibilities of conducting another case study of the Tanzanian REDD+ process. This study was later dropped from my project, but during this visit, I conducted four interviews, one with the director of the national REDD+ secretariat, two with NGO representatives involved in different REDD+ projects, and one with staff at the Norwegian Embassy who provided a large share of the funding for the national program. These interviews were primarily aimed at getting an overview of the Tanzanian REDD+ programs and the current discussions surrounding it.

3.3.3 Fieldwork in Burkina Faso

In addition to the policy analysis, for Paper II I conducted fieldwork in two villages where REDD+ projects were being introduced. This served as an important complement to the analysis of policy documents. The rural fieldwork took place over four weeks in March and April of 2015. It was funded by CIFOR, and was conceived as part of a larger cross-country comparative study on REDD+ initiatives – the Global Comparative Study. The snapshot gained from this fieldwork provided an insight into the dominance of certain policy discourses and the solutions they promote within the framework of the REDD+ program. It served to contextualise policy proposals, and provided an opportunity to observe interactions between FIP staff and villagers as mentioned above. The data collection strategies were based on the accumulated knowledge and understanding of Burkinabè society and forest management from my recurring trips and stays in the country since 2011 (see Section 3.4).

The choice of Burkina Faso as a case study was partly due to the fact that I had already started studying the country's REDD+ process when my PhD project started (see Section 3.4 below for more on this). As a REDD+ country, Burkina Faso has particularities that makes it stand out in comparison to other REDD+ countries (see Paper I). Although Burkina Faso was, in many ways, not a representative REDD+ country, it had features that made it interesting to study in relation to the discourses on REDD+. The dependence on forest resources in rural areas made it interesting to those stressing the potential for poverty

reduction of REDD+ programs, and thereby for examining the role of these discourses. From a gender perspective, the assumptions about the role women would play in the program also made it interesting for analysing discourses on gender in REDD+ and their subjectification effects.

Study area

The fieldwork was conducted in two villages – Baouiga and Gallo – which are both part of the country's participatory forest management program, and are included in the REDD+ program. They are located in southern Burkina, Ziro province, about 80 kilometres south of the capital Ouagadougou. Three main ethnic groups are present in the area: Nuni, who are considered the founders of the villages and owners of the land, Moose, who are defined as migrants, but who are the majority in Gallo and possibly also in Baouiga, and Fulbe, a cattle-breeding, pastoralist group who are settled a few kilometres outside the village centres. For more detail on the villages, see Paper II.

The choice of villages was made in discussions with the national FIP secretariat, the regional forestry officer, and the chair of the Union of forest management groups (Groupements de Gestion Forestière – GGFs) in the area. Their different locations in relation to the main road (indicating different economies and dependence on the forest) and to the forest management area were part of the criteria for selecting villages.

Data collection

The methods for data collection included focus groups and interviews. The focus group discussions were a demand from CIFOR, who funded the fieldwork, as a method they use extensively in research projects across the world. Focus groups are popular with development organisations as a way to gather information in the preparatory phases of project interventions. Consequently, there is a range of methodological guides to be found (eg. Jost *et al.*, 2014; IDS, 2015; IISD, 2015). While they may sometimes take the form of simple group discussions on a specific topic facilitated by the researcher, focus groups often consist of one or several so called Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) exercises, such as mapping, ranking and drawing of seasonal calendars or activity schedules.

The focus group discussions were facilitated by a CIFOR employee with limited knowledge of the local languages, with the assistance of an interpreter who translated between the local languages, Nuni and Moose, and French, for me and the CIFOR assistant. Participants were initially asked to talk about the forest and bush around them and how it had changed during the past 10 years (or more if they preferred) and the reasons for these changes. After that, they

were asked to list the resources they get from the bush. They also listed the actors they encounter in the forest or bush, and discussed who they get along with and who they might have conflicts with, as well as modes of conflict resolution. The discussions took between 1 and 2 hours.

I took notes and documented the interactions between participants. I used participant lists taken at the beginning of each meeting to record who talked, in order to keep track of whether one or a few participants dominated the discussion or whether it was more evenly distributed. The discussions were recorded and later I transcribed the French parts.

We conducted 11 focus groups – seven in Baouiga and four in Gallo. The number of participants varied between 8 and 40, but most of the groups had around 15-25 participants. In Baouiga, the focus groups were divided by ethnicity and gender, i.e. separate groups for Nuni men and women, Moose men and women and Fulbe men and women. In addition we did one with 'youths' i.e. young men from all three ethnic groups. In Gallo we did one focus group with women and one with men in the village centre, in addition to one with men in the Fulbe settlement, and one with 'youth' i.e. young men from all ethnic groups.

I also conducted semi-structured interviews with the help of an interpreter, because I believed it would provide more in-depth information, and greater opportunities for unforeseen issues to come up. The aim of the interviews was to gain as much information as possible about how forests and forest resources are used and managed in the study area. This included both the formal forest management and men's and women's everyday use of environmental resources. The interview guide is given in Appendix 2. I often deviated from the guide to ask follow-up questions or pursue topics brought up by the informant, or skipped questions which were rendered irrelevant by other answers.

I conducted total of 48 interviews with 50 individuals (two co-wives and a mother and a daughter were interviewed together), given in Table 4. The interviewees included 2 male village chiefs. The interviews were conducted between March 23 and April 18, 2015. Interviews generally lasted between 25 and 30 minutes. In addition to individual interviews, I conducted four group interviews with 2-3 representatives from the forest management groups, and with representatives from 2-3 women's groups in each village.

Table 4. *Interviews*

	Gallo	Baouiga	Total
Moose	14	7	**21**
Women	7	3	**10**
Men	7	4	**11**
Nuni	3	8	**11**
Women	2	4	**6**
Men	1	4	**5**
Peul	9	8	**17**
Women	5	4	**9**
Men	4	4	**8**
Gouroumanche	1		**1**
Men	1		**1**
Total	**27**	**23**	**50**
Women	14	11	25
Men	13	12	25

The choice of interview subjects was a combination of key informants and a wider selection of interviewees based on the explicit ambition of talking to people with different perceptions and perspectives. This was primarily achieved by looking for an even mix of interviewees in terms of sex and ethnicity, and to some extent age. The assumption, based on literature and my previous understanding of the context, was that these characteristics might be important in determining what resources they use and how. Some interviewees were chosen because of their specific engagement with the forest (e.g. woodcutters, hunters, women picking fruit). Others were chosen more at random. Some contacts with interviewees were mediated by others, in particular all Fulbe interviewees were selected by their own authorities.

Interviews were documented in notes taken during the interviews, and most of them were recorded and transcribed. In addition I had informal conversations about the forest and forest resources which were documented in a field diary. I worked with two different interpreters, who spoke the two main local languages - Mooré and Nuni – and translated into French. The translations were not always entirely to my satisfaction since I struggled to convince the interpreters to make literal translations, not their own interpretations.

I constantly reflected over the impact of my own presence as a white, Western woman, as well as the fact that my interpreters were male. How and to what extent this affected the answers we got in interviews is hard to know. The fact

that people were willing to talk about breaking the rules in the forest however, indicated that they were not too intimidated by me, my interpreter, or the situation.

In addition to the interviews and focus groups, I attempted to gain as much understanding as possible about resource use and social relations in the villages by observing what was going on around me, going to the market, and sitting down to drink the local beer when I was invited. I was also invited to accompany a group of women when they went to pick néré and I followed a woodcutter to the forest.

As already mentioned, the fieldwork had obvious limitations, due to its brief extension in time, my lack of knowledge of the local language, but also in relation to the chosen methods. The interviews provided knowledge limited to the specific topic of tree resource use. Importantly, the fieldwork was aimed at complementing the discourse analysis, providing an additional perspective from which to analyse the policies. However, the focus group discussions, which were a demand from CIFOR, were designed without sufficient attention to my research questions and aims. The facilitator of the discussions was not familiar with gender theory and research. In addition, his knowledge in the local language was limited. In the end, the information provided by these discussions often overlapped with the interviews, serving to confirm what I had already learned, but with limited use in terms of providing additional perspectives.

3.4 My research journey

Yanow (2007: 116) writes that interpretative analysis can only be enhanced by reflecting on the context and positionality of the researcher. I believe that my own background and positionality in relation to the material and area of research is highly relevant.

I started working with questions relating to forestry and climate change in general, and REDD+ specifically, long before I was enrolled as a PhD candidate in September 2012. After graduating from my degree in economics and human geography with a Master's thesis titled '*The role of forestry in mitigating climate change. A study of the voluntary carbon offset market*.' (Westholm, 2008) (a theoretical analysis of asymmetric information in the market for voluntary carbon credits), I started working as a research assistant at Focali (Forest, Climate and Livelihoods research network), a newly formed network of Swedish researchers. Focali was initially funded by Sida, and later also by the Swedish Forest Agency. Its stated aim is to provide scientific knowledge to Sida and other Swedish authorities "in order to use forest operations to achieve climate-poverty targets" (www.focali.se). Focali was formed at a time when these issues were

gaining attention in the UNFCCC negotiations, as well as among donors and international organisation working with environmental aid and support to climate programs. Most of the work of the network focused on bringing together researchers from across Sweden working with these issues in various disciplines, including foresters, physical and human geographers and economists. The secretariat was initially placed at the Environmental Economics Unit at the department of Economics at the University of Gothenburg.

As a research assistant my main task was to write reports and policy briefs synthesising existing knowledge, current debates, and activities relating to REDD+. I worked with researchers and PhD candidates, but often took the lead in writing and gathering information since I was the only one working full time on this task. I wrote about the activities of the international REDD+ pilot initiatives including UN-REDD, the FCPF and the FIP (Westholm *et al.*, 2009; Westholm *et al.*, 2011b; Westholm *et al.*, 2012), and case studies of countries working with REDD+ (Westholm, 2010b, a), and about the relation between REDD+, poverty and livelihoods issues (Biddulph *et al.*, 2009). In a report commissioned by Sida we wrote about REDD+ and tenure issues (Westholm *et al.*, 2011a). At the time, academic literature on REDD+ was limited, and several of the reports were extensively cited. In this way I contributed to the grey literature on REDD+, and to some extent to the way REDD+ was discussed among policy makers.

Although there was room for critical perspectives, Focali's aim was to describe rather than critically analyse REDD+ activities. For its members, most of whom were natural scientists, it was an opportunity to reach out with research results, and create interest in their research topics among potential funders of research. Among the active members, social scientists were in a minority, and they were primarily represented by economists. Although critical perspectives were brought up and discussed at internal meetings, and also brought forward in publications, there was limited scope for theoretically based analysis. The reports I wrote were primarily descriptive. I read large amounts of policy documents, and reflected upon them, but within Focali the space for moving beyond the dominant discourses was limited, and I also felt I lacked the tools for bringing the analysis further.

I first started working in Burkina Faso as a research assistant at Focali. In the ambition to conduct a number of desk-based case studies, representing different bio-physical, economic, and institutional contexts, Burkina Faso was included as an example of a country with dry forests with low carbon content and low economic value, yet high deforestation rates and high forest dependency (Westholm, 2010a). In addition, Sweden had long experience funding forestry-related aid in Burkina Faso, and we were encouraged by a Sida employee in

Burkina Faso to consider using it as a case study. The encouragement and promise of support in terms of contacts and information from Sida staff was an important factor in our choice of Burkina Faso.

In 2011 I wrote a Focali report about Burkina Faso's REDD+ program together with a master's student from SLU who had done field work there (Westholm & Kokko, 2011). Due to my knowledge of REDD+ and the policy process in Burkina Faso, I was invited to participate in another research project called *Gender and REDD+: Global instruments and changing environmental governance* led by Associate Professor Seema Arora-Jonsson at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences. Working in this project I was introduced to a new field of literature, and new tools for analysing and theorising the policies and processes I had been following for years. It provided me with a space for critically discussing REDD+ that had not been available within Focali.

After almost four years as a research assistant with Focali, I was enrolled as a PhD candidate in a project ('Land use and forestry in international climate policy – global and local opportunities and risks') funded by the Swedish Energy Agency, led by my Focali colleague Associate professor Madelene Ostwald. I was placed at the Department of Economics, in a PhD program in Environmental Management and Economics. This made sense since I had a degree in Economics, but as I was trying to formulate the aim and questions of my PhD, I was repeatedly told I "did not ask questions like an economist", meaning that the questions I asked were not those that can be analysed with economic methods and theories. On the other hand, I had a growing feeling that the economic methods and theories were not enough to answer the questions I found important, such as power relations and social inequalities. My collaboration in the SLU project, analysing gender in Burkina Faso's REDD+ program, which became Paper I of this thesis and another paper (Arora-Jonsson *et al.*, 2016), contributed to this feeling, and drew me towards other ways of asking questions and analysing, especially power relations.

While still working at the Department of Economics I also started a collaboration with CIFOR. They were looking for a PhD student to work on a project on gender and REDD+ in Burkina Faso, and offered to pay for my fieldwork. The project was a part of the Global Comparative Study (GCS), and meant to contribute to fulfilling the donor demand of including a gender perspective in the GCS. The wishes from my Swedish supervisors at the University of Gothenburg, as well as from CIFOR, were that I would conduct a survey study focused on women's and men's forest resource use, including an intersectional perspective. From the start I pushed for including a qualitative component in the study as well. In January 2015 I travelled to Burkina for a three month fieldwork period. However, as planning progressed, it became clear to me

that with the limited resources at hand, I would struggle to complete a statistically sound data collection, much less collect an interesting qualitative material. I also found that the questions I wanted to ask in relation to gender and resource use in the context of REDD+ were not of the kind that statistical analysis can answer. My doubts concerning the methods and research questions eventually led to changes in the project, and negotiations with CIFOR resulted in a fieldwork that can be seen as a compromise between my approach and the standard CIFOR approach to qualitative data collection which was focus groups. This was also the start of my transfer of universities and discipline, to the Department of Urban and Rural Development at SLU, with Assoc. Prof. Seema Arora-Jonsson as a supervisor.

3.5 Self-problematisation

Self-reflection, and discussion about who produces knowledge, from what perspective, and for whom, are central questions in feminist research, as well as critical social science at large (Doucet & Mauthner, 2006). Feminist theorists have pointed to the role of the scientist and researcher in the production of knowledge, showing how they are not disembodied, neutral observers, but rather how the perspective of the researcher matters for what they see, and that their role can never be independent of the processes they study (e.g. Harding, 1986; Haraway, 1988; Barad, 1996). Such reflexivity on the ontological and epistemological position of the researcher in relation to the research field has increasingly come to be seen as an important aspect of research, emphasised not just by feminist scholars (e.g. Bordieu, 2004; Davies, 2008; Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009).

Bacchi (2009) proposes a seventh step of "What's the Problem Represented to be?" (WPR) analysis, which consists in self-analysis, or self-problematisation, subjecting your own problem representations to the six questions repeated in Table 5.

Table 5. *Questions for self-problematisation according to the WPR approach*

Questions for self-problematisation
Q1. What's the problem represented to be in a specific policy?
Q2. What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the 'problem'?
Q3. How has this representation of the 'problem' come about?
Q4. What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the 'problem' be though about differently?
Q5. What effects are produced by this representation of the 'problem'?

Questions for self-problematisation
Q6. How/where has this representation of the 'problem' been produced, disseminated and defended? How could it be questioned, disrupted and replaced?

Q1. What's the problem represented to be?

The question I set out to investigate is that of how gender is represented in REDD+ and climate change policy discourses, and how these discourses might be criticised and challenged. Implied in this way of formulating the research question lies an assumption that there is a problem with how gender is represented in mainstream discourse, and that there is a need to critically assess and challenge these representation.

Q2. What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the 'problem'?

The feminist perspective is a point of departure of my research. To me, this means taking the normative standpoint that social, political and economic gender equality is a desirable objective, and that policy making and implementation should strive towards this objective. Doing feminist research is part of a political commitment to produce knowledge that will be useful in the endeavour to make a difference to women's lives (Letherby, 2005). The formulation of the research questions in this thesis is in line with this ambition.

Further, as argued previously, I consider gender inequalities to be the result of unequal relations of power. Therefore, gender inequality must be treated on a structural rather than an individual level. These theoretical perspectives are also elaborated above in Section 3.1.2. I assume that the power imbalances embedded in gender and other social relations are present at all levels – in personal interactions as well as national and global policy making. These are all taken-for-granted outlooks in the way I analyse my material.

The need for taking drastic measures to tackle climate change is a conclusion of climate science. In relation to REDD+, I also have some normative standpoints, which shape my understanding of the policies. I consider it the responsibility primarily of those living in the global North, with lifestyles that cause the majority of greenhouse gas emissions, to take on the main part of the mitigation efforts, and reduce their emissions. From this perspectives, the North/South relations embedded in REDD+ are key to understanding the meaning and impacts of REDD+ policies and policy making.

Q3. How has this representation of the 'problem' come about?

My understanding and representation of the problem of 'gender' in climate change policy is informed by feminist theory, and specifically feminist theorising in relation to development, environment and natural resource management. Since the 1970s and the publication of Ester Boserup's (1970) seminal book "Women's role in economic development", gender scholars and feminist practitioners have been discussing international development institutions approaches to gender and women. These discussions have influenced the work of these institutions, leading from the 'Women in Development' (WID) approach associated with a focus on women and their productive roles and integration in the economy to 'Gender and Development' (GAD) highlighting the relational aspects of gender (Razavi & Miller, 1995). Discussions about women's relation to the environment also led to a perspective termed 'Women, Environment and Development' (WED), linked to the WID perspective (Leach, 2007). The intellectual debates concerning these perspectives, and the critique of the approaches to gender applied by international institutions also led to the adoption of gender mainstreaming policies (see Section 4.2).

The debates around the approaches to gender within international institutions' and aid agencies' work on environment and development continue. Gender scholars, feminist practitioners, advocates and activists all contribute to the analysis of experiences and theoretical development of the field. In the next chapter I discuss literature in this field of relevance to my analysis.

Q4. What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? What are the silences? Can the 'problem' be thought about differently?

My conceptualisation of the 'problem' represents but one way of looking at it. I have chosen to consider policy discourses, rather than to study the matter in terms of, for example, inclusion of women in policy processes and decision making, or the local impacts of REDD+ implementation. As mentioned above, I was initially expected to do a quantitative study of the impacts of REDD+ on resource use in Burkina Faso. This approach was advocated by my colleagues at the Department of Economics in Gothenburg as well as CIFOR. Such a study forms part of the standard approaches in the research of CIFOR, which draws on large scale surveys to produce quantitative data which is comparable across contexts (cf. Arora-Jonsson & Sijapati Basnett, 2017). One such example of a CIFOR study is that by Larson et al. (2015), which draws on surveys and focus group discussions to quantify the participation of women in decision-making relating to forest resources and REDD+ in 77 villages across six countries.

While quantitative approaches can provide data which is easily communicable with policy makers, and comparable across research sites, I find them insufficient for conducting intersectional analysis of the relations of power and social difference which regulate access to, and use of, forest resources.

The choice to analyse global policies was also motivated by a gap identified in the literature. Local case studies are important, and I discuss the importance of policies being based on understanding of the local context in the analysis. However, there is a need for increasing the understanding of the relevance of a gender perspective also in global policymaking, and for analysing the meaning of inadequately addressing gender at a global level.

Q5. What effects are produced by this representation of the problem?

My theoretical perspectives influence the questions I ask in my research, as well as my interpretation of the material and the results. This becomes obvious not least in relation to the local fieldwork.

There is an extensive discussion among development scholars as well as feminists about the dilemmas and problems facing westerns/northern scholars working on issues of development (Harcourt, 2016). During fieldwork, as mentioned above and described further in paper II, I constantly reflected on my own positionality. Because my fieldwork was limited in time, the opportunities for self-reflexivity were limited. However, this also made such reflection in the interpretation of the material even more important. In the analysis phase, an important part was also comparing my interpretations of events with existing literature from the same geographical area, dealing with the same ethnic groups, or similar use of natural resources. While this enabled me to minimise the risk of misinterpreting events, the final analysis and conclusions are my own, and clearly influenced by my point of view.

I studied resource use and access in the villages from the perspective of gender in REDD+ policymaking, and this shaped my understanding. The fact that my research question related to global policymaking influenced made me consider the village forest in relation to the forests of Burkina Faso and tropical forests across the globe, and in relation to global climate change mitigation, rather than seeing them exclusively as a local resource. Another research question would inevitably have given me a different perspective on the villages and the people who live there.

My analysis of the social relations shaping resource use and access in the villages is influenced by my research question, the theoretical points of departure, as well as my positionality as a white, Western, female, educated, and not speaking the local language. Inevitably, I look at the life of the people in the villages through the lens of my preconceived notions of good/bad, right/wrong,

as well as a certain degree of exoticism. Despite awareness of the powerful discourse of development and improvement which shapes the relations between the global North and South, I do not believe I am able to rid myself of this lens when studying life in rural Africa.

In addition, my perspective was influenced by the mediation and constant presence of a male, educated, Burkinabè translator, with whom I discussed my interpretation of events, and through whom all my conversations were filtered. The fact that the translator, and my colleague from CIFOR did not know any gender theory made it difficult to discuss the findings, information and interpretations. For example, they exclaimed that "See! It's not tradition" when male woodcutters told us the reason women don't go to the forest to cut wood because it's too far away, and they are not physically strong enough. The translator also talked about how one of the ethnic groups we interviewed are ungrateful liars who want the state, aid agencies and NGOs to hand everything to them. While this attitude did not show when we met with people from this ethnic group, it made me uneasy about the interpretations.

The people I interviewed are unlikely to analyse the problems relating to resource access or relations of power in the villages in the same way as I do. My claims to truth in the analysis lie not so much in the ambition to describe reality through the eyes of NTFP collecting women, pastoralists, or woodcutters, as in how I theorise what I see. My opportunity to reflect, theoretically analyse, and mediate an analysis of their reality, places me in a powerful position in relation to the individuals and communities included in my study. Therefore, it is important to be self-reflective about my own "horizon of understanding" and theoretical perspectives (cf. Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009), which shape what I see, and how I analyse and interpret my findings, but also not to claim to know what I do not.

Q6. How/where has this representation of the 'problem' been produced, disseminated and defended? How could it be questioned, disrupted and replaced?

My feminist perspectives are, as shown above, part of a wider debate among academics, activists and practitioners. In the next Chapter (4), I bring up some key arguments in this debate, and also resistance to them, particularly in terms of internal resistance within policymaking institutions at an overarching ideological and discursive level, as well as in the everyday, practical work of these institutions.

4 Gender and global climate governance

In this thesis, I examine discourses on gender in global REDD+ and climate policy, analysing how gender is problematized, the solutions proposed, and the subject positions assigned to women within the identified discourses. Further, I analyse the opportunities for challenging the discourses on gender which dominate REDD+ and climate policy making. With this analysis, I intend to contribute to filling a gap in academic literature, relating to the global perspectives on gender in climate change and REDD+ governance. In order to formulate policies that are conducive to gender equality, it is not enough to include a gender perspective at the local level, but policy making at all levels must pay attention to gender. Analysing discourses on gender in global policy making can contribute to visibilising the gendered assumptions and taken for granted truths upon which policies are often based.

In my analysis I draw on existing literature, not only relating to gender and climate change policy, but also gender and environmental governance more broadly. I also turn to literature on gender in international development, including gender mainstreaming, since the international institutions involved in REDD+ policy making and implementation largely comprise organisations working on international development.

After an initial review of the role of gender in global governance of environment and development, I turn to the question of how mainstream discourses on gender can be, and have been, challenged. First, I consider feminist critique of the dominant perspectives on gender and women's empowerment in international development and environmental governance. I then consider feminist debates about how change can be achieved, and strategies for challenging mainstream discourses in policy making.

4.1 Gender in climate governance

Buckingham and Le Masson argue in a recently published book on climate and gender that until gender inequalities and their role in producing anthropogenic climate change are understood and addressed, the world will fail to address climate change and its impacts (Buckingham & Le Masson, 2017: 3). The understanding of the role of gender relations in relation to climate change causes, effects and policies is a growing academic field. In this section I discuss literature on gender in climate governance, with relevance for my analysis. Hence, I particularly bring up writings relating to policy on climate change mitigation and REDD+, as well as gendered discourses and discourses on gender in climate policy.

One prominent theme in literature on gender in international climate policy and governance relates to matters of representation and participation of women in UNFCCC negotiations and policy processes (e.g. Hemmati & Röhr, 2009; Buckingham, 2010; Kruse, 2014; Olson, 2014). Both Buckingham (2010) and Olson (2014) argue that women's voices have been insufficiently included in decision-making relating to climate change. Kruse (2014) statistically analysed the share of women in state delegations, over time and across institutional and socioeconomic factors, finding a modest increase in the share of women, and a positive relation between women's representation and the level of development and degree of political gender equality in the country. Other work on international climate change governance and gender has reviewed the existing policies and treaties concerning gender in climate change policy (Skutsch, 2002; Raczek *et al.*, 2010). Morrow (2017) observes that there has been a reluctance to take gender issues on board in the global UNFCCC regime, in contradiction with the gender mainstreaming commitments of the UN.

In relation to discourses on gender in climate change, the focus on women's vulnerability has been extensively discussed in the literature. While early scientific literature on gender and climate change for some time focused on women as especially vulnerable to impacts from climate change (MacGregor, 2010), this perspective has been extensively criticised. Policy-making on climate change has often been dominated by discourses on women as victims and especially vulnerable to climate change (Resurrección, 2013). As noted in the previous chapter (3), basing policies on such restrictive subject positions can have material and disempowering effects (Bacchi, 1999). By labelling women as inherently vulnerable their agency can become restricted. The conceptualisation of vulnerability as an inherent condition has been criticised for the way it detracts attention from the underlying causes of vulnerability, including gender and power inequalities in decision-making in environmental management (Arora-Jonsson, 2011). Feminist researchers strive to problematize

the vulnerability perspective and highlight its multidimensional and relational aspects (e.g. Arora-Jonsson, 2011; Tschakert, 2012; Gonda, 2016). Carr and Thompson (2014), for example, emphasise that vulnerabilities are produced by context-dependent, gendered patterns of labour and responsibility, but also by intersecting axes of social difference, including age, income and ethnicity. Tschakert (2012) stresses that climate change interacts with, and cannot be separated from, other drivers of change, and that the impacts they have cannot be singled out and attributed to specific groups, but rather that it is necessary to apply a theoretical lens of intersectionality. This leads to a call for local case studies to contextualise vulnerability and the impacts of climate change and climate programs (Tschakert, 2012). From a policy-making perspective, it means that global policies such as REDD+ must not be based on fixed representations of gender roles, but should allow for flexibility and adaptation to the local context where it is implemented.

The focus on contextualised case studies of gender relations has thus been part of a feminist strategy to move away from the globalising nature of climate change discourses in order to highlight the context-dependent nature of gender and power relations. Drawing especially on Donna Haraway's concept of situated knowledge (cf. Haraway, 1988), feminist researchers have shown how climate science and discourses conceal the effects it has in reproducing power and marginalising certain perspectives and experiences of climate change (Tuana, 2013; Moosa & Tuana, 2014; Bee *et al.*, 2015). Climate change is often described as a global threat to all of humanity, which means that the way people are differentially impacted by it is overlooked (MacGregor, 2014). Tuana (2013) argues that the focus on aggregated impacts in climate science, e.g. by the IPCC, conceals the fact that beneficial impacts in one region are seen to offset adverse impacts in another region, meaning that harm in one place is considered acceptable as long as it does not affect the global majority. Newell (2008) in an analysis inspired by feminist political ecology, and focused on race and class, observes that the rationalist, economistic approach to environmental policy, favouring cost-benefit analysis and willingness-to-pay estimations as the basis for decision-making benefits interests of the rich and disempowers the poor. He concludes that the confusion of willingness and ability to pay in the climate change negotiations led to the faulty conclusion that people in the global South value action on climate change less than people in the global North (Newell, 2008: 78). In the context of REDD+, this economistic approach has led to the conclusion that conserving tropical forests is efficient because compensating poor people for opportunity costs of conservation costs less in the short run than reducing fossil fuel emissions, as discussed in Section 2.2.

The focus on technical and economic solutions has been criticised for making it difficult to find an entry point for introducing gender issues into the climate change negotiations (Terry, 2009). Hultman and Anshelm (2017) argue that global climate policy negotiations are dominated by a hegemonic masculinity that they characterise as "ecomodern", and which recognises the problem of climate change, but focuses on large-scale solutions such as carbon capture and storage, carbon markets, and geoengineering. Bee et al. (2015) and MacGregor (2010) analyse the technocratic, positivist discourses that dominate climate change debate and policy making, describing them as masculinist discourses that exclude women and women's experiences and concerns. As an example, Bee (2013), in her work with Mexican farmer men and women, uses the concept of situated knowledge to show that what women do - in the field and in the household - shapes what they know, but their ability to draw on this knowledge in climate change adaptation may be circumscribed by their access to resources or decision-making power. I draw on these writings about the discourses on climate change and their gendered impacts, especially in the discussion about technocratic discourses, and the representations of the problem of gender and subject positions they produce.

A consequence of focus in the literature on gender and climate change on contextualising gender relations through case studies, is an emphasis on climate change adaptation rather than mitigation. Whereas climate change mitigation primarily needs to take place where the emissions of greenhouse gases are greater, i.e. in the global North, the need for adaptation is greater in the global South, where the resources for resisting, or adapting to, impacts of climate change are scarcer.[5] Adaptation has been the focus of a range of studies on gender and climate change impacts and interventions in the global South (e.g. Denton, 2002; Ahmed & Fajber, 2009; Djoudi & Brockhaus, 2011; Tschakert & Machado, 2012; Bee, 2013). As Reed et al. (2014) note, there is a dearth of literature on gender, climate change, and forests in the global North. However, there is now a growing literature on climate change mitigation projects in the context of the global South, including carbon sequestration and reduced emissions from forests and agriculture, as well as REDD+.

Gay-Antaki (2016), in her study of carbon projects in Mexico, found that women were involved through separate projects, within the sphere of domestic activities and reproduction, as a form of exclusion rather than inclusion in the projects. She warned that this approach risks intensifying inequalities because it

5. This perspective is institutionalised in the UNFCCC agreements which requires so called developed countries to make quantified pledges of emissions reductions, and particularly emphasises the vulnerability of so called developing countries to the adverse effects of climate change (www.unfccc.int)

fails to address gender inequalities as a matter of structural constraints and relations of power. In the analysis of gender in REDD+ policy discourses, I discuss this way of including women or gender as separate projects, additional to the main project activities. Studying a project in Kenya where a switch from traditional to improved cookstoves generated carbon credits to the voluntary carbon market Wang and Corson (2015) concluded that although there were some benefits for the women implementing the project, their labour primarily contributed to the accumulation of wealth accruing to project investors in the global North. I relate such locally contextualised findings to the way gender issues are brought into climate programs at the international level.

The feminist critique of decontextualisation and technocratic discourses in climate governance have also been linked to processes of depoliticisation (MacGregor, 2014). Drawing on Swyngedouw (2010, 2011), MacGregor (2014: 620-21) identifies four components of this process of depoliticisation, namely i) the consensus that the climate crisis is a real and imminent threat to humanity, ii) that it is presented as a threat to humanity as a whole, in a way that makes material and ideological differences irrelevant, iii) the need for immediate action, predominantly in the form of governance-beyond-the-state, including through individual and personal responsibility for reducing emissions, and iv) the power of the scientific discourse to define the problem and how we ought to relate to it. I connect to this debate in the analysis (Section 5.3.1) in a discussion about how the tension between standardised policy solutions and the need for contextualising gender relations is dealt with in REDD+ policy making.

Both Stephan et al. (2014) and McAfee (2015) write about the depoliticising effects of conceptualising REDD+ programs as win-win solutions upon which everyone can agree. Social and environmental impacts beyond carbon, such as gender equality or biodiversity, are brought in primarily through discussions about co-benefits and safeguards, and treated as side effects rather than interlinked through political, economic and social structures. Yocum (2016), in a study of carbon accounting for the REDD+ process in Malawi shows that stripping away social and ecological complexities, and presenting carbon calculations as independent of context, is central to the constitution of marketable carbon credits. Li (2007) stresses that depoliticisation is a process, not an achievement, and that there is always a possibility for challenging the mainstream, technical discourse. In the analysis I discuss the attempts by women's and/or environmental NGOs at challenging the depoliticising effects of global policy making, and in particular the technical discourses dominating gender mainstreaming approaches. Also in Paper III I look at depoliticisation of gender in REDD+, whereby it is presented as a technical and economic matter, rather than as social relations of power, and specifically with the possibilities for

challenging this depoliticisation. This is done through an analysis of two initiatives by WEDO and WOCAN, two women's organisations, at promoting integration of gender issues in REDD+ processes and carbon projects, and possibly challenging the mainstream discourses on gender in REDD+.

4.2 Gender in global environmental governance

In order to analyse discourses on gender in REDD+ and climate policy, I look beyond the field of climate change, to see how gender has been analysed in environmental governance, but also in other governance contexts, specifically in international development institutions and interventions.

Bernstein and Cashore (2012: 586) observe that at the international level, climate change and forest degradation are governed by a range of mechanisms including legal, non-legal, governmental and non-governmental arrangements. The formulation of REDD+ policy, and its implementation, can be seen as a hybrid between climate change mitigation mechanism of the UNFCCC, transnational aid program and project-based interventions. Intergovernmental institutions or organisations (IGOs) such as the UN and the World Bank are some of the main actors involved in REDD+ policy formulation and implementation. In their support to the preparation of REDD+ readiness plans (see Section 2.1), the World Bank is a driving force in the production of knowledge relating to REDD+ programs, including setting up Measuring Reporting and Verification (MRV) systems, and producing specific representations of the problem of deforestation and of the livelihoods connected to the forest, according to certain templates.

These processes of knowledge production are an important part of creating a globally standardised REDD+ scheme, the framework for which has been decided in UNFCCC negotiations and within IGOs. Global environmental governance processes influence domestic policy making not just through international rules including treaties such as the UNFCCC, but also through the creation of markets, through international norms and discourses, and through the direct access to domestic policy process such as that gained by the institutions funding and designing REDD+ programs (Bernstein & Cashore, 2012). In the formulation of REDD+ programs, IGOs collaborate with governments or ministries to formulate the national programs, and NGOs and private sector actors are often responsible for the implementation of local projects in what has been described as heterogeneous, contingent assemblages (Arora-Jonsson *et al.*, 2016). In Paper I, I study the process of formulating the national REDD+ program in Burkina Faso as a negotiation between interests of the donors, the national government, and the World Bank. I study how the production of

documents following specific formats, and containing the right type of information, entails a process of knowledge production, whereby the discourses dominating international policy making on REDD+ (and gender) are transferred and turned into national policies. As noted in Chapter 3, an important part of discourse analysis is paying attention to the actors involved in promoting particular discourses or positioning themselves in relation to discourses (Hajer & Versteeg, 2005).

In order to understand the production and development of knowledge in international institutions, analysis of policy documents is key. Goldman (2005) describes the crucial impact of knowledge production in the World Bank's transformation of its image, from heavily criticised as a narrow-sighted investor and borrower in the development arena, into a driving force of a green neoliberal agenda. Strict regulation concerning the type of documents, and their content, which had to be produced in policy processes and project development was crucial in this transformation. While still heavily criticised, this knowledge production contributed to the Bank's lead position in environmental governance projects such as REDD+. Practices of knowledge production have featured in several analyses of governance processes relating to development and/or environmental interventions (e.g. Ferguson, 1994; Scott, 1998; Mosse, 2005; Li, 2007). Drawing on the work of James Scott (1998) and his book *Seeing like a state*, Broome and Seabrooke (2012) analyse how international organisations such as the World Bank exercise political power over states, based on their cognitive authority to measure, analyse and prescribe institutional changes. In Paper I, I analyse how the role of the World Bank and REDD+ donors in exercising such cognitive authority in Burkina Faso's REDD+ process, through the production of policy documents and demands on the national government to produce certain kinds of knowledge.

In relation to gender, Kurian (2000: 107), in a close examination of the World Bank's Narmada River project, shows how the focus on quantitative data collection and analysis of its Environmental Impact Assessments has resulted in the marginalisation of more complex issues of gender, environment and development, and gendered power relations. Kurian argues that the Bank is dominated by a masculinist thinking shaped by mainstream economics and engineering which does not encompass an awareness of, sympathy for, or commitment to gender issues (ibid.: 164). The complexities and context dependence of gender relations, roles, norms, and practices, Kurian writes, do not lend themselves to quantification and the mainstream policy formulation and operationalisation procedures of the Bank. The result is a depoliticisation of gender similar to that observed by MacGregor (2014) and Yocum (2016) in relation to climate policy and REDD+. MacGregor (2014) however, stresses the

need for resisting such depoliticisation through public action in local political spaces. In my analysis below, I discuss attempts at challenging the depoliticising procedures of the World Bank and other international institutions in the context of REDD+.

The international institutions implementing REDD+ and climate mitigation projects, including UN bodies and the World Bank, are all bound by organisational gender mainstreaming commitments. Gender mainstreaming policies stem from the Platform for Action adopted at the UN conference on women in Beijing in 1995, calling for governments and other actors to "promote an active and visible policy of mainstreaming a gender perspective in all policies and programmes" (UN Women, 1995: para 202). This means that gender analysis and gendered concerns are meant to be included at all levels of policy making (Arora-Jonsson, 2014). Institutional policies for gender mainstreaming were adopted by the UN in 1997, and the World Bank in 2001 (True & Parisi, 2012). Since then, most development institutions and international NGOs have adopted the terminology of gender mainstreaming and gender equality (Moser, 2005).

Since their adoption, gender mainstreaming approaches have been criticised for turning gender issues into a technocratic matter or a box to be ticked (Walby, 2005; Desai, 2007; True & Parisi, 2012). Already at the Beijing meeting in 1995, there was widespread critique against the treatment of gender issues in development institutions, for failing to address the relational aspects of gender, and thereby risking depoliticisation, by stripping away aspects of power and subordination (Baden & Goetz, 1997). As discussed further in Paper III, and as I show in the next section, many feminists have criticised the technical, quantitatively focused approaches for depoliticising gender relations, thereby compromising the possibilities for transforming power relations.

The study of gender mainstreaming of environmental interventions, and environmental policy is a limited field. Arora-Jonsson (2014: 297) observes that gender mainstreaming has not reached environmental policy like it did social policy. In the context of climate change policy and interventions, gender perspectives have not been taken into account to the same extent as in the context of international development (Hannan, 2009). As I discuss in the analysis in Chapter 5, the inclusion of gender considerations in global climate policy came late, and it is often discussed in terms of how gender equality can increase the efficiency of policy interventions. In addition, as discussed also in Paper I, gender concerns are often postponed for consideration at the local stage, rather than in global and national policy making.

Leach (2007) analyses discourses and narratives on gender in and the environment in policy documents of international aid donors and NGOs. She

concludes that in the 1980s and early 1990s, policy approaches drew on ecofeminist notions of women as natural carers of the environment, and as having a particularly close relationship to nature. Leach notes that the incorporation of this perspective may have had instrumental reasons, as they enabled the incorporation of women in project activities, and the mobilisation of women's labour, skill and knowledge (Leach, 2007: 72). The critique against these perspectives within academic, and feminist circles, grew in the 1990s. Jackson (1993), for example, emphasised that women's environmental relations, or their specific knowledge about the environment, cannot be understood in isolation from men's. Leach (2007) observes how, eventually, policy discourses started to shift to a greater focus on gender relations, but her document analysis also reveals fewer references to women or gender at the beginning of the new Millennium. In this thesis I develop this argument, by studying a greater number of documents, and a specific policy program, rather than stopping at the overarching narratives.

Tyagi and Das (2017) reviewed studies of gender mainstreaming of forest policy in forest governance in South Asia. They found two dominant approaches: 1) economic empowerment of women, and 2) inclusion of women in forest governance. Policies on inclusion of women have been the subject of debates around quantity vs quality (Tyagi & Das, 2017: 240). Work such as that of Bina Agarwal (e.g. 2010) stressing the positive effects of including a "critical mass" of women in forest governance institutions, has encouraged policies regulating a minimum share of women, e.g. one third. However, including women in existing organisation such as forest committees, in an approach described as "add women and stir" (Arora-Jonsson, 2014: 303), has been criticised for being insufficient. In Paper II I examine the likelihood of making currently marginalised voices heard in existing forest management groups. Ahlers and Zwarteveen (2009: 417), in relation to water governance, argue that 'inclusion' and 'integration' in formal decision-making bodies ignore social, cultural, and historical dimensions of gendered inequities, and therefore such policies are insufficient for overcoming structural inequalities. On the other hand, Arora-Jonsson (2010) showed how women organising in around credits and savings in India seized the opportunity to shape an agenda and make claims far beyond this initial purpose. This highlights the fact that interventions may have unexpected, and unintended effects that may be difficult to predict.

Alston (2014) argues that one barrier to the effective and transformative implementation of gender mainstreaming has been that it was conceived and conceptualised at the international level, while it needs to be implemented at the national and local level. She maintains that climate change offers opportunities to overcome this barrier due to the engagement of transnational actors at local

level, and in collaboration with state institutions. Nevertheless, there is not much pointing towards a renewed and revitalised approach to gender mainstreaming of climate policy, as the one Alston calls for, as I discuss further in the analysis in Chapter 5 and particularly in Section 5.3.1 where I examine the efforts at reconciling global climate policy with calls for adapting interventions to the local context.

In addition to the literature discussing global policy and environmental governance, my analysis has been informed by writings about gender and environmental governance and policy at the local level. Some of this literature is included in the discussion below on market approaches and commercialisation of environmental products and resources. Cleaver (e.g. 1999, 2002) has written extensively about the institutional models and participatory approaches of development and natural resource management interventions. She emphasises that interventions aimed at strengthening natural resource management should be based on understanding of the underlying principles and social effects of existing management institutions, in order to draw upon and reinforce the positive aspects of existing institutions, but without reproducing or glossing over social divisions or inequality (Cleaver, 2002). Her conclusions can hold important lessons for REDD+ interventions, which often draw on existing forest management institutions, as exemplified in Paper II. Feminist political ecologists have written about the way gender and other relations of social difference structure access to natural resources, and how social relations are reproduced in interaction with the environment in various ways, and with varying attention to race, ethnicity (Rocheleau, 1995; Gururani, 2002; Nightingale, 2011; Mollett & Faria, 2013; Lau & Scales, 2016). Such analysis could provide important insights to policy makers about the need for understanding social relations in their specific context.

4.3 Trying to make a difference

Dankelman (2002) notes that women's organisations and networks have played an important part in pushing for attention to gender issues in relation to international environmental policy, particularly relating to the processes concerning sustainable development. She stresses that this work can provide lessons for how to promote a gender perspective also in relation to climate change policy. In this section, I start by examining some of the key debates and critique brought forward by feminists in relation to the discourses on gender in international development and environmental governance, in particular the arguments relating to gender equality and women's economic empowerment, as

promoted by the World Bank and other international institutions and aid agencies, as well as feminist critique of markets as gendered institutions.

I then move on to a discussion about the role of social and natural reproduction and care, which are central concepts in the feminist critique of economic policy. I outline a framework for examining the gendered effects of REDD+ by linking the commodification of carbon and environmental conservation work with social and natural reproduction.

4.3.1 Economic empowerment, gender equality and markets

Market discourses play an important role at various level of REDD+ policy making, as I will show in the analysis (Chapter 7) and also have brought up in the papers. The idea that market forces alone, through economic empowerment of women and investments in women's productivity, would provide efficient outcomes in terms of gender equality and development have long been criticised by feminists (e.g. Moser, 1989; Calkin, 2015). Seeing empowerment purely as a matter of increasing economic opportunities fails to recognise that gender is a matter of social relations. This perspective also fails to acknowledge that markets are not neutral, but socially embedded institutions, structured by social relations, including gender, as many studies have shown (Rankin, 2003; Harriss-White, 2005a).

The critique against instrumental and individualistic approaches to gender does not imply that economic empowerment is unimportant. Supporting women's economic opportunities, as Doss (2006: 79) emphasises, is necessary, but not sufficient for improving their welfare. In a review of economic literature, Esther Duflo (2012) finds extensive evidence that reducing poverty can disproportionately benefit women because it reduces their vulnerability, expands their opportunities, or frees up time. She further notes that economic development is not enough, and that e.g. labour market discrimination, unequal access to higher education, and preferences for giving birth to boys have been shown to remain unchanged by economic development. Kabeer and Natali (2013) emphasise that there is extensive evidence that women benefit from economic growth and economic opportunities, but that impacts vary across economic contexts. Thus, while economic empowerment can have beneficial effects on women, the critique against the focus of such approaches of development institutions such as the World Bank, is directed at the one-sided focus on economics and markets as the solution, and the failure to acknowledge that power relations are embedded in market exchange.

This means that market-based approaches to women's empowerment, such as those relating to commercialisation of forest products examined here in the

context of REDD+, are unlikely to have the straightforward positive effects expected by policy makers. In an often used definition of empowerment, Kabeer (1999: 437) sees it as a process of change whereby those who have been denied the ability to make choices acquire such an ability. Although Kabeer's work on empowerment has influenced the World Bank and other development institutions, in their version it has often come to be stripped of some crucial aspects, leading to a focus on the assets and economic opportunities of individuals (or groups) (Cornwall, 2016). In the context of REDD+, women's abilities to make choices are expected to be improved by their earning larger incomes from non-timber forest products (NTFPs). As I discuss below, and in Paper II, these policies are based on simplistic assumptions about the causes of women's subordination, and ignore how access to resources is shaped by power and social relations.

The policies promoted by institutions such as the World Bank, in the context of development and/or the environment, focusing on markets as tools for promoting gender equality, fail to see the social and political world as integrated with the economic, and rather conceptualise them as separate entities. Feminist economists maintain the importance of acknowledging that individual choices are not purely rational choices of utility maximisation, but they are constrained by social structures, belief systems, and ideologies (O'Brien *et al.*, 2000). In a related argument, Rai (2004: 581-2) argues that IGOs such as the World Bank symbolise the separation of the economic from the political, as they are presented as neutral players seeking maximum efficiency for all, while in fact they promote liberal democratic capitalism as the only model for development. She argues that these institutions adopt market principles of organisation and intervention assuming them to be neutral, while ignoring that markets are socially embedded and structured by non-market criteria which lead to gender-based distortions.

Chant and Sweetman (2012) write that the notion of the economic efficiency of women's empowerment assumes a smooth transition between individual economic empowerment and the social and economic structures that discriminate on grounds of gender, race, and class, failing to acknowledge that empowerment requires public action aimed at transforming laws, policies, as well as the practices that constrain personal and group agency. As noted above, markets cannot be expected to benefit women in the same way as men, because they are embedded in social relations. The problems with such assumptions can be understood through the distinction introduced by Molyneux (1985), between strategic and practical gender interests, or as Moser (1989) refers to them, strategic and practical gender needs. Strategic gender needs are formulated from the analysis of women's subordination, and what is needed to overcome it. They

can include the abolition of the sexual division of labour, removal of institutionalised discrimination, reproductive rights and measures against male violence and control over women, among other things (Molyneux, 1985). Practical gender needs or interests, on the other hand, are identified as a response to what is perceived as an immediate need, rather than as a means to attain a strategic goal, and include income-earning activities, and provision of basic services relating to food, shelter and water (Moser, 1989). While the fulfilment of practical gender needs is important, they should not be conflated with strategic needs.

The distinction between practical and strategic needs has been criticised for being too simplistic. As Arora-Jonsson (2013: 26) shows, also the articulation or mobilisation around practical needs can challenge structural disadvantage. On the other hand, she notes, including women in resource governance, for example, which would be categorised as a strategic need, may serve no more than to legitimise existing inequalities, if it is not implemented properly. Davids et al. (2014) point out, as I discuss further below, that change in relation to gender must be initiated within the relations of power in small, fragmented ways, as actors both uphold and subvert dominant discourses. This perspective negates the dichotomy of practical vs strategic needs, by pointing to the room for subversion which might be created also from seemingly practical changes. Thus, the implication of policy solutions should not be taken as a given based on the distinction between practical and strategic needs, although this conceptualisation can contribute to understanding the way policies contribute to promoting gender equality.

Economic empowerment can be seen as a way of providing for the practical needs of poor women. Because of women's subordination in society at large, markets alone, such as those for trade in NTFPs promoted within the framework of REDD+, cannot be relied upon to rectify inequalities. As O'Brien et al. (2000: 50) write, the assumption which has shaped the World Bank's work on gender, "that gender inequalities would be eradicated if market imperfections were removed, […] ignores the persistence of gendered power inequities which can keep women from controlling the fruits of their increased productivity". Gendered constraints on access to information, and control over capital, processing facilities, transport, or productive resources limits women's possibilities for economic upward mobility or accumulation, although they participate in market exchange (Harriss-White, 2005b). While women may produce and trade grains or tree products, men often control contacts with traders, or dominate possibilities for entering into wholesale trade, as shown in Burkina Faso in relation to the NTFP trade (Saussey *et al.*, 2008), as well as fuelwood trade (Zougouri, 2008). In addition, what are considered "women's

products" is neither stable, nor clear-cut. Numerous studies in different contexts have observed how men enter into production, or parts of a value chain of traditionally "female products" when profitability increases due to new technologies or market opportunities (Doss, 2006; Belcher & Schreckenberg, 2007; Elias, 2010; Shackleton *et al.*, 2011; Ingram *et al.*, 2014). Women therefore, risk losing out, or receiving only limited benefits, also from interventions specifically directed at them, if strategic gender needs are not addressed. In such cases, there are examples of women who have opted out of the mainstream NTFP markets to trade with each other, as Arora-Jonsson (2013: 223-25) shows in the case of women trading in bamboo goods in India.

Also the sexual division of labour, and women's burden of labour and responsibility for reproductive work, which often remains unrecognised in policy, can be related to the concept of strategic gender needs. By easing women's burden of responsibility for household work, women are, for example, expected to be able to increase their income by working outside the household. However, once again, the mechanisms involved are not necessarily as straightforward as the strategic/practical dualism would make it appear. In the next section, I examine the role of social and natural reproduction, and the feminist critique against the failure to take them into account in policy. I link this critique to the role of market discourses in REDD+ and climate policy, in order to analyse the impacts such discourses have on gender relations.

4.3.2 Theorising social and natural reproduction

Social and natural reproduction, or (re)productivity, have been brought forward as useful concepts for linking gendered analysis of social reproduction to environmental care work and the reproduction of nature (Biesecker & Hofmeister, 2010; Fraser, 2014). These concepts have been used for analysing the systematic exclusion of the natural environment and unpaid work from mainstream economics and policy discourses and the effects of market expansion on social as well as ecological provisioning (Benería *et al.*, 2016). The inclusion of women in REDD+ policies through targeted programs risks placing heavy responsibility on women for the implementation of REDD+, as I discuss in Paper I and II. The work done in feminist economics to highlight the often invisible role of reproduction and care work in the economy can contribute to the analysis of the impacts of mainstream discourses on gender in policy making relating to REDD+ and climate change mitigation.

Feminist economists have done extensive work on the role of social reproduction as an uncounted or unrecognised contribution to the economy (e.g. Power, 2004; Bakker, 2007), and argued for its inclusion in national accounts

and macroeconomic analysis (Hoskyns & Rai, 2007). Social reproduction can be defined as comprising biological reproduction and the provision of sexual, emotional and affective services within intimate relationships; unpaid production of goods and services, including care and voluntary work for the community; and reproduction of culture and ideology (Rai et al., 2013). While reproductive work is often analysed within a heteronormative framework of a heterosexual household where men perform productive tasks, and women perform reproductive tasks, reality is not that simple (Griffin, 2010). Social reproduction can take place in a range of contexts, and is conducted by women, men and children. In households including men and women, however, women tend to bear the overwhelming responsibility for reproductive labour.

Although necessary to sustain the formal economy, reproductive labour remains largely unrecognised, yet taken for granted in economic theory (Biesecker & Hofmeister, 2010). In the industrial era, the provision of social reproduction was assumed to be financed through the 'male breadwinner' model, in which the male household head would be paid a wage sufficiently large to sustain a family, while a wife performed domestic household labour without pay (Fraser, 1994; Elson & Cagatay, 2000). In this model, which influenced macroeconomic policy across the globe, social benefits could primarily be claimed by male wage earners or their dependants, leaving those who did not fit the norm more or less unprotected. As women's participation in paid labour increased, state-based social benefits were initially expanded in many places. However, the neoliberal policies promoted by international financial bodies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, entailed a drastic reduction of state-based entitlements, which were replaced instead by commodification and individualisation of social benefits (Elson & Cagatay, 2000). As the role of public provision was minimised, the burden of social reproduction was laid once again on women, specifically women in households that could not afford to pay for someone else to perform these services. In addition, rural areas in the global South, often have poorer access to state welfare, and in a context of male migration to urban areas, this further increases women's burden of responsibility (Hassim & Razavi, 2006).

As a starting point for the analysis of the implications of the discourses on gender and market-based solutions in REDD+, I draw on Fraser (2014), who links the role of social and natural reproduction with market discourses, based on Polanyi's theory of 'fictitious commodification', as she poses the question whether "societies [can] be commodities all the way down?". The theory of fictitious commodification discusses the destructive consequences of commodifying the 'conditions of production' including labour, land and money (Polanyi, 2012 [1944]). According to Polanyi (2012 [1944]: 108) the

unavoidable consequence of treating land, labour, and money as commodities in an unregulated market is depletion and destruction of the environmental conditions of production, erosion of social communities, and unpredictability in the value of money.

While Polanyi writes about labour in general, Fraser provides a feminist reading of this theory, putting forward specifically social reproduction and care as the basis for social co-operation, and the socialization and education of human beings who provide economic 'labour' (Fraser, 2014). The increasing commodification of women's labour on the one hand, and of care and social reproduction on the other, leads to depletion of the capacities for social reproduction, as showed in feminist research (e.g. Rai *et al.*, 2013). In the global North, where commodification of care work has been the result of women's increased participation in the labour force, immigrants often comprise a large share of the workforce supplying these services (Benería *et al.*, 2016). Hochschild (2001) characterises the shifts brought on by globalisation and neoliberal policies in the realm of social reproduction, whereby richer women in the global north increasingly pay poorer migrant women from the global south to perform reproductive tasks, as 'global care chains'. The migrants in turn, often leave their reproductive tasks, such as child care, to family members or even poorer women, creating international networks or chains of families linked through market and non-market relations (Yeates, 2012).

Land, in Polanyi's theory, is conceptualised as a condition of production in that it hosts the ecological and natural processes sustaining life and providing material inputs for social provisioning (Fraser, 2014). In the present day, commodification of these processes takes place not just in relation to land, but also ecosystem functions, for example within the framework of Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES), or carbon markets. Thus in REDD+, forests are commodified, not just through the products produced in them such as timber, fuelwood and fruits, but also through the carbon stored in them. The abstract nature of such trade, which, as showed above, is premised upon technologies of constructed 'baselines of deforestation' and systems for Measuring, Reporting, and Verification (MRV), makes their benefit in terms of climate change mitigation uncertain, and in the worst case could be counter-productive, by delaying emission reductions in other sectors in the global North (Bumpus & Liverman, 2010). At the same time REDD+ interventions may have concrete and extensive impacts for the people involved in their implementation on the ground.

Fraser (2014) argues, in contrast with Polanyi, that the destruction of the conditions of production is not exclusively negative. Because they are socially constructed and historically specific, shaped by relations of power and

domination which predate their marketization (cf. feudalism, patriarchy, and slavery), their erosion may also lead to emancipation. Fraser (2014: 550-1) observes that the struggles surrounding the processes of commodification are not two-sided – between neoliberals and proponents of social and environmental protection - but rather three-sided. "Not just marketization and social protection, but also emancipation" (ibid.: 551). While the commodification of social reproduction erodes social relations, and places a heavy burden on poor women, its implications have been taken as positive for some. Integration in the paid labour force for example, has long served as a strategy of emancipation for women. However, as the concept of global care chains (Hochschild, 2001) introduced above shows, the result of the emancipation of some women, specifically educated women of the global North, risks leading to the erosion of social reproduction in other parts of the world.

Also struggles over nature such as those relating to REDD+ encompass multiple struggles between e.g. indigenous movements, corporate interests, development proponents, and workers movements. While on the one hand, the commodification of nature is leading to depletion and destruction, and therefore is being resisted by environmental and indigenous movements, others have drawn upon it as a strategy of claiming their rights to land or gaining recognition for their environmental work through this same commodification (Arriagada *et al.*, 2015; Arora-Jonsson *et al.*, 2016).

The commodification of carbon from REDD+ projects depends on conservation work done by local communities, men and women. This work can be conceptualised as natural reproduction, and its commodification at a global scale is rendered possible by the global climate policy instruments of the UNFCCC. Environmental care work has become a commodified service, traded within the framework of PES. Although ecosystem services are provided by nature, and therefore can be produced without input of human labour (Kosoy & Cobrera, 2010), in the context of REDD+ some type of conservation labour is often involved. A (often criticised) premise of REDD+ is that such labour, and the land where it is performed, is cheaper in the global South, making REDD+ an economically efficient mitigation option for the global problem of climate change (McAfee, 2012). The commodification of such environmental care work has parallels with the commodification of social care. Gay-Antaki (2016) found in her analysis of carbon projects in Mexico that women's ability to spend time in the projects was taken for granted, and they were neither relieved of household duties nor compensated economically. She notes that this means that women's work, and their roles in production, reproduction and community management effectively subsidised the projects, providing economic as well as social viability. Wang and Corson (2015) showed in a study of a carbon offset program

in Kenya, how the commodification of carbon credits, through statistical analyses, quantification and marketing, remained unknown to the women who produced the actual emission reductions by using and maintaining improved stoves. They unknowingly signed off the property rights to the carbon, and access to the wealth they could generate, to the NGOs implementing the project.

Commodification and market discourses can thus have far-reaching consequences. One conclusion of Paper I was that REDD+ implied a shift of responsibility for the burden of environmental labour, from the richer global North, to the poor in the global South, particularly women. In the analysis in Section 5.3.3 I draw on the concept of care chains as a framework for analysing this shift.

4.3.3 Feminist influence in international organisations

Efforts have been made by UN institutions and NGOs at challenging the male dominance at the UNFCCC meetings, and promote integration of gender concerns in climate policy making (Buckingham, 2010). The Global Gender and Climate Alliance (GGCA) was launched in 2007 by IUCN, UNDP, UNEP and WEDO, with this aim (GGCA, 2017). As an alliance of UN agencies, IGOs and NGOs it works with policy advocacy, capacity-building, and knowledge sharing in the area of climate policy making. Morrow (2017) observes that advocacy in the UNFCCC relating to gender has resulted in improvements of women's representation, but that it remains to be seen how thoroughgoing commitments to gender are. An important question is thus how change can be achieved, and how the discourses dominating the work of international institutions involved in REDD+ and climate policy making can be influenced. Feminists have debated whether, and to what extent, change can be effected from the inside of the international institutions involved in development and environmental governance, or whether change must come from outside. In this section I bring up some of the key arguments of this debate, with relevance to REDD+, in order to analyse the possibilities of achieving change.

Feminist practitioners, working for international institutions to promote gender considerations and gender mainstreaming have varying experiences of the possibilities of promoting change. Gender experts are often brought into international institutions to translate gender and feminist knowledge into policy applications, but they many times find their scope for action is limited by institutional demands for simplification and particular framings of the issues (Prügl, 2012; Ferguson, 2015). Reviews of gender mainstreaming in development organisations, including the World Bank, various UN bodies, the African Development Bank, and northern governmental aid agencies have

repeatedly found internal resistance to gender equality programmes (Parpart, 2014). O'Brien et al. (2000: 45) noted that the World Bank system for promoting gender equality work in its projects was demand-driven, meaning that it was up to gender specialists to "sell" their services to project managers, which mostly meant stressing the business case for gender equity.

Eyben (2010: 56), on the other hand, argues that even an entirely instrumental approach to gender in development institutions, paying attention to gender equality as a matter of efficiency rather than as a right, may in the longer run produce transformative effects. In her view, even though international agencies produce blueprint policies for women's empowerment to be rolled out and scaled up, what happens in practice, as policies are negotiated and shaped, is something different which provides openings for individual agency of feminists working within these bureaucracies (ibid.: 60). She calls for moving away from absolutist positions in relation to bureaucratic institutions, and acknowledging the opportunities inherent in drawing on the ambiguity of discourses and practice. This case for pragmatism rather than absolutism in the face of complex realities and institutional constraints has been made by other as well (e.g. Razavi, 1997; Standing, 2004).

Others have been more critical of the possibilities to achieve change from the inside. Kurian (2000) concluded in her analysis of gender in the World Bank's Environmental Impact Assessments, that the Bank has no ambition to change the status quo or transform power relations. Instead, she writes, even the Bank's agenda on women and environment seems to aim at "a more efficient and productive way to use women in their socially-designated roles" (Kurian, 2000: 158). Women should be helped by gaining greater access to the fruits of development and a capitalist economy, not by questioning the system (ibid.: 107). The lack of interest or commitment to transforming power relations that Kurian describes is not unique, but rather a recurring critique among feminists and gender experts working with the World Bank and other international institutions, as reported by Parpart (2014).

The resistance within the World Bank and other IGOs against gender work is thus not necessarily a matter of formal rules, but rather, as Waylen (2014) points out, should also be understood in terms of informal institutions. Such informal institutions, including norms, rules and practices, are often less visible, and many times taken for granted. They are also difficult to identify and analyse in a study such as this thesis, which focuses on policy discourses. It is however important to acknowledge informal institutions as a factor to be taken into account by feminists aspiring to change the way gender issues are taken into account in IGOs such as those working on REDD+. Waylen (2014) argues that although informal institutions are often seen by gender scholars to subvert

change by preserving the status quo despite changes in formal rules towards gender neutrality, this is not always the case. She stresses the need for nuancing the picture and recognising that informal institutions also change, and may sometimes undermine gender-unequal formal institutions.

Standing (2004: 84) argues that bureaucracies are not engines of social and political transformation, but institutions set up to implement what has been decided by politics. Therefore, the appropriate space and place for driving transformation is in the political arena, outside of bureaucracies (ibid.). Although this may be an overly categorical dismissal of the possibilities for achieving change from the inside, it makes an important point about the role of bureaucracies, and the importance of political action.

Arora-Jonsson and Sijapati Basnett (2017) have shown in a study of an international environmental organisation that although gender mainstreaming frameworks in international organisations may be insufficient for bringing about a transformation, it can open up spaces for contestation, and provide opportunities for gender experts to bring up discussions about alternative narratives or discourses on gender. They also stress the importance of networks between insider gender experts and academics, government institutions and activitists in order to bring in alternative perspectives and raise discussions, also in contexts of depoliticised mainstreaming. Keck and Sikkink (1999) show that transnational advocacy networks can play an important part in influencing discursive positions of international institutions or states, or influencing policy change in 'target actors'. In relation to the World Bank, O'Brien et al. (2000: 65) argue that women's movements have had only limited success in advocating for more gender aware policies and programming, compared to the environmental movement and NGOs promoting a participation agenda. They see this to be the result of a lack of concerted global civil society coalition placing demands on the Bank's gender work, and limited support for such advocacy from the US women's movement. As Sandler and Rao (2012) emphasise, linkages between activists, policy, and academic feminists have been important and effective for producing concepts that can bring the debate forward, and be used for promoting transformation.

An important point made by Davids et al. (2014) in relation to gender mainstreaming, is that it although it is not revolutionary, in the sense of breaking with the past, it does contain a notion of change, which critics of mainstreaming approaches often disregard. The small steps entailed in this change may not challenge existing power hierarchies, but can provide openings for small-scale everyday types of subversion or resistance. They characterise the change possible through gender mainstreaming as a global strategy in terms of "little movements, steps forward, backwards and sideways in a very, very slow

revolution and process of change" which, they emphasise, can only be assessed with hindsight, and with recognition of the political context in which it takes place (Davids *et al.*, 2014: 405).

In a related argument, Newman (2013) stresses that the narrative of mainstreaming as serving to depoliticise feminist claims fails to acknowledge that this is not all that happened, and that it is not a definitive, complete process. Rather, she stresses the contingency, dynamism and multiplicity of configurations possible at the intersection of neoliberal rationalities and political activism. She uses the term 'spaces of power' to signify the possibilities created as activist projects draw on elements of neoliberal projects, and its contradictions, in order to pursue e.g. feminist goals. In Newman's view, it is necessary to recognise the agency of political actors, and to see that the political/cultural/social field in which they act is marked by contradictions, antagonisms and ambivalences which provide opportunities for pursuing political agendas.

As I move on to the analysis of REDD+ policy documents and discourses on gender in global REDD+ and climate policy making, I draw on these debates.

5 Discourses, impacts, and resistance in global REDD+ policy making: analysis and discussion

At the beginning of this thesis I posed two research questions:

1. In what way is gender discussed in the documents and programs framing REDD+ and climate mitigation policy?
2. What are the possibilities for challenging the mainstream discourses on gender in international REDD+ policy?

In order to answer these questions, I draw on the three papers, as well as additional material analysed, primarily the documents listed in Appendix 1.

I start by examining the discourses on gender in REDD+. I analyse how they problematize gender and some of the basic assumptions upon which they are based. I identify as key discourses the notions of gender equality as, on the one hand, a matter of improving the efficiency of policy design and implementation, and on the other hand as an objective in its own right. I further discuss the actors involved in forwarding particular discourses in REDD+ policy making.

I go on to examine the implications of these discourses on gender in REDD+ policy, including the notions of efficiency, equality and women's economic empowerment. I inquire into the tensions between global standardised policies, and the need for understanding gender relations in context. I also examine how actors, in particular women, are categorised and described, i.e. the subject positions produced and reproduced in REDD+ policy, or the subjectification effects (Bacchi, 2009) which may shape women's scope for agency and action within the REDD+ programs. Finally, I introduce a framework for analysing the effects of REDD+ policy discourses on the division of responsibilities for social and natural reproduction.

Finally, I examine to what extent it is possible for women's organisation to challenge the mainstream discourses on gender in REDD+, and inquire into the obstacles and opportunities they face in this endeavour.

5.1 Identifying discourses on gender in REDD+

As discussed in the Section 2.4 on gender in REDD+, gender issues have not played a prominent part in the formulation of global REDD+ policies. REDD+ countries are requested to address gender considerations when developing their national strategies on REDD+ (UNFCCC, 2011: 13). Bee and Sijapati Basnett (2016) have found however, that the specific safeguards developed by REDD+ pilot initiatives including the UN-REDD Programme and the FIP, lack attention to gender issues. The international institutions working on REDD+ and climate policy are bound by gender mainstreaming commitments, and have developed gender action plans or strategies, specifically for REDD+ or more generally relating to climate policy interventions. In the analysis of these documents, I identify a number of discourses relating to gender in REDD+ and climate policy. I start by discussing the discourses on gender equality and efficiency, which play an important part in the way gender is taken into account in the overarching policies and problematisations. I then move on to discuss the discourse on women's economic empowerment through NTFP commercialisation.

5.1.1 Discourses of efficiency and equality

The review of the gender action plans and guidelines published by international institutions working on climate policy and projects shows that attention to gender equality and inclusion of gender considerations is often motivated by gains in efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of interventions (CIF, 2010; UN-REDD, 2013; GEF, 2014; GCF, 2015; UNFCCC Secretariat, 2016). Specifically in relation to REDD+, the UN-REDD Programme 2011 report "The Business case for mainstreaming gender in REDD+", aims to demonstrate

> "how integrating gender equality principles into REDD+ will result in improved sustainability of climate and development outcomes" (UN-REDD, 2011: 5).

Among the international institutions most active in global efforts on REDD+, the focus on economic efficiency is the mainstream discourse guiding their work on gender in environmental management and/or development. The 2001 World Bank report "Engendering Development" argues that gender equality is a development objective because it "strengthens countries' abilities to grow, to reduce poverty, and to govern effectively" (World Bank, 2001: 1). It states that

economic development can increase gender equality in the long run, although emphasising that institutional reform promoting equal rights, and active measures to redress inequalities, are also necessary. This same outlook is the basis of the World Bank's gender action plan from 2007-2010 – "Gender equality as smart economics" – which stresses that women's lack of economic empowerment is economically inefficient, and hampers growth and poverty reduction (World Bank, 2006).

Gender equality, thus is often presented as part of the solution to a lack of efficiency and sustainability of policy interventions, and even to poverty. The underlying assumption of this discourse is that without involving women, policies will be less efficient. But gender equality is not only presented as a solutions to a problem. Gender inequalities are also see as a problem *per se*. This review shows that discourses on equality and efficiency co-exist in the documents relating to gender in global climate and REDD+ governance, but they play different roles. The focus on gender inequalities as a problem whose solutions is a stand-alone objective and a matter of rights is named as the primary reason for promoting gender equality in several gender documents by climate-related institutions (UN-REDD, 2011; CIF, 2014; Adaptation Fund, 2016). The UN-REDD Programme report, however, notes that

> "despite long-standing conventions, treaties and other instruments of international human rights law […] gender inequality generally prevails" (UN-REDD, 2011: 12),

and therefore a need is identified for bringing forward "the business case" for gender mainstreaming. The "equality" discourse can be seen as a way of justifying the sincerity of the commitment to gender issues of the institutions involved. The efficiency discourse, drawing on gender equality as a solution to other problems, on the other hand, becomes a way of justifying the attention to gender issues internally, to colleagues whose interests and priorities are not with gender issues.

The lack of knowledge of, and interest in, gender issues, within international institutions such as the World Bank, which makes the emphasis on efficiency discourses necessary, is familiar to feminist practitioners working with these institutions (Prügl, 2012; Ferguson, 2015). Lucy Ferguson (2015), writing about her own experiences as a gender expert, describes the need to "sell" gender to sceptical colleagues by reducing complexity and presenting it in non-political terms. Eyben (2010: 57) however, notes that discursive ambiguity is a strategy by some feminist bureaucrats, hoping that remaining vague on what gender equality is, or how to achieve it, might give them more room for manoeuvre, or "that other actors such as economists in the World Bank may find themselves

making choices concerning investment in 'women's economic empowerment' […] that eventually might lead to rights-based outcomes".

Although both discourses are present in the documents, the dominance of the efficiency discourse is clear in the solutions proposed, where technical and managerial solutions, and emphasis on economic empowerment and efficiency, tend to dominate over commitments to rights-based gender equality. The solutions proposed in climate-related policies for gender sensitive REDD+ and climate programs draw on a standard toolkit for gender mainstreaming, including collecting sex-disaggregated data, developing gender-specific indicators to measure and monitor advances, and bringing in gender expertise (UN-REDD, 2012; CIF, 2014; GEF, 2014; Adaptation Fund, 2016; UNFCCC Secretariat, 2016). In the case of Burkina Faso's national REDD+ program, it is clear that gender is seen as something to be dealt with later, and on the side, in specific projects directed at women (Paper I). Gender is not an integral part of the initial national REDD+ plan. The World Bank hired a gender specialist, but only after the program had already been formulated (personal communication, World Bank FIP staff, Washington, 4 Jan 2017). Several NGO and consultancy case studies of gender in REDD+ show the same late inclusion of gender considerations in REDD+ processes (Setyowati *et al.*, 2012; WOCAN, 2012; Bradley *et al.*, 2013), and lack of knowledge and understanding of gender issues among governments (Bradley *et al.*, 2013; IUCN & USAID, 2015e, f, b, c).

The postponement of the attention to gender issues indicates that gender is seen as relevant at the local or community level, and in relation to participation but not in the framing of the programs at international or national level. The GEF Gender Action Plan, for example, notes that gender mainstreaming is stronger in natural resource management and climate change adaptation projects than in mitigation and chemical projects, because they typically involve on-the-ground activities in local communities, where participation of both men and women is key to project implementation (GEF, 2014: 5). The latest guidelines published by the UN-REDD, however, recommend including a gender perspective at all stages of the REDD+ process (UN-REDD Programme, 2017).

Implicit in the deferral of gender considerations to a later stage of policy making, and to the local level, are assumptions about how and to whom gender is relevant. Ferguson (2015), in her analysis of development institutions, refers to this as the *externalisation* of gender issues, whereby gender is implicitly assumed to be a problem of the poor, rather than being relevant also for the development institutions themselves. However, if attention to gender is postponed to the implementation phase of a program, there is a risk that it will not be coupled with proper gender analysis, and thereby risks being less effective. The implications of postponing attention to gender, and treating it as a

local issue, rather than something which needs to be integrated at all levels is discussed further in Section 5.3.1.

5.1.2 Empowering women through NTFPs

Market discourses play an important role in REDD+ governance. Markets are present as solutions to the problems of deforestation and climate change, not only in policy proposals relating to market-based funding for REDD+, or the creation of markets for carbon credits and offsets. Markets also prevail as the model solution for deforestation, poverty, as well as gender inequalities. Arguments about economic efficiency, poverty reduction and economic empowerment are central to REDD+, and are the way women and gender are included in the programs. Gender equality is drawn into the logic of markets, as women's economic empowerment and participation in markets for forest products is presented as a principal solution to deforestation and to women's subordinate position in society.

A common way of involving women in REDD+ programs is through activities directed specifically towards women, often drawing on what are traditionally seen as female activities, not least NTFPs. The view that women are the main collectors of NTFPs, particularly wild plants, for household and subsistence use is a longstanding stereotype (Sunderland *et al.*, 2014). The FAO has been promoting NTFPs as a potential source of revenue for rural economies since the early 1990s (FAO, 1991). Women have often been at the centre of such activities (Neumann & Hirsch, 2000; Shackleton *et al.*, 2011). I show in Paper II that in Burkina Faso commercialisation of NTFPs is presented as a way to incentivise forest protection, and promoting women's economic empowerment, although these products are collected primarily in the fields, not the forests. Economic activities relating to NTFPs are an important component for involving women in the program. For example, under the heading "Project beneficiaries", the World Bank project appraisal document for one of the FIP projects in Burkina Faso states:

> "**Focus on integrating gender dimension.** Women are an integral part of processing activities such as Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFP). Developing gender sensitive activities will allow women to play a significant role and strengthen their ability to earn income. The support and development of processing activities in which women have traditionally been involved can serve as a channel to encourage further participation. This added participation may be boosted through the support for small and medium enterprises." (World Bank, 2013: 8, bold in original)

Comparison with documents of other REDD+ programs revealed similar approaches relating to NTFPs as a way of involving women and promoting economic empowerment. In the FCPF REDD+ program of the Democratic Republic of Congo, women were described as the main collectors of NTFPs, providing an opportunity for forest protection, biodiversity conservation and revenue generation for women (FCPF, 2016a: 266). In Vietnam's REDD+ project, women were described as maintaining "a greater interest in forest in terms of NTFPs" (FCPF, 2016b: 129). A CIFOR review of REDD+ projects in Brazil, Peru, Cameroon, Tanzania, and Indonesia reported that NTFPs would play a part in generating income from forests (Sills *et al.*, 2014). Several NGO reports on gender in REDD+ also put forward the potential for engaging women in trainings and business development relating to NTFPs (Gurung *et al.*, 2011; Bradley *et al.*, 2013).

The focus on economic empowerment for women ties into a neoliberal idea of markets as the most efficient way of allocating resources, which, as many before me have observed, is a dominant discourse in the World Bank (Rai, 2004; Griffin, 2010). Representing women's subordination and gender inequalities as a matter of poverty and economics enables solutions focused on market integration and promotion of economic opportunities for individual women, but fails to address the structures which are the cause of women's subordination (cf. Chant & Sweetman, 2012). Without proper gender analysis, the benefits of such interventions risk being limited, accruing only to certain women, or being appropriated by men. The fact that markets are not neutral, but rather socially embedded institutions, means that unequal power relations operate also in the market, and rewards and privileges in the market are distributed accordingly (Rai, 2004). Rather than facilitating a transformation of unequal power relations, markets are likely to reproduce, or even augment them.

Economic empowerment can be seen as supporting the fulfilment of practical gender needs, but it does not provide for the strategic gender needs (cf. Moser, 1989). Improving women's economic situation or opportunities for income generation is not problematic *per se.* On the contrary, it can bring important benefits in terms of reduced vulnerability and expanded opportunities (Duflo, 2012). In this sense, it might contribute to promoting women's strategic interests in the long run. The attempts at targeting women in REDD+ through NTFP commercialisation schemes, aimed at creating incentives for forest protection, and enhancing women's economic empowerment are, however, built upon a number of problematic assumptions. As previous literature has discussed, and as I showed in Paper II, although improving women's income may be beneficial, trade in NTFPs is unlikely to be the solution to gender inequalities. It is not coupled with efforts to remove other structural constraints that women face, for

example, in market participation. In the context of agriculture, Doss (2006) points out that targeting "women's crops" or "women's tasks" compartmentalises their contributions, and fails to see them as part of a wider context, where what men and women do is neither strictly divided, nor stable. Relating to NTFPs, several studies have found such roles to shift in the context of commercialisation and increased profitability (e.g. Elias, 2010; Ingram *et al.*, 2014). NTFP projects are based upon the assumption of gender roles as static, and the notion that what women do is what they want to, and should continue to do. This begs the questions if NTFPs will remain "women's products" if they become more profitable.

5.2 Discoursing actors

The way problems and problematisations are constructed through discourses leads to specific policy solutions being favoured over others, and to particular interests being promoted over others. Therefore, understanding which actors and interests are active in promoting a certain discourse, or who is favoured by it, is a crucial part of discourse analysis (Hajer & Versteeg, 2005).

The combination of actors involved in REDD+ policy making played an important part in how policies were formulated and problems represented. In the configuration of problem-solution representations (Bacchi, 1999), which REDD+ constitutes, a momentum was gained to mobilise international funding and political support for interventions and investments, as donors interested in supporting climate change mitigation could join forces with international development institutions, national governments and environmental NGOs. Despite urban fuelwood demand being identified as a driver of deforestation in Burkina Faso, improving local forest management was presented and accepted as the reasonable solution to deforestation and climate change, since it allowed interventions in poor rural communities in line with development objectives (Paper I). In relation to gender, empowering women through commercialisation of shea nuts was presented as a solution to gender equality as well as deforestation, despite such fruits being collected primarily from trees on agricultural fields (Paper II). Thus, apparent contradictions were smoothed out, and the problem was "rendered technical" (Li, 2007) through the presentation of a simplified description of cause and effect. Such policy compromises can be seen as a way of bringing together diverse interests and actors in contingent assemblages around REDD+ policy making (Arora-Jonsson *et al.*, 2016 and Paper I).

While the framework of REDD+ was negotiated between countries in the UNFCCC, the World Bank, together with the UN bodies of the UN-REDD

Programme, is a prominent actor in the programming and formulation of templates for national REDD+ programs. The institutional gender approach of the World Bank has been influential in shaping the work on gender in national REDD+ programs. The World Bank has a gender specialist working at the global level with the Forest Investment Program. In Burkina Faso, the appointment of female 'local animators' in some project sites, is a means to improve women's participation in those localities (personal communication, World Bank FIP staff, Washington, 4 Jan 2017). Nonetheless, I was informed by a World Bank officer that despite the appointment of female local staff, women still did not reach the target share of 30% of participants (personal communication, World Bank FIP staff, Washington, 4 Jan 2017).

Aid agencies from donor countries in the global North are also influential in the formulation of the global REDD+ pilot programs as well as national REDD+ programs, as I found in interviews with policy makers from the World Bank. As an example, Burkina Faso's limited potential for emission reductions made certain donors reluctant to invest, as they emphasised the carbon aspects of REDD+ (Paper I). On the other hand, the World Bank were keen to emphasise the positive livelihoods impacts the project would have, both to donors and to the national government. Government bureaucrats, the World Bank and civil society actors alike, built upon the narrative around the problem of deforestation as related to poverty, and the role of women in solving the problem.

The civil society representatives invited to participate in the national REDD+ process in Burkina Faso were selected by the Ministry of Environment, and as I discuss further below (Section 5.4), did not appear to challenge the mainstream discourses on deforestation and gender. A World Bank expert on Natural Resource Management complained that the stakeholders invited to participate in a REDD+ workshop, rather than the list proposed by the World Bank, appeared to comprise acquaintances of those responsible for REDD+ at the Ministry of Environment (personal communication, October 2011). By controlling who gets invited to stakeholder workshops, Ministry staff can, to a certain extent, control who gets a say and what gets said in the REDD+ policy process. In deciding which NGOs get invited, they can choose to exclude critical or dissenting voices (or not), and thereby also take some control over what information reaches the World Bank.

The gender-related reports and case studies I analyse, which have been published by NGOs, sometimes in collaboration or with funding from aid agencies or IGOs, are often written by the same people (to the extent that an author is provided). A few individuals have been involved as NGO representatives and/or consultants in the writing of a large number of reports. The same few people are active as both NGO representatives and consultants,

sometimes working for their own NGOs, sometimes writing on behalf of aid agencies. The most prominent example is Jeanette Gurung, executive director of WOCAN, who has been involved in writing six of the reports I have reviewed. In addition, Lorena Aguilar, senior advisor of the IUCN gender programme, has authored both IUCN reports and a commissioned gender review of the FIP programme. The uniformity in authorship leads to overlaps in the texts, with the same recommendations recurring (see Section 5.4). This way, the global debate on gender in REDD+, including gender advocates and NGOs, is dominated by a limited number of voices and perspectives.

5.3 Implications of the discourses

I analyse the implications the discourses on gender have on REDD+ policy making. This is done through an analysis of the tension between global policy making and its attempts at producing standardised policy solutions, and the need for considering gender relations in context. Further, I analyse the subject positions presented for women in REDD+ policy, i.e. the subjectification effects (cf. Bacchi, 2009). Finally, I discuss the potential effects of REDD+ policies on women and gender relations drawing on the concepts of reproduction and global care chains.

5.3.1 Dealing with the local in global policy

The feminist calls for contextualised gender analyses (e.g. Tschakert, 2012) are not easily accommodated within the standardised solutions and systems for monitoring and measuring results of REDD+ and other climate policy interventions. At the global scale, REDD+ is contingent on tropical forests across the globe being conceptualised as stocks of entirely fungible carbon, independent of where or in what context it exists. Through calculation of baseline scenarios for deforestation, and the development of technical MRV systems, a tonne of carbon in the Brazilian Amazon is conceived as interchangeable with a tonne of carbon in the Congo Basin. This is enabled through management techniques and the production of standardised knowledge, some of which were described in Paper I, which reduce complexities and make tropical deforestation ‘legible’ (cf. Scott, 1998) and amenable to intervention.

In policy documents, attempts at moving beyond the standardised solutions are often made through references to participation of stakeholders in decision-making. “Full and effective participation of relevant stakeholder” is one of the safeguards of the Cancún agreement (UNFCCC, 2011). Also Burkina Faso’s REDD+ program is described in policy documents as “participatory” and

"demand-driven" (AfDB, 2013a; Burkina Faso, 2013; FIP, 2013; World Bank, 2013; see also Paper II). This is meant to ensure that local needs and interests are included in the programs. Nevertheless, the project budget for one of the two projects included in Burkina's REDD+ program, the Participatory Forest Management project (PGFC) which is headed by the African Development Bank (AfDB), includes detailed budget posts enumerating equipment such as beehives, improved stoves, and processing plants for NTFPs, even before the consultation process has begun (AfDB, 2013b: 46). The "demand-driven" approach thus appears to be foreclosed as project activities are already specified in such detail before local people have their say. Rather than the participatory approach enabling local people's influence in the process, it appears to serve the purpose of providing legitimacy for already planned interventions.

A document of the other FIP project in Burkina, on the other hand, emphasises that the estimation of costs and benefits are

> "for demonstration only, as they will be established following a consultation process that will attempt to capture the preferences and values of the main stakeholders of the project" (World Bank, 2013: 107).

How open this process is to the preferences of local people remains unclear. The project component relating to consultations, named "Sub-component 1.2: Broad awareness-raising and consultation related to REDD+", states that at the local level,

> "engagement of stakeholders will focus on the establishment of the necessary organizational arrangements and consultation processes for the development of a national REDD+ strategy [… and] be geared towards ensuring consistency between local investments (micro-project oriented) and national reforms" (World Bank, 2013: 11).

While this could imply that the national strategy will be adapted to local needs, the fact that the local consultations were planned for later, after the strategy was adopted, seems to speak against this. Most project activities appear to have been defined beforehand, and consultations risk serving as top-down dissemination of information, rather than bottom-up participation.

Another example indicating that project activities were already defined beforehand, is the statement that

> "As the economic base for non-timber forest products is linked to the participation of women, the consultations will include a strong focus on gender sensitivity" (ibid.: 11).

Once again, the implication of this statement is that the decision that women should participate in REDD+ through NTFP-related activities has already been made. This is not what will be up for discussion in the consultations. In addition, "gender sensitivity", although not explicitly defined in the documents, appears to mean primarily that women are included in the consultations.

In the way participation is handled, in the documents and in practice, there is a risk that participation and consultations become a bureaucratic obligation, or a way of forging a consensus around REDD+ project activities, rather than a tool for shaping REDD+ interventions to the local context. As reported by World Bank staff in the previous section, full participation of women in Burkina Faso's REDD+ program has not been achieved. I observed during REDD+ meetings in one village in Burkina Faso how the FIP/REDD+ staff sought to get the answers they wanted from villagers. Despite efforts to include women, REDD+ interventions risk increasing existing marginalisation of certain groups in the two REDD+ villages of my study in Paper II. By drawing on existing organisations for forest management, and ignoring existing exclusions of Fulbe women and migrants from the use of certain resources REDD+ interventions risk perpetuating existing inequalities. This is the result of the lack of analysis of how local power relations involving gender and ethnicity shape access to specific resources and membership in local organisations.

The feminist critique of standardised policy solutions is not new, but has been brought up in relation to gender mainstreaming approaches of international institutions working on development and/or environment (Chant & Sweetman, 2012; Cornwall & Rivas, 2015). The tension between global standardisation and local contexts can be seen to have gained urgency in the context of global climate change agreements and the negotiations of the UNFCCC, which are based on the premise that climate change must be solved if agreement is achieved on a global scale. Several authors have written about the depoliticisation that takes place in climate policy negotiations as parties strive to reach consensus on policy measures (Swyngedouw, 2011; MacGregor, 2014; McAfee, 2015). MacGregor (2014: 623) maintains that the appearance of consensus is made possible by marginalising less powerful people from the debate, and side-lining environmental issues not related to carbon and climate. This, she argues, has resulted in environmental justice issues that have traditionally been most relevant to women, being pushed to the side. I show in Paper III how initiatives by women's organisations to integrate gender issues in REDD+ and carbon projects struggle with this tension between standardisation and the need for contextualised understanding of gender relations, in their attempts to challenge the often depoliticised, decontextualized, and technical mainstream discourses, while striving to maintain their ties to policy makers.

In the analysis about the implications of the discourses on gender in REDD+ policy making, I now move on to the subject positions available within these discourses. In doing this, I point to an often unrecognised effect of policy making, which relates to the exclusions it creates through categorisations, and not least, the restricting and disciplining effects on those involved.

5.3.2 Subject positions

The discourses I identify in policy documents allow for a limited number of subject positions. These subject positions are closely coupled to the justification of attention to gender as a matter of efficiency and sustainability of interventions. Women are repeatedly described as having particular roles, rights and responsibilities, e.g. in the household or in relation to natural resources (CIF, 2010; UN-REDD, 2011; GEF, 2012; UNFCCC Secretariat, 2016). GEF mainstreaming policy lists as a minimum requirement for gender mainstreaming "recognizing and respecting the different roles that women and men play in resource management and in society" (GEF, 2012: 3). The UN-REDD justifies why gender matters for REDD+ stating that

> "Gender specific roles, rights and responsibilities, as well as women and men's particular use and knowledge of the forests, shape their experiences differently. These gender-differentiated needs, uses and knowledge of the forest can be critical inputs to policy and programmatic interventions that help enable the long-term success of REDD+ on the ground." (UN-REDD, 2011: 8)

Women's roles, and particular relationship to natural resources, has thus given them specific knowledge which should be taken into account and can be drawn upon to improve the outcomes of climate policies, a perspective which also recurs in official documents (European Union, 2012; UN-REDD, 2012; GCF, 2015; Adaptation Fund, 2016; UNFCCC Secretariat, 2016). A UN-REDD report on implementing gender sensitive REDD+, for example, observes that

> "women and men […] possess critical knowledge which can inform the UN-REDD programmatic and policy interventions and improve the efficacy, effectiveness and sustainability of REDD+ outcomes" (UN-REDD, 2012: 2).

In this way, women's and men's differential roles and responsibilities in natural resource use are drawn upon to justify attention to gender in REDD+ programs. Including women based on the attention to these different roles is presented as a way to enhance efficiency. This resonates with Leach's (2007) argument about how the notion of women's closeness to nature supported the mobilisation of women's labour and knowledge in environmental interventions in the early

1990's. However, implied in this perspective are assumptions about these roles, and the differences between them, as static. The point that what are considered male and female roles in relation to natural resources management is not fixed, has been made long ago, and over again (e.g. Fortmann & Rocheleau, 1985; Rocheleau & Edmunds, 1997). Nevertheless, as my analysis of policy documents and the case study of Burkina Faso show, REDD+ programs often draw on ideas about women's traditional roles in forest management, such as the policies relating to NTFPs as traditionally female products, and shape interventions to include women in these roles specifically, thus leading to a conservation of existing gender relations.

The vulnerability of women to climate change is also a recurring theme (UN-REDD, 2011; CBD *et al.*, 2012; European Union, 2012; UNFCCC, 2012; GCF, 2015; UN Women, 2015; Adaptation Fund, 2016). In feminist literature on climate change there is widespread critique of the stereotype of women as vulnerable and victims, and the failure to contextualise this vulnerability (eg. MacGregor, 2010; Arora-Jonsson, 2011; Tschakert & Machado, 2012). In the context of adaptation, the latest Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC emphasises that describing women's vulnerability as universal, risks missing that the causes of inequality are complex, relational, and dynamic in context-specific ways (Olsson *et al.*, 2014: 808). Nevertheless, it appears that the vulnerability narrative prevails in policy documents on climate change and REDD+.

Another stereotype about women as virtuous carers of the environment, especially in the global North as opposed to the global South where they are mainly vulnerable (Arora-Jonsson, 2011), also recurs in the documents, although somewhat less frequently than the vulnerability narrative. Women are repeatedly described as "agents of change" (UN-REDD, 2011; CIF, 2012; UN-REDD, 2013; CIF, 2014; UN Women, 2015; Adaptation Fund, 2016; UNFCCC Secretariat, 2016). This role as "agents of change" is many times coupled to their specific roles and knowledge of natural resource management and forests. A UN-REDD (2011: 12) report for example, states

> "That women are forest managers, stewards and agents of change should be acknowledged and leveraged in seeking to identify and promote the multiple social and environmental benefits linked to forestry policy".

A report from the expert group meeting of UN Women (2015: 4) states that

> "Women's agency is reflected in their knowledge of and leadership in sustainable natural resources management, in spearheading sustainable practices at the household, community, national and global levels, in responding to disasters and other climate related crises".

What it means for women to be "agents of change" is rarely specified, which makes it difficult to see how policies or projects can take this role into account in practice, or promote this agency. Further, as Davids et al. (2014: 403) point out, the notion that women are agents of change almost as "inborn fighters of gender inequality" who, as opposed to men, can step out of the disciplining and normalising powers of discourse.

I further analyse the extent to which women's organisations present alternative subject positions in the section on feminist influence in REDD+ below (Section 5.4).

5.3.3 Social and natural reproduction

The attempts at engaging women in REDD+ by drawing on the discourse of economic empowerment risk having unintended effects. In schemes designed to promote commercialisation of NTFPs, women are brought into REDD+ programs in targeted projects focused on what are considered "traditionally female" activities. By directing specific attention to women, rather than gender relations, there is a risk that responsibilities for environmental protection falls disproportionately on women, as showed in Papers I and II.

REDD+ can be seen as a transfer of responsibilities for environmental protection and reproduction. The direction of this transfer – from North to South, and from rich to poor - is an effect of the rationality of economic efficiency, where emissions reductions and mitigation actions are to be implemented where they are constructed as cheapest, based on the logic of opportunity costs (McAfee, 2012). The commodification of carbon credits is an important factor facilitating this transfer of responsibilities. Further, these transfers are mediated by international institutions working on REDD+, as well as governmental actors and NGOs implementing national and local REDD+ projects. Arora-Jonsson et al. (2016) identify a new kind of 'global' citizenship where the new responsibilities for care and reproduction of the global environmental commons are transferred to poor people in the south, but without being matched by corresponding rights.

Due to the discourses on gender and economic empowerment, these shifts in responsibility are gendered. This is a result both of existing gender relations, and of the attempts at engaging women by directing efforts specifically at them, but without changing existing relations of power and divisions of labour. Attempts at drawing women into markets – for environmental goods or services - in a context where women remain responsible for household care work, may have adverse effects by increasing the demands on women's time and their burden of labour (Folbre, 2006). An implicit assumption of such policies is that women's

time and capacity is infinitely elastic (Elson, 1993), which reveals a disregard for the labour that women perform within the household. An example of this are the restrictions in forest use proposed in Burkina Faso's national REDD+ program, and the resulting decrease in income, which would disproportionately affect men, while the focus on NTFP commercialisation as a means to compensate for this loss of income-generating activities, and to incentivise forest protection, is directed at women (Paper II).

The consequences of this shift are difficult to predict. As noted before, women's and men's role are not necessarily static, and changing conditions for income generation may result in unexpected changes in these roles. Thus, there is the possibility that women's burden of labour increases, or that men take over what was previously considered female activities, such as collection, processing and/or sale of NTFPs, or, perhaps less likely, that men take on a greater share of household labour.

Such changing roles, or the shift in responsibilities and income-generating opportunities resulting from REDD+ interventions if no change occurs, remain unacknowledged in policy documents. There is some awareness of the strain on women's time. In communication with the World Bank relating to Burkina Faso's REDD+ program in January 2017, I was informed that women's participation and gender awareness were improving, that more inclusive meetings were being held at local level, and that funding had been approved to allow women to come to meetings with one or two people accompanying them, such as "an aunt to take care of the kids, or a suspicious husband, or a cousin, or to pay for someone taking care of the family back home" (personal communication, World Bank FIP staff, Washington, 4 Jan 2017).

Similar proposals of arranging child care in relation to REDD+ meetings and trainings have been proposed by WEDO in the REDD+ SES gender initiative analysed in Paper III. Paper III inquires into the way the two gender initiatives deal with the issue of reproduction and gendered division of labour, as an important question in feminist debate and advocacy. While both initiatives recognise the limits imposed by their responsibilities for reproductive work on women's time, there is little discussion about promoting a more equal sharing of the burden of labour. The W+ standards focus on technical solutions (improved stoves) for reducing the strain on women's time.

The review of case studies and evaluations of gender in early REDD+ implementation also shows that there is an awareness of the constraints on women's time and their burden of labour. According to a gender assessment of a regional REDD+ project in Cambodia, over half of the women stated that lack of time was a reason for not participating in REDD+ (Bradley *et al.*, 2013). Nevertheless, while feminist scholars have argued for the need for social policies

to relieve women, or for a change in the division of labour between women and men (Elson & Cagatay, 2000; Hoskyns & Rai, 2007), the recommendations in these reports are less transformative, calling for time-saving technologies (Gurung *et al.*, 2013a, b; Gurung *et al.*, 2014), or for taking women's time constraints into account when planning meetings (WOCAN, 2012; Gurung *et al.*, 2013a; Gurung *et al.*, 2014; IUCN & USAID, 2015f).

This indicates an awareness about the strain on women's time and labour within international institutions and NGOs, but the solutions offered are more technical than social, e.g. time saving technologies, planning meetings at the right time of day, reducing environmental degradation. Griffin (2010: 94-95) points out that such explicitly gendered interventions are often based on heteronormative assumptions, and reify the formal/informal, public/private distinctions which are part of the problem. Although these solutions may contribute to temporarily relieving the burden of women, they do not address the structural causes of the problem with unequal distribution of labour. In the long run, therefore, they risk contributing to the transfer of responsibilities for environmental care work to women by facilitating their participation in REDD+ projects, but without redressing structural inequalities.

An important note, however, in relation to the distinction between practical and strategic needs, and the need for policies addressing structural inequalities, is that the outcomes of policies are unpredictable. What may seem like technical, depoliticised measures, may in some cases have more far-reaching consequences. Gaining more income, organising together around processing and trade in NTFPs, or spending time outside of the household may open opportunities for questioning the status quo, or imagining other ways of doing or being (Arora-Jonsson, 2013). The slow, and uncertain, change entailed in such processes should not be ignored, but can be made part of the feminist strategy, as Davids et al. (2014) write. On the other hand, it is not enough for policy makers aiming to transform unequal relations of power to depend on such processes to do the work for them. Rather, policymaking aimed at reducing gender inequalities in REDD+ should strive to counter the structural constraints facing women in markets or in relations to responsibilities for reproduction.

The focus on reproduction provides an opportunity to highlight the interconnectedness of REDD+ policies with a broader societal context, where social policies relieving women's burden of responsibility for care and reproduction, for example, could also affect the way REDD+ impacts on women and gender relations. Drawing on feminist economics writings about gendered divisions of labour, and social and environmental reproduction and care, I propose analysing the processes whereby responsibilities for environmental protection is transferred to women in the global South as '*global environmental*

care chains', parallel to Hochschild's (2001) 'global care chains' of social reproduction. It offers a framework for understanding the gendered effects of REDD+ and climate policy in a broader perspective, and at a global scale. It could also contribute to greater awareness of the gendered effects of REDD+ within policy-making institutions.

In the next section, I move on to examine the attempts at challenging the mainstream discourses on gender in REDD+, in order to answer my second research question. In the analysis of reports, policy briefs and case studies published by women's organisations and environmental NGOs, I examine their policy solutions and problem representations, and the subject positions they present, and relate them to the discourses I identified in official policy documents.

5.4 Feminist influence in REDD+ policy

Women's organisations across the world are attempting to enhance the attention to gender in REDD+ design and implementation. Gender advocates working in environmental and/or women's NGOs, or as consultants to aid agencies and international institutions work to highlight the importance of attention to gender in the formulation of policies and projects. In order to examine to what extent the mainstream discourses on gender in REDD+ are being challenged, I analyse a body of documents issued by NGOs, often with funding from aid agencies, arguing for the need to pay greater attention to gender, and to include women in REDD+ projects. These reports and case studies are aimed at providing recommendations and positive examples to those shaping REDD+ projects at international and national level. I inquire to what extent they challenge the mainstream discourses on gender in REDD+.

Like in the official body of documents, the efficiency discourse is prevalent in NGO reports and case studies on gender in REDD+, although it is often paired with gender equality as an objective in its own right. IUCN, for example, introduces a set of case studies on gender in REDD+ in a number of countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, stating that

> "in order for REDD+ to become a successful mechanism to combat climate change, and in order for it to provide concrete environmental solutions, gender-responsive standards and safeguards that incorporate gender equality and women's rights must be at the core of REDD+ policies and programmes." (IUCN & USAID, 2015c, e, a, f, d, b).

Similarly, the Centre for People and Forests (RECOFTC) introduces a bulletin on "Gender and REDD+" with a quote from IUCN's *Arbovitae* magazine declaring that

> "Taking a gender perspective in forestry has nothing to do with political correctness and everything to do with development and conservation effectiveness"

only to move on to stress the rights of women, and the need to move beyond avoiding harm in REDD+ activities (RECOFTC & REDD-Net, 2011). The women's community forestry network REFACOF (Réseau des Femmes Africaines pour la Gestion Communautaire des Forêts), which works across Francophone Africa, on the other hand, draws on international human rights law as a foundation for their demands for gender equality in REDD+ (REFACOF, 2012; Karpe *et al.*, 2013).

'Gender', often meaning women, and the need to include women, is for the most part acknowledge in environmental policy, although gender mainstreaming often becomes a technocratic exercise (Arora-Jonsson, 2014). My analysis shows that women's organisations and environmental NGOs active in the global REDD+ debate use much of the same language. Many of the solutions proposed by NGOs are similar to those proposed by REDD+ institutions, including gender mainstreaming, a range of technical solutions such as improved stoves and agroforestry, capacity building, developing gender sensitive indicators and collecting sex-disaggregated data, as well as establishing quotas and regulations for women's representation in REDD+ processes (Gurung *et al.*, 2011; RECOFTC & REDD-Net, 2011; WOCAN, 2012; Bradley *et al.*, 2013; Gurung *et al.*, 2013b, a; Gurung *et al.*, 2014; IUCN & USAID, 2015c, e, a, d). The obligation experienced by gender experts working in international institutions to comply with the official discourse, and internal norms around gender, in order to justify gender considerations (cf. Prügl, 2012; Ferguson, 2015) may partly apply also to these documents, some of which are produced as consultancy reports funded by aid agencies or REDD+ programs. Nevertheless, it also shows the dominance of the mainstream discourses on gender, and the difficulty in looking beyond them for alternative solutions.

There are however differences in the emphasis and perspectives of NGOs compared to official REDD+ programs. The need for ensuring women's access to tenure is more clearly articulated in these reports than in the official policy documents on gender and REDD+. In the context of Francophone Africa, the women's community forestry organisation REFACOF stresses that it is necessary to work to ensure women's access to land and forest tenure in the context of official as well as customary law (REFACOF, 2012; Karpe *et al.*,

2013). Similar recommendations are made by Gurung et al. (2011) in their analysis of gender in REDD+ in Asia, and in Bradley et al.'s (2013) Cambodia study. The demand for tenure rights situates the question of gender in a broader context of gendered power relations and access to resources, and opens up the possibilities for a political debate about resource distribution and the gender-differentiated opportunities to benefit from REDD+ interventions. Tenure is not totally absent from official discourse, but it is often seen as a legal or technical adjustment, not fitted into a wider debate about resource access. Such a debate, if pushed for by women's groups, could potentially constitute a challenge to the depoliticising notions of economic empowerment as a sufficient solution to women's disadvantaged position, which dominates the REDD+ policy making.

Another recommendation made by NGOs, which does not receive much attention in official REDD+ documents, relates to the mobilisation of women's networks and support to women's organisations (RECOFTC & REDD-Net, 2011; Gurung *et al.*, 2013b, a; Gurung *et al.*, 2014; IUCN & USAID, 2015c, b, a, d). UN Women's expert group meeting report on gender-responsive climate action (UN Women, 2015: 8) stood out as an exception among the official documents, clearly advocating the need for

> "empowered women's movements that link up the local level and shape local policies and work in solidarity with global women's movements, national women's machineries and United nations agencies and bodies".

The members of this expert group included representatives from international institutions, national governments as well as NGOs, including WEDO, WOCAN, and IUCN. A couple of the civil society representatives were authors of the NGO reports analysed here. The role of this Expert Groups as advisory to the official processes thus, provided an opportunity for expressing a somewhat different perspective than the official documents of the international institutions.

The call made for mobilising women's movements to voice the demands for approaches conducive of gender equality is important. A strong and widespread women's movement, drawing on international networks, could potentially challenge the mainstream discourses on gender in REDD+ and environmental governance (cf. Keck & Sikkink, 1998; Sandler & Rao, 2012). In addition to challenging the discourse in a broader context, such a movement could form the basis for the creation of "spaces of power" (Newman, 2013) where the contradictions and inconsistencies of the REDD+ assemblage can be drawn upon to pursue feminist goals. Through networks of support between feminist insiders and outsiders, opportunities may arise to raise issues and discussions concerning the mainstream approaches to gender within international institutions (Arora-Jonsson & Sijapati Basnett, 2017). Social movements and networks of women

with a strong local base, can also create opportunities for challenging the stereotypes about women, visibilising multiple subjectivities, and highlighting the importance of context-specific understanding of gender relations. Sharma (2006), for example, has shown how a government sponsored NGO working with grassroots empowerment in India did not just produce disciplined state subjects, but active, sometimes dissident, political actors.

The attempts at presenting alternative subjectivities for women, different from those present in the official documents, are modest in the reviewed case studies and reports. The vulnerability discourse is less prominent in the NGO reports than in official documents. The emphasis is, however, strong on women's and men's different roles and responsibilities, and the resulting difference in knowledge and interests (e.g. RECOFTC & REDD-Net, 2011; Bradley *et al.*, 2013; Gurung *et al.*, 2013a; IUCN & USAID, 2015a). This call for understanding the specific gendered roles and responsibilities of women and men may be seen as another way of emphasising the need for contextual understanding of gender relations. Emphasising the specific knowledge of women has also been used as a way of justifying the inclusion of women in policies and projects, but without confronting a need for change (Leach, 2007; Arora-Jonsson, 2014). Rather, there is a risk, as discussed above (Section 5.3.2), that this way of discussing gender relations in natural resource management promotes a notion of gender roles as stable and unchanging. This way, the emphasis of women's roles and specific knowledge risks leading to policies that conserve gender roles rather than promote change. As Standing (2004) observes, the language of transformation cannot be taken up by bureaucracies unchanged. Although gender advocates use the language of roles, responsibilities and knowledge in order to promote a recognition of women's agency in natural resource management, this language risks being subsumed into the efficiency discourses of the World Bank and official REDD+ programs. This highlights the difficulties women's organisations and gender advocates face in interactions with the policy-making processes of such institutions.

The market discourse which is prominent in official discourse has also influenced some women's organisations, as the analysis of the W+ in Paper III shows. WOCAN has taken inspiration from consumer-directed certification schemes such as the Fair Trade label, and the voluntary carbon market in the design of the W+ initiative. Just as Fraser (2014) observes in relation to commodification of labour and land, the debates relating to the commodification of carbon are not two-sided, and many actors, not least within environmental NGOs are hoping that it may provide new sources of income and opportunities for local communities or marginalised people to ascertain and/or formalise ownership or control over their forest lands. As private sector actors expect to

earn profit from selling carbon credits, WOCAN saw an opportunity to promote gender issues through a market-based certification scheme. Embracing the market approach, WOCAN created the W+ certification labelling in order to encourage carbon projects focusing on women's (economic) empowerment.

As showed in Paper III, the strategies of WEDO and WOCAN in their initiatives at enhancing attention to gender through REDD+ safeguards work (WEDO REDD+ SES) or as co-benefits (W+ standards), were cautious rather than radical, in asking for modification of existing approaches rather than transformation. WOCAN adopted a co-benefits approach, presenting women's empowerment as an additional benefit that might also make carbon credits more attractive to buyers. In this tactic, they embraced the technocratic discourse of producing measurable and quantifiable results. The WEDO REDD+ SES initiative works with safeguards, and a rights-based approach, which, as Paper III shows, provides more opportunities for promoting alternative perspectives on gender roles and relations. They too, however, rely on the interest and commitment of governments and donors developing REDD+ programs. Although they attempt to present alternative subject positions for women, and promote mobilisation of women's groups and networks, their discourse is not radically different from that dominating REDD+ policy making. This can be seen as a self-disciplining effect, as the women's organisation, although aiming to make change in the way gender issues are treated in policy processes, do not want to risk being excluded from the process by proposing radical changes that would shift relations of power to the detriment of those in charge. They are, however, trying to raise the discussion about gender relations, and possibly hoping for moderate proposals for change to generate greater impacts, a strategy described by Eyben (2010), for example.

The disciplining effects of discourse can also be more powerful than gender advocates toning down their critique of those in power. As shown in the analysis of discoursing actors above, critical voices risk being excluded altogether from the policy process. In my study of the policy process of Burkina Faso, I did not find voices pushing for radical change of the mainstream discourse. In the national policy process, the civil society representative described as representing the voice of women and indigenous peoples, was an educated woman from the city, employed at the Ministry of Environment. She represented a NGO for women professionals in environment and forestry (AMIFOB – l'Amicale des forestières au Burkina Faso). Although she might have been knowledgeable about the work rural women do in the forest, she had not been elected by grassroots to represent them, but rather identified by colleagues at the Ministry of Environment because of her engagement in AMIFOB. In interviews she expressed no critique of the official REDD+ process. Rather she repeated much

of the same discourse found in the REDD+ policy documents and in interviews with government officials, i.e. that women have a close tie to the forest, and specifically could benefit from activities relating to NTFP commercialisation. She pointed to the importance of taking gender issues and women into account in the process, and expressed that this would be done through the Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM) – the specific funding mechanism available for local communities and indigenous people to develop projects related to the REDD+ process. This was the answer given also by government officials and World Bank officers when asked how gender would be taken into account. Nevertheless, when the first DGM funding was approved, women and gender were only mentioned briefly, in the background and in relation to NTFPs, in formulations similar to the main REDD+ policy documents (FIP, 2015).

The document analysis shows that discourses on gender in REDD+, which dominate policy making, are not easily challenged from within, or in interaction with these policy processes. Preconceived notions of how to do REDD+, and how to do gender in REDD+, are deeply embedded in the processes of knowledge production, policy formulation and project development of the international institutions involved in REDD+ design and implementation, and in the way REDD+ programs are held together. The interaction of women's NGOs and organisations with these processes, through documents and meeting participation, takes place on established terms which makes inserting alternative discourses a difficult task. The results from the document analysis highlight the difficulties in moving beyond the dominant discourse. In addition, reports and case studies are produced against the background of already ongoing REDD+ projects, with little opportunity for proposing major changes or different ways of doing REDD+. The chosen strategy, thus, may be to try and promote modifications rather than transformations of the processes.

Within this apparently narrow frame for what can be imagined in terms of gender policy, feminist advocates have an important role to play in pushing for gender perspectives, and for women's voices to be heard. Although this may not lead to a transformation of power relations, it can contribute to some improvements and avoid the worst pitfalls, such as a total disregard for women's use of the forest. The mobilisation of women's groups and networks may also contribute to women gaining a stronger voice, and could provide opportunities for advocating for change, in relation to REDD+, but also beyond REDD+, as the example Arora-Jonsson (2010) shows, analysing women organising in around credits and savings in India. Thus, drawing on the opportunities provided by REDD+ to mobilise around gender issues appears to be the best chance at promoting positive change.

At the same time, it must be kept in mind that REDD+ does not take place in a vacuum, where a reality different from the rest of society can be imagined. Rather, the way gender issues are treated in REDD+ reflects larger structures. Therefore, it would be unrealistic to assume that changes could take place in REDD+ implementation without shifts taking place at a larger scale. However, just as changes in other fields can contribute to a change also in REDD+ policies, what happens in REDD+ can contribute to changes in other fields. If REDD+ policies contribute to the fulfilment of women's practical needs, this may in turn contribute to increased opportunities for claiming rights or imagining alternative subjectivities. While the "slow revolution" of gender mainstreaming (Davids *et al.*, 2014) may thus lead to small steps forward, feminists and gender advocates continue to have an important role in pushing for larger steps, and calling for policymakers to take responsibility for the changes they are aiming to effect in the daily use of natural resources of a large number of people, by implementing REDD+ at global scale, across the global South.

6 Summary of the papers

6.1 Paper I

Defining solutions, finding problems: Deforestation, gender and REDD+ in Burkina Faso. By Lisa Westholm and Seema Arora-Jonsson. Published in Conservation and Society 13(2), pp. 189-199.

The first paper of this thesis is a study of the national-level formulation of the REDD+ program in Burkina Faso. It draws on analysis of policy documents (including international REDD+ documents, institutional documents and documents pertaining to the national REDD+ program of Burkina), interviews with policy makers, and participation in policy meetings in order to answer questions about what the problem of gender in REDD+ is represented to be? Applying the Bacchi's (1999) "What's the Problem Represented to be?" approach, we asked What presuppositions are implied or taken for granted in representations of gender and women? What is left unproblematic? and What effects these problem representations have on policy formulation? With these questions we set out to examine whether the framing of REDD+ programs can provide openings for a transformation as argued for by its proponents, or whether the fears of REDD+ exacerbating gender inequalities might be justified.

We come to the conclusion that REDD+ in Burkina Faso was a solution in need of a problem. International donors and northern aid agencies looking to pilot REDD+ in a range of settings needed to mobilise support from national and international actors in order to gain acceptance for the interventions. In order to do this, the solutions REDD+ offers needed to be coupled to suitable problem representations. A key to this mobilisation of support, was the presentation of Burkina Faso's REDD+ program as a "triple-win" solution, which would promote climate change mitigation, adaptation and poverty reduction. Assumptions about gender were at the heart of the production of 'actionable

knowledge' (cf. Vetterlein, 2012) that enabled REDD+ to be presented as a policy solution to the problems of deforestation, poverty and gender inequality.

We further conclude that the treatment of gender issues in Burkina Faso's REDD+ program appears to be perpetuating gendered divisions of labour. Discussions about gender in policy documents and among policy makers were more about how best to use women's labour, or how women's role in NTFP collection could be used to promote program objectives. I build on this argument in the overall analysis in the previous chapter (Chapter 5) in a discussion about social and natural reproduction in REDD+.

Despite gender mainstreaming commitments of the involved donors and international institutions, including the World Bank and the African Development Bank, gender issues were not seen to warrant attention throughout the program. Instead, the matter of gender inequalities was pushed to the margin, and presented as something that could be dealt with later and on the side, in a separate funding module – the Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM) – and through specific projects dedicated to women. Thus, gender issues came to be present without being named in the process, as formal environmental decision-making moves upwards, to international institutions and donors, while responsibility and the burden of actual environmental labour shifts further down in particularly gendered ways.

6.2 Paper II

Fruits from the forest and the fields: Forest conservation policies and intersecting social inequalities in Burkina Faso's REDD+ program. By Lisa Westholm. Published in International Forestry Review 18(4), pp. 511-521.

In the attempt to answer the first research question of this thesis, about the way gender is discussed and brought into the policy making related to REDD+, Paper II provides a concrete example of the role of discourses on gender in REDD+. This paper analyses the local formulation and early implementation of REDD+ in Burkina Faso in order to situate the policies analysed in a local context.

In the REDD+ program in Burkina Faso, women are targeted in projects promoting commercialisation of NTFPs aimed to incentivise forest conservation and simultaneously provide economic opportunities for women. Such policies are based on essentialist assumptions about what men and women do, ignoring that social relations of inequality need to be understood in context, an argument which I expand in the overall analysis (Chapter 5). By relating the analysis of policy documents to data on forest and tree resource use in two villages where

REDD+ projects are being planned, the paper points to the blind spots, and potential consequences stemming from a lack of adherence to the local context in policy formulation.

The analysis shows that the policy program is based on implicit assumptions about what men and women do, lacking insights into the power embedded in social relations, and failing to take into account context-specific social difference based on ethnicity, migrant status and other factors. Notably, these assumptions include a perception of gender relations and gendered divisions of labour and resource use as static, and the notion that interests within the household as well as the community are homogenous. As a consequence, despite the express ambition to make the REDD+ process participatory, inclusionary and demand-driven, currently marginalised voices were unlikely to be heard in existing forest management organisations. Rather, the lack of acknowledgement of intersecting relations of inequality leads to crucial aspects of NTFP resource use being overlooked, and risks leading to increased marginalisation of certain groups.

6.3 Paper III

What room for politics and change in global climate governance? Addressing gender in co-benefits and safeguards. By Lisa Westholm and Seema Arora-Jonsson.

My second research question relates to the possibilities for challenging mainstream discourses on gender in REDD+ policy making. In this article we examine two such attempts by women's organisations. One is a collaboration between WEDO (Women's Environment and Development Organization) and the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards initiative (REDD+ SES) aimed at developing guidelines for gender sensitive safeguards implementation in national REDD+ programs. The other is the W+ standards, a certification scheme for carbon projects aimed at enhancing women's empowerment which was launched by WOCAN (Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management).

In an analysis of the documents and websites of the two initiatives, and framing them in relation to the concepts of co-benefits and safeguards in REDD+, we examine how they relate to the mainstream discourses on gender in REDD+, and in what way they challenge them. Specifically, we analyse how they position themselves as outsiders/insiders, the solutions they propose for dealing with gender inequalities, and how they relate to the collective versus the individual as a vehicle for change. We ask if and how the strategies chosen in the two initiatives enable a conceptualisation of gender that acknowledges its

political dimensions and is able to challenge the mainstream discourse on gender as a technical matter. We conclude that although their strategies place them at risk of being co-opted into the mainstream discourse, both initiatives encompass a diversity and flexibility which is necessary in the face of the contingency of REDD+ projects.

7 Conclusions

“Conserving carbon and gender relations?” is the question I ask in the title of this thesis. I have looked to answer it by analysing the discourses on gender in global REDD+ policy. I have brought to the fore the role of global policymaking, such as the large scale endeavours of the UNFCCC negotiations, in shaping approaches to gender in policies at international, as well as national and local level. I have identified discourses on gender in REDD+ policy, examined their implications, and inquired into the possibilities for women’s organisations and gender advocates to challenge the mainstream discourses and promote alternative subject positions, and problem representations and policy solutions for gender equality.

My analysis of a wide range of official documents, related to REDD+ policies and institutions, shows that the discourses on gender rarely move beyond the homogenising notion of women as vulnerable beings whose economic empowerment will benefit not only themselves, but especially increase the efficiency and sustainability of climate change mitigation. The discourse of gender equality as a matter of efficiency and sustainability of interventions, rather than an objective in its own right, dominates the formulation of policies and operationalisation of actions on gender.

In REDD+ policies and programs, gender is often treated as a local concern, to be addressed at the local level and in the targeted communities. This compartmentalises gender as a concern only for women, and especially poor women in the global South, rather than recognising that unequal relations of power, structured by gender (among other factors), are prevalent throughout society, and shape policymaking at all levels. Postponing the attention to gender, and bringing it in only at specific moments in the phase of implementation, forestalls the opportunities for achieving a transformation of gender relations. Rather, REDD+ programs and REDD+ policy making should be based on proper gender analysis and gender should be integral to the framing of policies at all levels.

I show that gender concerns are often addressed through specific projects directed at women and "female products", such as NTFP commercialisation. Such policy proposals for promoting gender equality are based on assumptions about individual economic empowerment as a solution, not only for the individual, but also for structural gender inequalities. While a distinction between practical and strategic gender needs can provide a framework for examining such assumptions, there are limitations to this approach to gender equality. Also practical improvements may provide openings for claiming different subject positions or raising a political debate. On the other hand, as my analysis of policy discourses shows, claims to addressing strategic and structural inequalities may be overstated. My case study of Burkina Faso's REDD+ program shows that also strategic interventions, although concerned with the representation and participation of women, risk perpetuating unequal relations of power. This is the result of critical voices being excluded from the process, and the insufficient understanding of existing inequalities and marginalisation in the organisation of resource use and access.

Policymaking should not rely on small steps, but recognise the structural constraints that women face, like those relating to market participation or influence in decision-making, and aim for a more transformative role. This requires knowledge and understanding of the constraints and, from the perspective of global climate and REDD+ policymaking, also a flexibility to adapt policies to the local context. While feminist researchers have long pointed to the way gender relations shape the functioning of markets, additional research on the mechanisms whereby women are disadvantaged in commodity markets, such as those for NTFPs, could shed light on the obstacles they face, and the way social relations of inequality are embedded in markets.

I demonstrate through my analysis the role of social and natural reproduction, and how market-based solutions risk enhancing an unequal distribution of responsibilities for such work, by displacing responsibilities, from rich to poor, from North to South, and from men to women. To characterize this transfer of responsibilities I introduce the concept of "global environmental care chains", whereby people in the global North pay those in the global South for climate change mitigation work in order to postpone their own mitigation actions. This concept sheds light on the global linkages of rights, responsibilities and accountability involved in REDD+. Drawing on this perspective, future research could provide deeper understanding of the mechanisms involved, and provide additional empirical evidence, relating to the REDD+ as well as other climate policy programs.

Finally, I inquire into the possibilities for challenging the mainstream discourses on gender in global REDD+ and climate change mitigation policy. I

show that the women's and/or environmental organisations advocating for the inclusion of gender concerns in REDD+ policy making and implementation, often adopt a moderate position, asking for modification of existing strategies rather than radical transformation. I find that among the women's organisations advocating for gender in REDD+ through reports and case studies, many seem to adhere to and internalise the official discourse, proposing the same measures already included in gender mainstreaming frameworks of the international institutions working on REDD+. Such strategies may be necessary in order to maintain a position of some influence with the international institutions responsible for REDD+ policy making.

On the other hand, I show how the international institutions have taken up some of the discourse of feminist activists and academics, such as the focus on women's and men's specific roles, responsibilities and knowledge in natural resource management. However, even when international institutions are influenced by the language of gender advocates, they are likely to use it with a somewhat different meaning. This language, thus, risks perpetuating stereotypes about what men and women do in the forest, rather than promoting change.

Challenging the institutionally entrenched resistance to transformation is likely to require hard work at all fronts, from the outside and from within, at the local level as well as internationally. The support for women's movements and networks advocated by women's NGOs is crucial in this context, as an opportunity to push for change and insert demands founded in the local realities of the women affected by REDD+ interventions.

As a final point, the focus on reproduction reveals that REDD+, like other environment and development policies, cannot be analysed in isolation from a broader societal context. Neither is advocating for gender sensitive REDD+ policies in isolation going to result in transformative change of gender relations. Rather, there is a need for social policy which can relieve women of some of their burden of responsibility, and open up the possibility for making different choices and claiming different subject positons. If REDD+ policy is to avoid conserving gender relations along with carbon, it must be open to multiple subjectivities of the people involved, rather than presenting them with fixed roles to play.

References

Abood, S.A., Lee, J.S.H., Burivalova, Z., Garcia-Ulloa, J. & Koh, L.P. (2015). Relative Contributions of the Logging, Fiber, Oil Palm, and Mining Industries to Forest Loss in Indonesia. *Conservation Letters*, 8(1), pp. 58-67.

Adaptation Fund (2016). *Annex 4 to OPG: Gender Policy of the Adaptation Fund*. https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/opg-annex4-gender-policy/: Adaptation Fund.

Adger, N.W., Agrawala, S., Mirza, M.M.Q., Conde, C., O'Brien, K., Pulhin, J., Pulwarty, R., Smit, B. & Takahashi, K. (2007). Assessment of adaptation practices, options, constraints and capacity. In: Parry, M.L., Canziani, O.F., Palutikof, J.P., van der Linden, P.J. & Hanson, C.E. (eds) *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University press.

AfDB (2013a). *Gazetted forests participatory management project for REDD+ (PGFC/REDD+). Project appraisal report*: African Development Bank Group.

AfDB (2013b). *Gazetted forests participatory management projects for REDD+ (PGFC/REDD+). Volume 2: Technical annexes*: African Development Bank Group.

Agarwal, A. & Narain, S. (1991). *Global Warming in an Unequal World: A case of environmental colonialism*. New Delhi: Centre for Science and Environment.

Agarwal, B. (2010). *Gender and green governance. The political economy of women's presence within and beyond community forestry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ahlers, R. & Zwarteveen, M. (2009). The water question in feminism: water control and gender inequities in a neo-liberal era. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 16(4), pp. 409-426.

Ahmed, S. & Fajber, E. (2009). Engendering adaptation to climate variability in Gujarat, India. *Gender & Development*, 17(1), pp. 33-50.

Alston, M. (2014). Gender mainstreaming and climate change. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 47, Part B, pp. 287-294.

Alvesson, M. & Sköldberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research.* London: SAGE Publications.

Angelsen, A. (2014). The economics of REDD+. In: Alavalapati, J. & Kant, S. (eds) *Hanbook of forest resource economics*. London: Routledge, pp. 290-306.

Angelsen, A. & McNeill, D. (2012). The evolution of REDD+. In: Angelsen, A., Brockhaus, M., Sunderlin, W.D. & Verchot, L. (eds) *Analysing REDD+. Challenges and choices*. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR, pp. 31-50.

Arora-Jonsson, S. (2010). Particular and wider interests in natural resource management: Organizing together but separately. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, 25(S9), pp. 33-44.

Arora-Jonsson, S. (2011). Virtue and vulnerability: Discourses on women, gender and climate change. *Global Environmental Change*, 21(2), pp. 744-751.

Arora-Jonsson, S. (2013). *Gender, Development and Environmental Governance: Theorizing Connections*. London/New York: Routledge.

Arora-Jonsson, S. (2014). Forty years of gender research and environmental policy: Where do we stand? *Women's Studies International Forum*, 47(B), pp. 295-308.

Arora-Jonsson, S. & Sijapati Basnett, B. (2017). Disciplining gender in international organizations: The texts and practices of gender mainstreaming. *Gender, Work and Organization*, forthcoming.

Arora-Jonsson, S., Westholm, L., Temu, B.J. & Petitt, A. (2016). Carbon and Cash in Climate Assemblages: The Making of a New Global Citizenship. *Antipode*, 48(1), pp. 74-96.
Arriagada, R.A., Sills, E.O., Ferraro, P.J. & Pattanayak, S.K. (2015). Do Payments Pay Off? Evidence from Participation in Costa Rica's PES Program. *PLoS ONE*, 10(7), p. e0131544.
Arts, B. & Buizer, M. (2009). Forests, discourses, institutions. A discursive-institutional analysis of global forest governance. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 11, pp. 340-347.
Bacchi, C. (1999). *Women, policy and politics. The construction of policy problems*. London: SAGE Publications.
Bacchi, C. (2009). *Analysing policy: What's the problem represented to be?* Australia: Pearson.
Bacchi, C. (2012). Why study problematizations? Making politics visible. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 2(1), pp. 1-8.
Bacchi, C. & Eveline, J. (eds) (2010). *Mainstreaming politics: Gendering practices and feminist theory*. Adelaide: University of Adelaide Press.
Baden, S. & Goetz, A.M. (1997). Who needs [sex] when you can have [gender]? Conflicting discourses on gender at Beijing. *Feminist Review*, 56(Summer, 1997), pp. 3-25.
Bakker, I. (2007). Social Reproduction and the Constitution of a Gendered Political Economy. *New Political Economy*, 12(4), pp. 541-556.
Barad, K. (1996). Meeting the universe halfway: Realism and social constructivism without contradiction. In: Nelson, L.H. & Nelson, J. (eds) *Feminism, Science and the Philosophy of Science* Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Bee, B.A. (2013). Who reaps what is sown? A feminist inquiry into climate change adaptation in two Mexican *ejidos*. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 12(1), pp. 131-154.
Bee, B.A., Rice, J. & Trauger, A. (2015). A Feminist Approach to Climate Change Governance: Everyday and Intimate Politics. *Geography Compass*, 9(6), pp. 339-350.
Bee, B.A. & Sijapati Basnett, B. (2016). Engendering social and environmental safeguards in REDD+: lessons from feminist and development research. *Third world quarterly*, pp. 1-18.
Belcher, B. & Schreckenberg, K. (2007). Commercialisation of non-timber forest products: A reality check. *Development Policy Review*, 25(3), pp. 355-377.
Benería, L., Berik, G. & Floro, M.S. (2016). *Gender, development and globalization. Economics as if all people mattered*. Second. ed. New York and Oxon: Routledge.
Bergström, G. & Boréus, K. (eds) (2013). *Textens makt och mening. Metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys.* 3rd ed. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
Bernstein, S. & Cashore, B. (2012). Complex global governance and domestic policies: four pathways of influence. *International Affairs*, 88(3), pp. 585-604.
Biddulph, R., Westholm, L., Mattsson, E., Pettersson, J. & Strömberg, J. (2009). *Making REDD work for the poor. Inception report*. (Focali Report 2009:02. Göteborg: Focali.
Biesecker, A. & Hofmeister, S. (2010). Focus: (Re)productivity. Sustainable relations both between society and nature and between the genders. *Ecological Economics*, 69, pp. 1703-1711.
Bordieu, P. (2004). *Science as science and reflexivity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Boserup, E. (1970). *Woman's role in economic development*. London: Allen & Unwin.
Bradley, A., Billah Setyowati, A., Gurung, J., Yeang, D., Net, C., Khiev, S. & Brewster, J. (2013). *Gender and REDD+: An assessment in the Oddar Meanchey community forestry REDD+ site, Cambodia*: WOCAN, FFPRI, Pact.
Broome, A. & Seabrooke, L. (2012). Seeing like an International Organization. *New Political Economy*, 17(1), pp. 1-16.
Buckingham, S. (2010). Call in the women. *Nature*, 468(7323), pp. 502-502.
Buckingham, S. & Le Masson, V. (eds) (2017). *Understanding climate change through gender relations*. London: Routledge.
Bumpus, A.G. & Liverman, D.M. (2010). Carbon colonialism? Offsets, greenhouse gas reductions, and sustainable development. In: Peet, R., Robbins, P. & Watts, M. (eds) *Global political ecology*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 203-224.
Burkina Faso (2013). *Projet de gestion décéntralisée des forêts et espaces boisés (PGDFEB). Cadre de gestion environnementale et sociale (CGES)*: World Bank.
Bäckstrand, K. & Lövbrand, E. (2006). Planting trees to mitigate climate change: Contested discourses of ecological modernization, green governmentality and civic environmentalism. *Global Environmental Politics*, 6(1), pp. 50-75.
Calkin, S. (2015). Feminism, interrupted? Gender and development in the era of 'Smart Economics'. *Progress in Development Studies*, 15(4), pp. 295-307.

Carr, E.R. & Thompson, M.C. (2014). Gender and Climate Change Adaptation in Agrarian Settings: Current Thinking, New Directions, and Research Frontiers. *Geography Compass,* 8(3), pp. 182-197.
Catney, P. & Doyle, T. (2011). The welfare of now and the green (post) politics of the future. *Critical Social Policy,* 31(2), pp. 174-193.
CBD, UNCCD & UNFCCC (2012). *The Rio conventions: Action on gender*. Randers: Convention on Biological Diversity, United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.
Chant, S. & Sweetman, C. (2012). Fixing women or fixing the world? 'Smart economics', efficiency approaches, and gender equality in development. *Gender & Development,* 20(3), pp. 517-529.
CIF (2009). *Design document for the Forest Investment Program, a targeted program un the SCF Trust Fund*. Washington D.C.: Climate Investment Funds (CIF).
CIF (2010). *Strategic Environmental, Social and Gender Assessment of the Climate Investment Funds*. Washington D.C.: Climate Investment Funds.
CIF (2012). *Gender review of the CIF*. Istanbul: Prepared by Aguilar, L., Rogers, F., Pearl-Martinez, R., Castaneda, I., Athanas, A., Siles, J., IUCN.
CIF (2014). *CIF gender action plan*. Montego Bay: Climate Investment Funds.
Cleaver, F. (1999). Paradoxes of participation: questioning participatory approaches to development. *Journal of International Development*(11), pp. 597-612.
Cleaver, F. (2002). Reinventing Institutions: Bricolage and the Social Embeddedness of Natural Resource Management. *The European Journal of Development Research,* 14(2), pp. 11-30.
Cornwall, A. (2016). Women's Empowerment: What Works? *Journal of International Development,* 28(3), pp. 342-359.
Cornwall, A. & Rivas, A.-M. (2015). From 'gender equality and 'women's empowerment' to global justice: reclaiming a transformative agenda for gender and development. *Third world quarterly,* 36(2), pp. 396-415.
Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review,* 43(6), pp. 1241-1299.
Dankelman, I. (2002). Climate change: Learning from gender analysis and women's experiences of organising for sustainable development. *Gender & Development,* 10(2), pp. 21-29.
Davids, T., van Driel, F. & Parren, F. (2014). Feminist change revisited: Gender mainstreaming as slow revolution. *Journal of International Development,* 26(3), pp. 396-408.
Davies, C.A. (2008). *Reflexive ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others*. New York: Routledge.
den Besten, J.W., Arts, B. & Verkooijen, P. (2014). The evolution of REDD+: An analysis of discursive-institutional dynamics. *Environmental Science & Policy,* 35, pp. 40-48.
Denton, F. (2002). Climate change vulnerability, impacts and adaptation: Why does gender matter? *Gender and Development,* 10(2), pp. 10-20.
Desai, M. (2007). The Messy Relationship Between Feminisms and Globalizations. *Gender & Society,* 21(6), pp. 797-803.
Djoudi, H. & Brockhaus, M. (2011). Is adaptation to climate change gender neutral? Lessons from communities dependent on livestock and forests in northern Mali. *International Forestry Review,* 13(2), pp. 123-135.
Doss, C. (2006). Engendering agricultural technology for Africa's farmers. Promises and pitfalls. In: Kuiper, E. & Barker, D.K. (eds) *Feminist economics and the World Bank. History, theory and policy*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 79-93.
Doucet, A. & Mauthner, N. (2006). Feminist methodologies and epistemology. *Handbook of 21st Century Sociology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage*, pp. 36-45.
Dryzek, J.S. (1997). *The politics of the earth: Environmental discourses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Dryzek, J.S. (2005). *The politics of the Earth: environmental discourses*. 2. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Duflo, E. (2012). Women empowerment and economic development. *Journal of Economic Literature,* 50(4), pp. 1051-1079.
Elias, J. (2013). Davos Woman to the Rescue of Global Capitalism: Postfeminist Politics and Competitiveness Promotion at the World Economic Forum. *International Political Sociology,* 7(2), pp. 152-169.

Elias, M. (2010). *Transforming nature's subsidy: Global markets, Burkinabè women and African shea butter*. Diss. Montreal: McGill University.
Elson, D. (1993). Gender-aware analysis and development economics. *Journal of International Development*, 5(2), pp. 237-247.
Elson, D. & Cagatay, N. (2000). The social content of macroeconomic policies. *World Development*, 28(7), pp. 1347-1364.
European Union (2012). *European Parliament resolution of 20 April 2012 on women and climate change (2011/2197(INI))*. Brussels: European Parliament.
Eyben, R. (2010). Subversively Accommodating: Feminist Bureaucrats and Gender Mainstreaming. *IDS Bulletin*, 41(2), pp. 54-61.
Fairhead, J. & Leach, M. (1995). False forest history, complicit social analysis: rethinking some West African environmental narratives. *World Development*, 23(6), pp. 1023-1035.
FAO (1991). *Non-wood forest products: the way ahead*. (FAO forestry paper. Rome: FAO.
FCPF *Forest Carbon Partnership Facility*. www.forestcarbonpartnership.org [2017-01-31].
FCPF (2016a). *Emission Reductions Program Document (ER-PD). Mai-Ndombe Emission Reductions Program, Democratic Republic of Congo*. www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/: Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, World Bank.
FCPF (2016b). *Emission Reductions Program Document (ER-PD). Vietnam*. www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/: Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Vietnam.
Ferguson, J. (1994). *The anit-politics machine: "Development," depoliticization, and bureaucratic power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Ferguson, L. (2015). “This Is Our Gender Person”. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 17(3), pp. 380-397.
FIP (2013). Projecct information document. FIP - Decentralized forest and woodland management project (P143993). Available from: www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cifnet/?q=country/burkina-faso.
FIP (2015). *Project Information Document (PID) Appraisal stage. Local Forest Communities Support Project (P149434)*. www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/country/burkina-faso/burkina-fasos-fip-programming: Forest Investment Program.
Fischer, R., Hargita, Y. & Günter, S. (2016). Insights from the ground level? A content analysis review of multi-national REDD+ studies since 2010. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 66, pp. 47-58.
Folbre, N. (2006). Measuring Care: Gender, Empowerment, and the Care Economy. *Journal of Human Development*, 7(2), pp. 183-199.
Fortmann, L. & Rocheleau, D. (1985). Women and agroforestry: four myths and three case studies. *Agroforestry Systems*(2), pp. 253-272.
Fraser, N. (1994). After the Family Wage: Gender Equity and the Welfare State. *Political Theory*, 22(4), pp. 591-618.
Fraser, N. (2014). Can society be commodities all the way down? Post-Polanyian reflections on capitalist crisis. *Economy and Society*, 43(4), pp. 541-558.
Gay-Antaki, M. (2016). "Now we have equality": A feminist political ecology analysis of carbon markets in Oaxaca, Mexico. *Journal of Latin American Geography*, 15(3), pp. 49-66.
GCF (2015). *Gender Policy and Action Plan*. Songdo, Korea: Green Climate Fund.
GEF (2012). *Policy on gender mainstreaming. SD/PL/02*. https://www.thegef.org/gef/node/5733: Global Environment Facility.
GEF (2014). *Gender equality action plan*. Washington D.C.: The Global Environment Facility.
GGCA *Global Gender and Climate Alliance*. http://gender-climate.org/ [2017-07-19].
Goldman, M. (2005). *Imperial nature. The World Bank and struggles for social justice in the age of globalization*. (Yale Agrarian Studies Series. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
Gonda, N. (2016). *"How to recaffeinate climate change": The politics of gender and climate change in post-neoliberal Nicaragua*. Diss. Budapest: Central European University.
Griffin, P. (2010). Gender, governance and the global political economy. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 64(1), pp. 86-104.
Gupta, J. (2012). Glocal forest and REDD+ governance: win–win or lose–lose? *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 4(6), pp. 620-627.
Gurung, J., Ganz, D. & Kono, A. (2014). *Women's inclusion in REDD+ in the Philippines. Lessons from good practices in forest, and other natiural resource management sectors*: UN-REDD, WOCAN, USAID LEAF.

Gurung, J., Giri, K., Setyowati, A. & Lebow, E. (2011). *Getting REDD+ right for women. An analysis of the barriers and opportunities for women's participation in the REDD+ sector in Asia*: USAID.
Gurung, J., Kono, A. & Ganz, D. (2013a). *Women's inclusion in REDD+ in Cambodia. Lessons from good practices in forest, agriculture and other natural resources management sectors*: UN-REDD, WOCAN, USAID LEAF.
Gurung, J., Kono, A. & Ganz, D. (2013b). *Women's inclusion in REDD+ in Sri Lanka. Lessons from good practices in forest, agriculture and other natural resources management sectors*: UN-REDD, WOCAN, USAID LEAF.
Gururani, S. (2002). Forests of pleasure and pain: Gendered practices of labor and livelihoods in the forests of the Kumaon Himalayas, India. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 9(3), pp. 229-243.
Hajer, M.A. (1995). *The politics of environmental discourse: ecological modernization and the policy process*. Clarendon: Oxford University Press.
Hajer, M.A. & Versteeg, W. (2005). A decade of discourse analysis of environmental politics: Achievements, challenges, perspectives. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 7(3), pp. 175-184.
Hannan, C. (2009). Gender mainstreaming climate change. *Kvinder, køn & forskning*(3-4), pp. 46-51.
Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), pp. 575-599.
Harcourt, W. (2016). Revisiting global body politics in Nepal: A reflexive analysis. *Global Public Health*, 11(1-2), pp. 236-251.
Harding, S. (1986). The Instability of the Analytical Categories of Feminist Theory. *Signs*, 11(4), pp. 645-664.
Harriss-White, B. (2005a). Commercialisation, commodification and gender relations in post-harvest systems for rice in South Asia. *Economic and Political Weekly*, pp. 2530-2542.
Harriss-White, B. (2005b). Female and male grain marketing systems. Analytical and policy issued for West Africa and India. In: Jackson, C. & Pearson, R. (eds) *Feminist visions of development: Gender analysis and policy*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis, pp. 190-215.
Hassim, S. & Razavi, S. (2006). Gender and Social Policy in a Global Context: Uncovering the Gendered Structure of 'the Social'. In: Razavi, S. & Hassim, S. (eds) *Gender and Social Policy in a Global Context: Uncovering the Gendered Structure of 'the Social'*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 1-39. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230625280_1
http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230625280_1.
Hemmati, M. & Röhr, U. (2009). Engendering the climate-change negotiations: Experiences, challenges and steps forward. *Gender and Development*, 17(1), pp. 19-32.
Hill Collins, P. (2004). Comments on Hekman's "Truth and method: Feminist standpoint theory revisited": Where's the power? In: Harding, S. (ed. *The feminist standpoint theory reader. Intellectual and political controversies*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 247-253.
Hochschild, A.R. (2001). Global care chains and emotional surplus value. In: Hutton, W. & Giddens, A. (eds) *On the edge: Living with global capitalism*. London: Vintage, pp. 130-46.
Holmgren, S. & Arora-Jonsson, S. (2015). The Forest Kingdom – with what values for the world? Climate change and gender equality in a contested forest policy context. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, 30(3), pp. 235-245.
Hoskyns, C. & Rai, S.M. (2007). Recasting the Global Political Economy: Counting Women's Unpaid Work. *New Political Economy*, 12(3), pp. 297-317.
Howarth, D. (2010). Power, discourse, and policy: articulating a hegemony approach to critical policy studies. *Critical Policy Studies*, 3(3-4), pp. 309-335.
Hultman, M. & Anshelm, J. (2017). Masculinities of global climate change. Exploring ecomodern, industrial and ecological masculinity. In: Griffin Cohen, M. (ed. *Climate change and gender in rich countries: Work, public policy and action*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 19-34.
Humphreys, D. (2009). Discourse as ideology: Neoliberalism and the limits of international forest policy. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 11(5-6), pp. 319-325.
Ickowitz, A. (2006). Shifting Cultivation and Deforestation in Tropical Africa: Critical Reflections. *Development and Change*, 37(3), pp. 599-626.
IDS *Participatory methods*. www.participatorymethods.org/ [2015-09-12].
IISD *Participatory research for sustainable livelihoods. A guide for field projects on adaptive strategies*. www.iisd.org/casl/caslguide/guidebook-home.htm [2015-09-12].

Ingram, V., Schure, J., Tieguhong, J.C., Ndoye, O., Awono, A. & Iponga, D.M. (2014). Gender implications of forest product value chains in the Congo basin. *Forests, Trees and Livelihoods*, 23(1/2), pp. 67-86.
IPCC (2007). *Climate Change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
IPCC *IPCC - Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. www.ipcc.ch [2017-06-09].
IUCN & USAID (2015a). *The African women's network for community management of forests (REFACOF): Empowering African women to influence REDD+. A national, policy-level initiative*. (Gender & REDD+ case study series.
IUCN & USAID (2015b). *The association of indigenous village leaders (VIDs): Ensuring community voices influence national policy in Suriname. A local to national policy-level initiative*. (Gender & REDD+ case study series: IUCN.
IUCN & USAID (2015c). *Cameroon, Ghana & Uganda's gender & REDD+ roadmaps. A national, policy-level initiative*. (Gender & REDD+ case study series: IUCN.
IUCN & USAID (2015d). *Hariyo Ban: REDD+ for economic development in Nepal. A national, local-level initiative*. (Gender & REDD+ case study series: IUCN.
IUCN & USAID (2015e). *M-REDD: Mainstreaming gender in policies and laws related to climate change and REDD+ in Mexico. A national, policy-level initiative*. (Gender & REDD+ case study series: IUCN.
IUCN & USAID (2015f). *Trees for global benefit: Empowering Ugandan women with land concessions and tree planting benefits. A local-level, implementation initiative*. (Gender & REDD+ case study series: IUCN.
Jackson, C. (1993). Doing what comes naturally? Women and environment in development. *World Development*, 21(12), pp. 1947-1963.
Jost, C., Ferdous, N. & Spicer, t.D. (2014). *Gender and inclusion toolbox: Particiaptory research in climate change and agriculture*. Copenhagen: CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS), CARE International, World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF).
Jørgensen, M. & Phillips, L.J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage Publications.
Kabeer, N. (1999). Resources, agency, achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. *Development and Change*, 30(3), pp. 435-464.
Kabeer, N. & Natali, L. (2013). Gender Equality and Economic Growth: Is there a Win-Win? *IDS Working Papers*, 2013(417), pp. 1-58.
Karpe, P., Ndjebet, C. & Edoa, C.W. (2013). *Forêt, REDD et participation des femmes au Cameroun. Contribution du REFACOF*. Edéa, Cameroun: REFACOF.
Karsenty, A. & Ongolo, S. (2012). Can “fragile states” decide to reduce their deforestation? The inappropriate use of the theory of incentives with respect to the REDD mechanism. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 18(0), pp. 38-45.
Karsenty, A., Vogel, A. & Castell, F. (2014). “Carbon rights”, REDD+ and payments for environmental services. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 35(0), pp. 20-29.
Keck, M.E. & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond border. Advocacy networks in international politics*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
Keck, M.E. & Sikkink, K. (1999). Transnational advocacy networks in international and regional politics. *International Social Science Journal*, 51(159), pp. 89-101.
Khadka, M., Karki, S., Karky, B.S., Kotru, R. & Darjee, K.B. (2014). Gender Equality Challenges to the REDD+ Initiative in Nepal. *Mountain Research and Development*, 34(3), pp. 197-207.
Khatun, K., Gross-Camp, N., Corbera, E., Martin, A., Ball, S. & Massao, G. (2015). When Participatory Forest Management makes money: insights from Tanzania on governance, benefit sharing, and implications for REDD+. *Environment and Planning A*, 47(10), pp. 2097-2112.
Kosoy, N. & Cobrera, E. (2010). Payments for ecosystem services as commodity fetishism. *Ecological Economics*, 69(6), pp. 1228-1236.
Krause, T., Collen, W. & Nicholas, K.A. (2013). Evaluating Safeguards in a Conservation Incentive Program: Participation, Consent, and Benefit Sharing in Indigenous Communities of the Ecuadorian Amazon. *Ecology and Society*, 18(4).
Kruse, J. (2014). Women’s representation in the UN climate change negotiations: a quantitative analysis of state delegations, 1995–2011. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 14(4), pp. 349-370.

Kurian, P.A. (2000). *Engendering the environment? Gender in the World Bank's Environmental Policies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
Kvist, E. & Peterson, E. (2010). What Has Gender Equality Got to Do with It? An Analysis of Policy Debates Surrounding Domestic Services in the Welfare States of Spain and Sweden. *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 18(3), pp. 185-203.
Lang, C. (2016). The virtual economy of REDD: Conflicts of interest, hot air, and dodgy baselines. *REDD Monitor* [Blog]. http://www.redd-monitor.org/2016/06/02/the-virtual-economy-of-redd-conflicts-of-interest-hot-air-and-dodgy-baselines/.
Larson, A.M., Dokken, T., Duchelle, A.E., Atmadja, S., Resosudarmo, I.A.P., Cronkleton, P., Cromberg, M., Sunderlin, W., Awono, A. & Selaya, G. (2015). The Role of Women in Early REDD+ Implementation: Lessons for Future Engagement. *International Forestry Review*, 17(1), pp. 43-65.
Lau, J.D. & Scales, I.R. (2016). Identity, subjectivity and natural resource use: How ethnicity, gender and class intersect to influence mangrove oyster harvesting in The Gambia. *Geoforum*, 69, pp. 136-146.
Leach, M. (2007). Earth Mother Myths and Other Ecofeminist Fables: How a Strategic Notion Rose and Fell. *Development and Change*, 38(1), pp. 67-85.
Letherby, G. (2005). *Feminist research in theory and practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
Li, T.M. (2007). *The will to improve: governmentality, development and the practice of politics*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
Liftin, K.T. (1994). *Ozone discourses. Science and politics in global environmental cooperation*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Lohmann, L. (2012). Financialization, commodification and carbon: The contradictions of neoliberal climate policy. *Socialist Register*, 48, pp. 85-107.
MacGregor, S. (2010). 'Gender and climate change': from impacts to discourses. *Journal of the Indian Ocean Region*, 6(2), pp. 223-238.
MacGregor, S. (2014). Only Resist: Feminist Ecological Citizenship and the Post-politics of Climate Change. *Hypatia*, 29(3), pp. 617-633.
McAfee, K. (2012). The Contradictory Logic of Global Ecosystem Services Markets. *Development and Change*, 43(1), pp. 105-131.
McAfee, K. (2015). The post- and future politics of green economy and REDD+. In: Stephan, B. & Lane, R. (eds) *The politics of carbon markets*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 237-260.
McAfee, K. (2016). Green economy and carbon markets for conservation and development: a critical view. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 16(3), pp. 333-353.
McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(3), pp. 1771-1800.
Mollett, S. & Faria, C. (2013). Messing with gender in feminist political ecology. *Geoforum*, 45, pp. 116-125.
Molyneux, M. (1985). Mobilization without Emancipation? Women's Interests, the State, and Revolution in Nicaragua. *Feminist Studies*, 11(2), pp. 227-254.
Moosa, C.S. & Tuana, N. (2014). Mapping a Research Agenda Concerning Gender and Climate Change: A Review of the Literature. *Hypatia*, 29(3), pp. 677-694.
Morrow, K. (2017). Integrating gender issues into the global climate change regime. In: Buckingham, S. & Le Masson, V. (eds) *Understanding climate change through gender relations*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 31-44.
Moser, C. (2005). Has gender mainstreaming failed? *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 7(4), pp. 576-590.
Moser, C.O.N. (1989). Gender planning in the third world: Meeting practical and strategic gender needs. *World Development*, 17(11), pp. 1799-1825.
Mosse, D. (2005). *Cultivating Development. An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice*. (Anthropology, Culture and Society. London: Pluto Press.
Murray, S. & Powell, A. (2009). "What's the Problem?". *Violence Against Women*, 15(5), pp. 532-552.
Neumann, R.P. & Hirsch, E. (2000). *Commercialisation of Non-timber Forest Products: Review and analysis of research*. Bogor: CIFOR, FAO.
Newell, P. (2008). The political economy of global environmental governance. *Review of International Studies*, 34(03), pp. 507-529.
Newman, J. (2013). Spaces of power: Feminism, neoliberalism and gendered labor. *Social Politics*, 20(3), pp. 200-221.

Nightingale, A.J. (2011). Bounding difference: Intersectionality and the material production of gender, caste, class and environment in Nepal. *Geoforum*, 42, pp. 153-162.
O'Brien, R., Goetz, A.M., Scholte, J.A. & Williams, M. (2000). *Contesting global governance. Multilateral economic institutions and global social movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Olson, J. (2014). Whose voices matter? Gender inequality in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. *Agenda*, 28(3), pp. 184-187.
Olsson, L., Opondo, M., Tschakert, P., Agrawal, A., Eriksen, S.H., Ma, S., Perch, L.N. & Zakieldeen, S.A. (2014). Livelihoods and poverty. In: Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea & White, L.L. (eds) *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 793-832.
Parpart, J.L. (2014). Exploring the transformative potential of gender mainstreaming in international development institutions. *Journal of International Development*, 26(3), pp. 382-395.
Peach Brown, H.C. (2011). Gender, Climate Change and REDD+ in the Congo Basin Forests of Central Africa. *International Forestry Review*, 13(2), pp. 163-176.
Pham, T.T., Mai, Y.H., Moeliono, M. & Brockhaus, M. (2016). Women's Participation in REDD+ National Decision-Making in Vietnam. *International Forestry Review*, 18(3), pp. 334-344.
Polanyi, K. (2012 [1944]). *Den stora omdaningen*. Riga: Arkiv förlag.
Power, M. (2004). Social Provisioning as a Starting Point for Feminist Economics. *Feminist Economics*, 10(3), pp. 3-19.
Prügl, E. (2012). Gender expertise as feminist strategy. In: Calgar, G., Prügl, E. & Zwingel, S. (eds) *Global institutions: Feminist strategies in international governance*. Florence, KY, USA: Routledge, pp. 57-73.
Raczek, T., Blomstrom, E. & Owren, C. (2010). Climate change and gender: Policies in place. In: Dankelman, I. (ed. *Gender and climate change: An introduction*. Washington DC: Earthscan, pp. 194-211.
Rai, S.M. (2004). Gendering Global Governance. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 6(4), pp. 579-601.
Rai, S.M., Hoskyns, C. & Thomas, D. (2013). Depletion. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 16(1), pp. 86-105.
Rankin, K.N. (2003). Cultures of economies: gender and socio-spatial change in Nepal. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 10(2), pp. 111-129.
Razavi, S. (1997). Fitting gender into development institutions. *World Development*, 25(7), pp. 1111-1125.
Razavi, S. & Miller, C. (1995). *Gender mainstreaming: A study of efforts by the UNDP, the World Bank and the ILO to institutionalize gender issues*. (Occasional paper: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
RECOFTC & REDD-Net (2011). *Gender and REDD+*. (REDD-Net Bulletin Asia Pacific, Issue 04). https://www.recoftc.org/project/redd-net-asia-pacific/policy-briefs/redd-net-asia-pacific-bulletin-4-gender-and-redd.
Reed, M.G., Scott, A., Natcher, D. & Johnston, M. (2014). Linking gender, climate change, adaptive capacity, and forest-based communities in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 44(9), pp. 995-1004.
REFACOF (2012). *Document de Position sur la Réduction des Emissions dues à la Déforestation et à la Dégradation des Forêts (REDD+)*. Ouagadougou, http://www.refacof.com/index.php/centre-de-presse/94-document-de-position-sur-la-reduction-des-emissions-dues-a-la-deforestation-et-a-la-degradation-des-forets-redd.
Resurrección, B.P. (2013). Persistent women and environment linkages in climate change and sustainable development agendas. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 40, pp. 33-43.
Ribot, J. (1999). A history of fear: imagining deforestation in the West African dryland forests. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*(8), pp. 291-300.
Rocheleau, D. & Edmunds, D. (1997). Women, men and trees: Gender, power and property in forest and agrarian landscapes. *World Development*, 25(8), pp. 1351-1371.
Rocheleau, D.E. (1995). Gender and biodiversity: A feminist political ecology perspective. *IDS Bulletin*, 26(1), pp. 9-16.

Rodrigues Faria, W. & Nunes Almeida, A. (2016). Relationship between openness to trade and deforestation: Empirical evidence from the Brazilian Amazon. *Ecological Economics*, 121, pp. 85-97.
Sandler, J. & Rao, A. (2012). The elephant in the room and the dragons at the gate: strategising for gender equality in the 21st century. *Gender & Development*, 20(3), pp. 547-562.
Saussey, M., Moity-Maizi, P. & Muchnik, J. (2008). Nouvelles formes de reconnaissance des femmes burkinabè dans la production collective de beurre de karité. *Cahiers Agricultures*, 17(6), pp. 582-586.
Scott, J.C. (1998). *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. (Yale Agrarain Studies Series. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
Setyowati, A.B., Gurung, J. & Septiani, Y. (2012). *Integrating gender into REDD+ safeguards implementation in Indonesia*: UN-REDD Programme, Wocan.
Shackleton, S., Paumgarten, F., Kassa, H., Husselman, M. & Zida, M. (2011). Opportunities for enhancing poor women's socio-economic empowerment in the value chains of three African non-timber forest products (NTFPs). *International Forestry Review*, 13(2), pp. 136-151.
Sharma, A. (2006). Crossbreeding Institutions, Breeding Struggle: Women's Empowerment, Neoliberal Governmentality, and State (Re)Formation in India. *Cultural Anthropology*, 21(1), pp. 60-95.
Sharp, L. & Richardson, T. (2001). Reflections on Foucauldian discourse analysis in planning and environmental policy research. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 3(3), pp. 193-209.
Sills, E.O., Atamadja, 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, Indonesia: CIFOR.
Skutsch, M.M. (2002). Protocols, treaties, and action: The 'climate change process' viewed through gender spectacles. *Gender & Development*, 10(2), pp. 30-39.
Solheim, E. (2008). Preface. In: Angelsen, A. (ed. *Moving ahead with REDD. Issues, options and implications*. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR, pp. iv-v.
Standing, H. (2004). Gender, Myth and Fable: The Perils of Mainstreaming in Sector Bureaucracies. *IDS Bulletin*, 35(4), pp. 82-88.
Stephan, B., Rothe, D. & Methmann, C. (2014). Third side of the coin: Hegemony and governmentality in global climate politics. In: Stripple, J. & Bulkeley, H. (eds) *Governing the global climate: Rationality, practice and power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Stiem, L. & Krause, T. (2016). Exploring the impact of social norms and perceptions on women's participation in customary forest and land governance in the Democratic Republic of Congo; implications for REDD+. *International Forestry Review*, 18(1), pp. 110-122.
Sultana, F. (2014). Gendering Climate Change: Geographical Insights. *The Professional Geographer*, 66(3), pp. 372-381.
Sunderland, T., Achdiawan, R., Angelsen, A., Babigumira, R., Ickowitz, A., Paumgarten, F., Reyes-García, V. & Shively, G. (2014). Challenging Perceptions about Men, Women, and Forest Product Use: A Global Comparative Study. *World Development*, 64, Supplement 1, pp. S56-S66.
Sunderlin, W.D., Larson, A.M., Duchelle, A.E., Resosudarmo, I.A.P., Huynh, T.B., Awono, A. & Dokken, T. (2014). How are REDD+ Proponents Addressing Tenure Problems? Evidence from Brazil, Cameroon, Tanzania, Indonesia, and Vietnam. *World Development*, 55, pp. 37-52.
Swyngedouw, E. (2010). Apocalypse forever? Post-political populism and the spectre of climate change. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 27(2), pp. 213-232.
Swyngedouw, E. (2011). Depoliticized Environments: The End of Nature, Climate Change and the Post-Political Condition. *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement*, 69, pp. 253-274.
Terry, G. (2009). No climate justice without gender justice: an overview of the issues. *Gender & Development*, 17(1), pp. 5-18.
Thompson, M.C., Baruah, M. & Carr, E.R. (2011). Seeing REDD+ as a project of environmental governance. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 14(100-110).
True, J. & Parisi, L. (2012). Gender mainstreaming strategies in international governance. In: Calgar, G., Prügl, E. & Zwingel, S. (eds) *Global institutions: Feminist strategies in international governance*. Florence, KY, USA: Routledge, pp. 37-56.
Tschakert, P. (2012). From impacts to embodied experiences: tracing political ecology in climate change research. *Geografisk Tidsskrift-Danish Journal of Geography*, 112(2), pp. 144-158.

Tschakert, P. & Machado, M. (2012). Gender Justice and Rights in Climate Change Adaptation: Opportunities and Pitfalls. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 6(3), pp. 275-289.
Tuana, N. (2013). Gendering climate knowledge for justice: Catalyzing a new research agenda. In: Alston, M. & Whittenbury, K. (eds) *Research, action and policy: Addressing the gendered impacts of climate change*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 17-31.
Tyagi, N. & Das, S. (2017). Gender Mainstreaming in Forest Governance: Analysing 25 Years of Research and Policy in South Asia. *International Forestry Review*, 19(2), pp. 234-244.
UN-REDD (2011). *The Business Case for Mainstreaming Gender in REDD+*: UN-REDD Programme.
UN-REDD (2012). *Implementing gender-sensitive, effective and sustainable REDD+ strategies*: UN-REDD Programme.
UN-REDD (2013). *Guidance note on gender sensitive REDD+*. Geneva: UN-REDD Programme.
UN-REDD (2017). *Comparative analysis of the UNFCCC REDD+ related decisions and other multilateral and bilateral requirements to access results-based payments / results-based finance for REDD+ results-based actions*. (Technical Resource Series 5. Geneva: UNDP.
UN-REDD Programme *UN-REDD Programme*. www.un-redd.org [2015-09-05].
UN-REDD Programme (2017). *UN-REDD methodological brief on gender*. (Technical Resource Series 4. Geneva: UNDP.
UN Women (1995). *Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. Fourth World Conference on Women 1995*. http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform: UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.
UN Women (2015). *Implementation of gender-responsive climate action in the context of sustainable development: Report of the Expert Group Meeting*. https://unfccc.int/files/gender_and_climate_change/application/pdf/egmreport_bonn_final_25_november_2015.pdf.
UNFCCC (2002). *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its seventh session, held at Marrakesh from 29 October to 10 November 2001. Addendum. Part two: Action taken by the Confernece of the Parties. Volume IV. FCCC/CP/2001/13/Add.4*. Geneva: United Nations.
UNFCCC (2008). *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its thirteenth session, held in Bali from 3 to 15 December 2007. Addendum. FCCC/CP/2007/6/Add.1*. Bali: UNFCCC.
UNFCCC (2011). *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its sixteenth session, held in Cancun from 29 November to 10 December 2010. Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties. Addendum. FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1*. Cancún: United Nations.
UNFCCC (2012). *CDM and women*. Bonn: UNFCCC.
UNFCCC *Gender and climate change*. http://unfccc.int/gender_and_climate_change/items/7516.php [2017-02-10].
UNFCCC (2014b). *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its nineteenth session, held in Warsaw from 11 to 23 November 2013. Addendum. FCCC/CP/2013/10/Add.1*. Warsaw: UNFCCC.
UNFCCC (2016). *Report of the Conference of the Parties on its twenty-first session, held in Paris from 30 November to 13 December 2015. Addendum. FCCC/CP/2015/10/Add.2*. Paris: UNFCCC.
UNFCCC Secretariat (2016). *Guidelines or other tools for integrating gender considerations into climate change related activities under the Convention. FCCC/TP/2016/2*. (Technical paper by the secretariat: UNFCCC.
United Nations (1992). *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. New York.
Walby, S. (2005). Introduction: Comparative gender mainstreaming in a global era. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 7(4), pp. 453-470.
Walby, S., Armstrong, J. & Strid, S. (2012). Intersectionality: Multiple Inequalities in Social Theory. *Sociology*, 46(2), pp. 224-240.
Wang, Y. & Corson, C. (2015). The making of a 'charismatic' carbon credit: clean cookstoves and 'uncooperative' women in western Kenya. *Environment and Planning A*, 47(10), pp. 2064-2079.
Waylen, G. (2014). Informal Institutions, Institutional Change, and Gender Equality. *Political Research Quarterly*, 67(1), pp. 212-223.
Weatherley-Singh, J. & Gupta, A. (2015). Drivers of deforestation and REDD+ benefit-sharing: A meta-analysis of the (missing) link. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 54, pp. 97-105.
Verloo, M. (2005). Mainstreaming gender equality in Europe. A critical frame analysis approach. *The Greek Review of Social Research*, 117(B), pp. 11-34.
Verloo, M. & Lombardo, E. (2007). Contested gender euqality and policy variety in Europe: Introducing a critical frame analysis approach. In: Verloo, M. (ed. *Multiple meanings of*

gender equality: A critical frame analysis of gender politics in Europe. Budapest: CEU, pp. 21-49.
Westholm, L. (2008). *The role of forestry in mitigating climate change. A study of the voluntary carbon offset market.* Diss. Göteborg: University of Gothenburg.
Westholm, L. (2010a). *Focali country brief - Burkina Faso*. (Focali biref 2010:02. Göteborg: Focali.
Westholm, L. (2010b). *Focali country brief. Malysia*. (Focali Brief 2010:03. Göteborg: Focali.
Westholm, L., Biddulph, R., Hellmark, I. & Ekbom, A. (2011a). *REDD+ and tenure: A review of the latest development in research, implementation and debate.* (Focali Report 2011:02. Göteborg: University of Gothenburg, Focali, Sida.
Westholm, L., Henders, S., Ostwald, M. & Mattsson, E. (2009). *Assessment of existing global financial initiatives and monitoring aspects of carbon sinks in forest ecosystems - the issue of REDD.* (Focali Report 2009:01. Göteborg: Focali, Sida.
Westholm, L. & Kokko, S. (2011). *Prospects for REDD+. Local forest managment and climate change mitigation in Burkina Faso*. Gothenburg: Focali Report 2011:01.
Westholm, L., Mattsson, E. & Ostwald, M. (2012). *REDD+ revisited - steady pace or passed momentum?* (Focali Brief 2012:05. Göteborg.
Westholm, L., Ostwald, M., Henders, S. & Mattsson, E. (2011b). *Learning from Norway - A review of lessons learned for REDD+ donors*. (Focali Report 2011:03. Göteborg: Focali.
Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. & Yates, S.J. (eds) (2001). *Discourse theory and practice. A reader*. London: Sage.
Vetterlein, A. (2012). Seeing Like the World Bank on Poverty. *New Political Economy*, 17(1), pp. 35-38.
WOCAN (2012). *An assessment of gender and women's exclusion in REDD+ in Nepal*: WOCAN, HIMAWANTI.
World Bank (2001). *Engendering development: through gender equality in rights, resources, and voice*. (World Bank policy research report. Washington D.C.: World Bank, Oxford University Press.
World Bank (2006). *Gender equality as smart economics: World Bank Group Gender Action Plan (Fiscal years 2007-10)*. Washington D.C.
World Bank (2013). *Project appraisal document on a proposed grant to Burkina Faso for a Forest Investment Program - Decentralized forest and woodland management project*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
Wornell, E.J., Tickamyer, A.R. & Kusujiarti, S. (2015). Gender mainstreaming principles in Indonesia's REDD+ program a document analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 8(8), pp. 159-170.
Yanow, D. (2007). Interpretation in policy analysis: On methods and practice. *Critical Policy Studies*, 1(1), pp. 110-122.
Yeates, N. (2012). Global care chains: a state-of-the-art review and future directions in care transnationalization research. *Global Networks*, 12(2), pp. 135-154.
Yocum, H.M. (2016). "It Becomes Scientific…:" Carbon Accounting for REDD+ in Malawi. *Human Ecology*, 44(6), pp. 677-685.
Zougouri, S. (2008). *Derrière la vitrine du développement. Aménagement forestier et pouvoir local au Burkina Faso.* Diss. Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Acknowledgements

Writing this thesis has been a long process and hard work. I'm grateful for the people who have supported me along the way.

I would like to thank Seema for believing in me enough to take me in. Thank you for flooding me with suggestions for what I should read and for your ambitions on my behalf. Thank you also to Örjan, for careful readings, encouragement and kind words.

Gunnar Köhlin and Madelene Ostwald were instrumental in my enrollment as a PhD candidate. Before that, they gave me a job as a research assistant for Focali, leading me to the study of REDD+ in the first place. Thank you for that.

CIFOR provided funding for two of my stays in Burkina Faso, and for my rural fieldwork. The staff at the CIFOR office in Ouagadougou provided useful assistance including contacts and practicalities during fieldwork.

I am grateful to all the people in Burkina Faso who shared information with me in interviews, meetings and conversations. I'm especially grateful to the people of Gallo and Baouiga who welcomed me to their villages and their homes.

I also want to thank my colleagues at LAG for the warm welcome I received there. Thank you to Eva for practical and moral support. And a special thanks to Sara and Klara for walks and talks and coffee in time of need.

Sist men framför allt vill jag tacka mina närmaste som alltid finns där och gör livet glatt. Mamma, som kom till Burkina när jag som mest behövde det. Pappa, min ständige livscoach och störste beundrare. Joel, som påminner vad som är viktigt i livet. Aron, alltid klok, resonerande och optimistisk. RUTH! När jag är med henne spelar inget annan nån roll. Hanna som fortsatt locka med Skånesemestrar fast jag ständigt skjutit upp. Och Stefan, som inte klagat över inställda semestrar eller helgarbete. Som fattat beslut åt mig när jag inte orkat, och packat väskorna och tagit ut mig i skogen när jag behövde en paus. Nu blir det glaciärsemester!

Appendix 1. Documents analysed

UNFCCC agreements

United Nations (1992). *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. New York.

UNFCCC (2008). Report of the Conference of the Parties on its thirteenth session, held in Bali from 3 to 15 December 2007. FCCC/CP/2007/6/ Bali: UNFCCC.

UNFCCC (2010). Report of the Conference of the Parties on its fifteenth session, held in Copenhagen from 7-19 December 2009. FCCC/CP/2009/11/ Copenhagen: UNFCCC.

UNFCCC (2011). Report of the Conference of the Parties on its sixteenth session, held in Cancun from 29 November to 10 December 2010. Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties. FCCC/CP/2010/7/ Cancún: UNFCCC.

UNFCCC (2012). Report of the Conference of the Parties on its seventeenth session, held in Durban from 28 November to 11 December 2011. FCCC/CP/2011/9/ Durban: UNFCCC.

UNFCCC (2013). Report of the Conference of the Parties on its eighteenth session, held in Doha from 26 November to 8 December 2012. FCCC/CP/2012/8/ Doha: UNFCCC.

UNFCCC (2014). Report of the Conference of the Parties on its nineteenth session, held in Warsaw from 11 to 23 November 2013. FCCC/CP/2013/10/ Warsaw: UNFCCC.

UNFCCC (2015). Report of the Conference of the Parties on its twentieth session, held in Lima from 1 to 14 December 2014. FCCC/CP/2014/10/ Lima: UNFCCC.

UNFCCC (2016). Report of the Conference of the Parties on its twenty-first session, held in Paris from 30 November to 13 December 2015. FCCC/CP/2015/10/ Paris: UNFCCC.

IPCC reports

IPCC (2007). Climate Change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

IPCC (2014). Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of climate change. Working group III contribution to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

REDD+ pilot programs

CIF (2009). Design document for the Forest Investment Program, a targeted program UN the SCF Trust Fund. Washington D.C.: Climate Investment Funds (CIF)

CIF (2011). Summary of the Co-Chairs. Forest Investment Program Sub-Committee Meeting, Cape Town, South Africa, June 29 and 30, 2011: Climate Investment Funds

CIF (2012). *Additional option for procedure to allocate reserve funds to encourage private sector engagement and innovation FIP/SC.9/CRP.2*). Istanbul, Turkey: Climate Investment Funds.

CIF (2012). *Ideas for private sector engagement under the first round of competitive proposals to be funded from the FIP reserve FIP/SC.8/Inf.3*). Washington D.C.: Climate Investment Funds.

CIF (2013). Update in the implementation of the Dedicated Grant Mechanism for indigenous peoples and local communities. Washington, DC: Climate Investment Funds

CIF (2014). Forest Investment Program. www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/node/5 [2014-01-30]

FCPF (2012). *FCPF Readiness Fund: Guidelines and Generic Terms of Reference for SESAs and ESMF*. https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/social-inclusion: Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, World Bank

FCPF (2012). *Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Fund Common Approach to Environmental and Social Safeguards for Multiple Delivery Partners*. https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/social-inclusion: Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, World Bank

FCPF (2012). *Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) Template with guidelines*. https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/guidelines-and-templates: World Bank

FCPF (2013). *World Bank Safeguard Policies and the UNFCCC REDD+ Safeguards*. https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/social-inclusion: Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, World Bank

FIP (2010). *Report of FIP Expert Group: Recommendations for Pilots under the Forest Investment Program (FIP)*. Manila, Philippines: World Bank Climate Investment Funds

FIP (2011). *Design for the Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities to be established under the Forest Investment Program*. Washington: Climate Investment Funds

UN-REDD Programme (2009). *UN-REDD Programme Rules of Procedure and Operational Guidance*: UN-REDD Programme.

UN-REDD Programme (2011). *The UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015*. Geneva: UN-REDD, FAO, UNDP, UNEP.

UN-REDD Programme (2011). *The Business Case for Mainstreaming Gender in REDD+:* UN-REDD Programme

UN-REDD Programme (2012). *Implementing gender-sensitive, effective and sustainable REDD+ strategies*: UN-REDD Programme

UN-REDD Programme (2013). *Guidance note on gender sensitive REDD+*. Geneva: UN-REDD Programme

UN-REDD Programme (2015). *Country approaches to REDD+ safeguards. A global review of initial learning experiences and emerging lessons*. Technical Resource Series 2. http://www.unredd.net/documents/redd-papers-and-publications-90/un-redd-publications-1191/technical-resources-series.html: UN-REDD Programme.

UN-REDD Programme (2017). *Comparative analysis of the UNFCCC REDD+ related decisions and other multilateral and bilateral requirements to access results-based payments / results-*

based finance for REDD+ results-based actions. Technical Resource Series 5. Geneva: UNDP.

UN-REDD Programme (2017). *UN-REDD methodological brief on gender*. Technical Resource Series 4. Geneva: UNDP.

Institutional documents

Aguilar, L., Rogers, F., Pearl-Martinez, R., Castaneda, i., Athanas, A. & Siles, J. (2012). *Gender review of the CIF*. Istanbul: Climate Investment Funds (CIF), IUCN

Adaptation Fund (2016). *Annex 4 to OPG: Gender Policy of the Adaptation Fund*. https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/opg-annex4-gender-policy/: Adaptation Fund.

CBD, UNCCD & UNFCCC (2012). *The Rio conventions: Action on gender*. Randers: Convention on Biological Diversity, United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

CIF (2010). *Strategic Environmental, Social and Gender Assessment of the Climate Investment Funds*. Washington D.C.: Climate Investment Funds

CIF (2014). *CIF gender action plan*. Montego Bay: Climate Investment Funds

European Union (2012). European Parliament resolution of 20 April 2012 on women and climate change (2011/2197(INI)). Brussels: European Parliament

GCF (2015). *Gender Policy and Action Plan*. Songdo, Korea: Green Climate Fund

GEF (2012). *Policy on gender mainstreaming. SD/PL/02*. https://www.thegef.org/gef/node/5733: Global Environment Facility

GEF (2014). *Gender equality action plan*. Washington D.C.: The Global Environment Facility

UNFCCC Secretariat (2016). Guidelines or other tools for integrating gender considerations into climate change related activities under the Convention. FCCC/TP/2016/2. Technical paper by the secretariat: UNFCCC

World Bank (2006). Gender equality as Smart Economics: World Bank Group Gender Action Plan (Fiscal years 2007-10). Washington DC

World Bank (2015). World Bank Group gender strategy (FY16-23): Gender equality, poverty reduction and inclusive growth. Washington DC: World Bank

National REDD+ documents

AfDB (2013). Gazetted forests participatory management project for REDD+ (PGFC/REDD+). Project appraisal report: African Development Bank Group

AfDB (2013). Gazetted forests participatory management projects for REDD+ (PGFC/REDD+). Volume 2: Technical annexes: African Development Bank Group

Burkina Faso (2012). *Plan de Préparation à la REDD (R-PP Burkina Faso)*: Forest Carbon Partnership Facility.

Burkina Faso (2013). *Projet de gestion décéntralisée des forêts et espaces boisés (PGDFEB). Cadre de gestion environnementale et sociale (CGES)*: World Bank.

CIF (2014). *Burkina Faso Investment Plan. Baseline and Targets.* https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/content/burkina-faso-fip-2014-baselines-and-targets: Climate Invetsment Funds.

FCPF (2016). *Emissions Reduction Initiative (IRE) Document. Mexico* www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/: Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, World Bank

FCPF (2016). *Emission Reductions Program Document (ER-PD). Mai-Ndombe Emission Reductions Program, Democratic Republic of Congo*. www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/: Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, World Bank

FIP (2011). *Aide-mémoire de la troisième Mission Conjointe du Programme d'Investissement Forestier (PIF) 10-14 octobre 2011*, Burkina Faso: World Bank, African Development Bank.

FIP *Decision - FIP Investment Plan: Burkina Faso.* www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cifnet/?q=country-program-info/burkina-fasos-fip-programming [2012-03-21].

FIP (2011). *Investment Plan for Burkina Faso.* (FIP/SC.6/5. Cape Town, South Africa: Climate Investment Funds, Forest Investment Program.

FIP (2012). *Investment Plan for Burkina Faso. FIP/SC.9/4*. Istanbul, Turkey: Climate Investment Funds, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)

FIP (2013). *Projecct information document. FIP - Decentralized forest and woodland management project (P143993).* Available from: www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cifnet/?q=country/burkina-faso.

FIP (2013). *Burkina Faso: Dedicated Grant Mechanism for local communities*. Concept note. https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cifnet/?q=country/burkina-faso

FIP (2015). *Project Information Document (PID) Appraisal stage. Local Forest Communities Support Project (P149434).* www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/country/burkina-faso/burkina-fasos-fip-programming: Forest Investment Program.

MEDD (2012). *Plan de Préparation à la REDD (R-PP - Burkina Faso).* Burkina Faso: Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable.

MEDD (2013). *Programme d'Investissement Forestier. Projet de Gestion Décentralisée des forêts et espaces boisés (PGDFEB). Cadre de Gestion Environnementale et Sociale.* Burkina Faso: Ministère de l'Environnement et du Devéloppement Durable (MEDD).

Tanzania (2013). *Bi-annual report. REDD+ strategy development and implementation process in Tanzania*. 1st October 2012-31 March 2013. Dar Es Salaam: National REDD+ Secretariat, Institute of Resource Assesment, University of Dar Es Salaam.

Tanzania (2013). *National strategy for reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+).* Dar Es Salaam: Vice President's Office, United Republic of Tanzania.

Tanzania (2013). *Tanzania REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards. Draft June 2013.* Dar Es Salaam: Vice Presidents Office, United Republic of Tanzania.

World Bank (2013). *Aide memoire. Mission d'appui à la préparation du Projet Gestion décentralisée des forêts et Espaces Boisés rentrant dans le cadre du Plan d'Investissement du Programme d'Investissement Forestier pour le Burkina Faso. 20 mai au 1er juin 2013*: World Bank.

World Bank (2013). *Project appraisal document on a proposed grant to Burkina Faso for a Forest Investment Program - Decentralized forest and woodland management project.* Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Reports and policy briefs

Aguilar, L. (2009). *Training manual on gender and climate change*. San José, Costa Rica: IUCN, UNDP, Global Gender and Climate Alliance (GGCA)

Aguilar, L. & Sasvari, A. (2009). *Gender equality within the REDD and REDD-plus framework*. www.genderandenvironment.org: IUCN

Angelsen, A. (ed.) (2008). *Moving ahead with REDD: Issues, options and implications*. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.

Angelsen, A., Brockhaus, M., Kanninen, M., Sills, E., Sunderlin, W.D. & Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S. (eds) (2009). *Realising REDD+. National strategy and policy options.* Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.

Angelsen, A., Brown, S., Loisel, C., Peskett, L., Streck, C. & Zarin, D. (2009). *Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD): An options assessment report.* www.redd-oar.org/: Government of Norway, Meridian Institute.

Angelsen, A., Brockhaus, M., Sunderlin, W.D. & Verchot, L. (2012). *Analysing REDD+: Challenges and choices*. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR. Available from: http:/www.cifor.org/nc/online-library/browse/view-publication/publication/3805.html.

Bradley, A., Billah Setyowati, A., Gurung, J., Yeang, D., Net, C., Khiev, S. & Brewster, J. (2013). *Gender and REDD+: An assessment in the Oddar Meanchey community forestry REDD+ site, Cambodia*: WOCAN, FFPRI, Pact

Eliasch, J. (2008). *Eliasch Review. Climate Change: Financing Global Forests*. London: Office of Climate Change, HM Government of the UK.

Gurung, J., Giri, K., Setyowati, A. & Lebow, E. (2011). *Getting REDD+ right for women. An analysis of the barriers and opportunities for women's participation in the REDD+ sector in Asia*: USAID.

Gurung, J., Ganz, D. & Kono, A. (2014). *Women's inclusion in REDD+ in the Philippines. Lessons from good practices in forest, and other natiural resource management sectors*: UN-REDD, WOCAN, USAID LEAF

Gurung, J., Kono, A. & Ganz, D. (2013). *Women's inclusion in REDD+ in Cambodia. Lessons from good practices in forest, agriculture and other natural resources management sectors*: UN-REDD, WOCAN, USAID LEAF

Gurung, J., Kono, A. & Ganz, D. (2013). *Women's inclusion in REDD+ in Sri Lanka. Lessons from good practices in forest, agriculture and other natural resources management sectors*: UN-REDD, WOCAN, USAID LEAF

IUCN (2016). *Gender in mitigation actions*. Washington D.C.: IUCN

IUCN & USAID (2015). *The African women's network for community management of forests (REFACOF): Empowering African women to influence REDD+. A national, policy-level initiative*. Gender & REDD+ case study series

IUCN & USAID (2015). *The association of indigenous village leaders (VIDs): Ensuring community voices influence national policy in Suriname. A local to national policy-level initiative*. Gender & REDD+ case study series: IUCN

IUCN & USAID (2015). *Cameroon, Ghana & Uganda's gender & REDD+ roadmaps. A national, policy-level initiative*. Gender & REDD+ case study series: IUCN

IUCN & USAID (2015). *Hariyo Ban: REDD+ for economic development in Nepal. A national, local-level initiative*. Gender & REDD+ case study series: IUCN

IUCN & USAID (2015). *M-REDD: Mainstreaming gender in policies and laws related to climate change and REDD+ in Mexico. A national, policy-level initiative*. Gender & REDD+ case study series: IUCN

IUCN & USAID (2015). *Trees for global benefit: Empowering Ugandan women with land concessions and tree planting benefits. A local-level, implementation initiative*. Gender & REDD+ case study series: IUCN

Kanninen, M., Murdiyarso, D., Seymour, F., Angelsen, A., Wunder, S. & German, L. (2007*). Do trees grow on money? The implications of deforestation research for policies to promote REDD*. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.

Karpe, P., Ndjebet, C. & Edoa, C.W. (2013). Forêt, REDD et participation des femmes au Cameroun. Contribution du REFACOF. Edéa, Cameroun: REFACOF.

Lambrou, Y. & Piana, G. (2006). *Gender: The missing component of the response to climate change.* Rome: FAO.

MacFarquhar, C. & Goodman, L. (2015). *Demonstrating 'respect' for the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards: the importance of community collected information.* Analytical Paper. Oxford: Global Canopy Programme.

Mihn Thoa, P., Giri, K. & Eggerts, E. (2015). *Gender analysis of Lam Dong's provincial REDD+ action plan*. Bangkok: USAID LEAF, UN-REDD

Rey, D., Roberts, J., Korwin, S., Rivera, L. & Ribet, U. (2013). *A guide to understanding and implementing the UNFCCC REDD+ safeguards*. London: ClientEarth.

Rey, D., Roberts, J., Korwin, S., Rivera, L., Ribet, U. & Ferro, P. (2013). *A guide for consistent implementation of REDD+ safeguards.* London, UK: ClientEarth, UKaid.

Setyowati, A.B., Gurung, J. & Septiani, Y. (2012). *Integrating gender into REDD+ safeguards implementation in Indonesia*: UN-REDD Programme, Wocan

WOCAN (2012). *An assessment of gender and women's exclusion in REDD+ in Nepal*: WOCAN, HIMAWANTI

NGO project documents and websites

REDD+ SES (2016) *REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards*. www.redd-standards.org Accessed: 2016-11-01.

REDD+ SES (2012). *Developing a gender sensitive REDD+. REDD+ SES Factsheet*. http://redd-standards.net/more/countries/ecuador/factsheets-ecuador: Ministerio del Ambiente, Ecuador.

REFACOF (2012). Document de Position sur la Réduction des Emissions dues à la Déforestation et à la Dégradation des Forêts (REDD+). Ouagadougou,

http://www.refacof.com/index.php/centre-de-presse/94-document-de-position-sur-la-reduction-des-emissions-dues-a-la-deforestation-et-a-la-degradation-des-forets-redd.

WEDO (2017) *WEDO - Women's Environment and Development Organization*. http://wedo.org Accessed: 2017-01-10.

WEDO & REDD+ SES (2013a). *From research to action, leaf by leaf: Getting gender right in the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards. Action steps for national REDD+ programs*. Booklet 2: WEDO, REDD+ SES.

WEDO & REDD+ SES (2013b). *From research to action, leaf by leaf: Getting gender right in the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards. Lessons from action research. Booklet 1*: WEDO, REDD+ SES Secretariat.

WOCAN (2014). *W+ 4 step process for stakeholder analysis*. Retrieved from http://www.wplus.org/

WOCAN (2014). *Methodology Form - W+ Domains. Time 001*. Retrieved from http://www.wplus.org/

WOCAN (2015). *W+ Standard. Version 1.2* May 2015. Retrieved from http://www.wplus.org/

WOCAN (2016a). *Method Form - W+ Domain*: Leadership. Retrieved from http://www.wplus.org/

WOCAN (2016b). *W+ Standard: Ensuring benefits to women - accelerating investment in women*. Retrieved 2016-11-07, from http://www.wplus.org/.

WOCAN (2016c). *Method Form - W+ Domain: Income and Assets. Version 01.0*. Retrieved from http://www.wplus.org/

WOCAN (2017a). *W+ Standard Version 1.3 2017. Draft for comment.* www.wplus.org.

WOCAN (2017b). *WOCAN - Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management*. Retrieved 2017-01-10, from www.wocan.org/.

Appendix 2. Interview guide

Background

Votre nom c'est quoi?
Vous avez quelle âge?
Vous êtes allé à l'école? Combien d'années?
Vous êtes née dans cette village? Si non, où ? Vous êtes arrivé ici quand ?
Vous avez faites quoi pour vous établir ici/pour avoir la terre ?
Vous pouvez décrire votre situation familial? (Vous êtes marié ? Combien des femmes? Enfants? Personnes à charge? Organisation de concession?)
Quelle est votre activité ou source revenu primaire?
Vous cultivé quelle superficie ? (champs individuel ou de la famille etc) Culture primaire?
Vous consumes ou vendes cette culture ? (Qui décide quoi vous cultivez et quoi vous faites avec la récolte?)
Vent à qui ? Où ? Les recettes sont à qui ? Vous utilisez comment ?
Vous avez des bétails? Quoi? Combien?

Organisation

Vous êtes membre du GFF/association des femmes ? Pour quoi (non) ?
Vous faites quoi dans le groupement ?
Ça marche comment ?

Activités dans la forêt/brousse

Qui récolte le bois de chauffe de votre ménage ? Où ? Combien ?
Vous allez normalement à la forêt? Pour faire quoi ? Cueillir quoi ?
Ces ressources forestières, vous pouvez les trouver hors de la forêt aussi? Où?
Combien de temps vous allez à la forêt? Qui décide quand vous allez à la forêt?
Vous demandez la permission de quelqu'un ?
Vous allez seule ou avec quelqu'un? Avec qui ? Pourquoi?
Est-ce que vous aimez aller en brousse ? Est-ce que vous avez peur en brousse ?
Que est-ce que vous faites avec ce que vous cueillez dans la forêt ? (consomme, vende…)
Vente de quoi ? Ça vient d'où ? A qui ? Où ?

Changements

Est-ce que la forêt a changé pendant votre vie? (augmenté/diminué etc) Comment ? A cause de quoi ?
Votre usage de la forêt a changé? Comment ? Pour quoi ?
Il y a des menaces contre la forêt ?
Que est-ce qu'on peut faire pour protéger la forêt ?

Avenir

Quelles sont les inquiétude que vous avez dans la vie quotidien ?
Vous voudrais changer quelque chose ? Quoi ? Comment ?
Comment vous voudriez que la vie soit pour vos enfants? Filles/fils ?