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| UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME **BUREAU FOR DEVELOPMENT POLICY (BDP)** | | | | MISSION REPORT SUMMARY **Date: 28 Sept 2012** | | |
| **Name:** Silje Haugland | | EEG | **Phone :** +41-212-906-5190 | **Travel Authorization #:** | | |
| **Approved Mission Itinerary:**  New York-Kathmandu-New York | | | **List of Annexes**:   * [List of Participants](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=8674&Itemid=53) * All additional information including presentations and background material has been posted on [The Forests Dialogue (TFD) website](http://environment.yale.edu/tfd/dialogue/exclusion-inclusion-of-women-in-the-forest-sector/scoping-dialogue-on-the-exclusion-and-inclusion-of-women-in-the-forest/). * See also Aki Kono (UNDP Regional Centre)’s BTOR at the [UN-REDD workspace.](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=1259&Itemid=53) | | | |
| **Inclusive Travel Date**  20-25 Sept 2012 | **Key counterparts in location**  Participants in The Forests Dialogue’s Scoping Mission on Inclusion and Exclusion of Women in the Forestry Sector, with special attention to UNDP/UN-REDD colleagues Aki Kono (UNDP Regional Centre) and Tore Langhelle (UNDP CO Vietnam), partners in UN-REDD’s regional gender collaboration Jeanette Gurung (WOCAN) and Kenneth Ames (LEAF), Gry Solstad from Norway’s ICFI team, and Gender Policy Director in NORAD, Bjorg Skotnes. Please see list of participants for all participants in the Scoping Dialogue. | | | | |
| **Purpose/Objective of Mission:**   1. To contribute to and learn from the emerging community of practice on gender and SFM/REDD. 2. To discuss and plan regional and national level gender and REDD+ work with regional colleagues and partners. | | | | | | |
| **Summary of Mission Findings:**  Background:   * This was a The Forests Dialogue (TFD) *Scoping Dialogue* - a first dialogue- organized on women inclusion and exclusion in the forestry sector. * Previous TFD dialogues, such as on REDD+ and FPIC, had showed that women’s inclusion in the forestry sector is particularly weak. * WOCAN (Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture & NRM) (with initiative from Jeanette Gurung) was the host of the dialogue. * WOCAN was created based on work in Nepal, and Nepal also stands out as country with particularly many women community forestry management/user groups (CFUGs) and also a country having a national policy to promote gender equality and social inclusion. * The Scoping Dialogue was organized as a stakeholder driven and led process, with open discussions, group discussions and a field trip to Chitwan, to visit to a REDD+ pilot project, the committee and decision makers for this project, and a women’s community forestry management group (CFUG).   Findings from the field trip and discussions:  The Scoping Dialogue explored various questions, related to the norms in forestry institutions, the relative success of inclusion of Indigenous Peoples’ issues compared to women in SFM and REDD+ (UNDPRIP has been more prominent for SFM/REDD+ than CEDAW), the lack of research on women and forestry, how to build the Business Case for women’s inclusion, pros and cons of including women as a ‘stakeholder group’, meaningful participation, leadership, the use of “gender” vs. women, cultural and structural barriers to women’s inclusion in the forestry sector, mixed vs. women only forest management groups, and involvement of men in gender and forestry work, as well as other topics. Here are some of the main findings:  Field trip:   * Participation in forestry community groups has traditionally been seen as a masculine activity, and where women are participating, it was not necessarily *meaningful* participation (e.g. women who were *not* vocal would be preferred as members or leaders, in contrast to very active women who sometimes would be excluded from the decision making processes). This was seen as related to normative perceptions about leadership, as well as socio-economic factors, such as women in general being more illiterate and uneducated than men. * There are particularly few women in leadership positions in forestry. In the village case, the fact that women were in minority in the political parties, and the politicization of the chairman positions*, partly due to the funding coming to community forestry programs and REDD+,* was seen as an additional barrier for women to obtain decision making positions. * The stakeholders appreciated the criteria of 50 % women participation in a committee. * Benefit Distribution: The stakeholders highlighted the usefulness of clear national guidelines regarding the proportions of the benefit distribution (15% of the income should go to “women’s eactivities”). * In addition to the 15% “women’s quota”, certain poverty alleviation investments, such as biogas, were seen as an especially beneficial and time saving to women. * The women forestry management groups often received the “left over” forest in the community. However the women managed groups were often very successful in managing the forest in a sustainable manner and increase carbon stocks. * The stakeholders in the community forestry groups found that men were more often involved in illegal logging. The stakeholders noted that women had been acting as forest rangers in calling the police and making efforts to stop the illegal logging to secure sustainability and continuity of the projects (and the funding). This was seen as an outcome of effective participation of women in the projects. * Capacity development to women was seen as especially effective because it would benefit “the whole family”. Women were seen as playing a stronger social and educational role, transferring the knowledge to the family as well as other community members. * The women in the village saw both advantages and disadvantages in ‘women only’ vs. ‘mixed’ CFUGs: a women only group gave the women more self-confidence, and more ownership to the processes; however, the mixed groups often had better forest resources and access to decision makers. The women also found some security limitations to their participation as forests guards, and the ‘women only’ CFUGs would partner with other CFUGs to go to the forest at night etc. * Among the barriers to inclusion of women in the forestry sector is that women often need permission from their husband to go out of the house to attend meetings. Education of men is therefore important to meet household level resistance.   Meeting discussions:   * The participants found that women play a significant role in forest management, but that women leadership is more advanced in other sectors and that the forestry sector in some ways is ‘lagging behind’. * Participants highlighted the need to learn from other sectors and success stories. * REDD+ has been framed as very ‘technological’ and leaving out women. * Many participants highlighted the strong ‘male’ norms in forestry education and in forestry departments, and a lack of women to challenge these. * Participants highlighted the importance of not only defining women as victims or as part of a “vulnerable group” (even though women often are in vulnerable situations). This could portray women as passive, and not active and important contributors and forest users. * A “no regrets” approach for REDD+ was suggested, to make sure that REDD+ leads to sustainable development. * The Global Compact was mentioned by participants in the dialogue. The Global Compact organizes an [Annual Equality Means Business Events](http://unglobalcompact.org/news/195-03-06-2012) and has developed the [Women's Empowerment Principles](http://unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/human_rights/Resources/WEP_EMB_Booklet.pdf) together with UNIFEM. * There were discussions on what focus would be most productive; to focus on ‘gender’ or on ‘women’s inclusion’ (different opinions on this). * One challenge that was highlighted was the need to obtain more data; to make women’s contributions in the forestry sector more visible. * An interesting discussion in the “Business Case for women inclusion” group crystallized two ways of “making the business case” for women’s inclusion; either through a transformative argument (rights based, development effectiveness) or with an efficiency argument (market based, economical/commercial argument). The difference between these approaches were highlighted, and also the limitations with both.   Next steps after this Scoping Dialogue:  TFD will mainstream gender into its activities, policies and its other dialogues.  The TFD Steering Committee will in November decide if this becomes an “initiative”, which would include a few more national dialogues on the topic.  A co-chair summery will be produced within a month.  **All papers, presentations and additional information from the Scoping Dialogue have been posted on the** [**TFD website**](http://environment.yale.edu/tfd/dialogue/exclusion-inclusion-of-women-in-the-forest-sector/scoping-dialogue-on-the-exclusion-and-inclusion-of-women-in-the-forest/)**.**  On the sidelines:   * Discussions with UNDP Vietnam on Vietnam’s integration of gender considerations in Phase 2. Vietnam will conduct a gender analysis for REDD+ and will recruit experts for this. The results from this analysis will function as a baseline for further activities. * Discussions with Norway on gender/REDD+. * Discussions with UN-REDD regional level, WOCAN and LEAF to understand better the regional collaboration. | | | | | | |
| **Recommendations / Action to be Taken:**  Make announcement on the UN-REDD workspace and possibly on the UN-REDD webpage about this event.  Continue to support the regional gender collaboration in Asia Pacific, especially the UN-REDD led phases of the initiative.  Stay in touch with the Vietnam CO and provide technical support to their gender equality and women’s empowerment activities (for Phase 2).  Promote the regional gender collaboration and the Vietnam gender work at the UN-REDD Policy Board meeting in October in Congo Brazzaville.  Make linkages between the UN-REDD global mainstreaming work and the persons involved in regional gender work as well as interested individuals in COs (such as Vietnam).  Facilitate interaction between the UNDP Gender Team, the regional gender collaboration and other relevant projects and initiatives, for instance by UN WOMEN.  Participate in the emerging community of practice on gender and SFM/REDD+ facilitated by TFD. Explore options for synergies with UN-REDD work on gender equality and women’s empowerment for more sustainable REDD+, - especially if this becomes a TFD initiative and several national level dialogues will be held in different countries.  Long term: there is a need to collect and distribute stories on gender dynamics and women’s involvement in management of forests and how this leads to more sustainable and effective REDD+ processes and outcomes. | | | | | **Distribution:**   * UNDP / UN-REDD global team * UNDP Gender Team colleagues * UNDP Viet Nam | |